United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 15, 2014 No. 110

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 15, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT PITTENGER 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.

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, I joined several of my colleagues and hundreds of people in the Congressional Auditorium to watch a gripping new film, ''The Interpreters,'' by VICE News, about the American failure to protect Afghans who helped our soldiers as guides, interpreters, and drivers. Their lives are now at risk as a result of their brave service and our failure to act.

For almost a decade, I have been battling to have the United States honor these obligations by effectively implementing the Special Immigrant Visas program authorized by Congress. For a while, we were battling the bureaucracy itself, which issued an embarrassing total of 32 visas for all of 2012 to help save these poor souls trapped in a bureaucratic hell.

Since the beginning of the year, this bureaucratic logjam has broken and we have been able to raise it to an average of 400 a month. With that progress has come troubling news.

Congress set the cap on these visas artificially low—only 3,000 for the entire fiscal year. These visas are effectively gone now. They are used up. It is not theoretical. We have 6,000 Afghan applicants in the pipeline right now and more who are looking for relief and safety.

Recently, Secretary Kerry, in a powerful opinion piece in the LA Times, noted this challenge and called on Congress to act and raise the cap. With each day that passes, as is so vividly illustrated by VICE Media's gripping documentary, these are people whose lives and those of their families are left to the tender mercies of the Taliban seeking revenge and setting as an example.

One case just caught my eye. The plight of Mohammad is typical. His father was murdered and his toddler brother was abducted, all because of his special service to the United States. Without a Special Immigrant Visa, he was next on the list to be kidnapped, tortured, and perhaps beheaded.

As Secretary Kerry pointed out, ''the way a country winds down a war in a faraway place and stands by those who risk their own safety to help us in the fight sends a powerful message to the world that is not soon forgotten.'' Secretary Kerry said:

And as the withdrawal proceeds, the United States is in danger of sending the wrong message to the interpreters and others who put their lives on the line to help our troops and diplomats do their jobs.

That is why this is so urgent.

Remember how we brought the Iraqi Special Immigrant Visa back to life last October in the middle of impossible circumstances during the government shutdown? There was bipartisan support, thanks to Leader CANTOR, Leader HOYER, Chairman GOODLATTE, TULSI GABBARD, ADAM KINZINGER, and others. A number of bipartisan leaders sprung to action. We need that same bipartisan spirit of support and urgency for the Afghan visa program. As soon as possible, Congress must authorize at least 1,000 additional visas for this fiscal year to get us through these next critical months.

It is the moral obligation of every Member of Congress not to just cosponsor H.R. 4594, the bipartisan Afghan Allies Protection Act, which I have introduced with my friend and colleague ADAM KINZINGER and Senators MCCAIN and SHAHEEN in the Senate, but we should demand action before we adjourn.

As Congressman KINZINGER pointed out, it doesn't matter where you stood on the Iraq war—I thought it was a tragic mistake, and I still do—but what matters now is where we stand in keeping our commitments. Innocent lives are at stake. American honor is on the line. Our future actions could be compromised if people don't trust us.

It is our duty to save the lives of those who risked so much to help us when we needed them. They need us to cosponsor H.R. 4594 to protect innocent lives and American honor.

FOREIGN POLICY

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

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor today because I believe that Congress must put an end to the waste of American lives and taxpayer dollars overseas.

Recently, President Obama requested $500 million to train and arm Syrian rebels. In his editorial, ''Congress Can Stop Obama's Ramp Up to War,'' Pat Buchanan made an excellent point, saying:

> Before Congress takes up his proposal, both Houses should demand that Obama explain exactly where he gets the constitutional authority to plunge us into what the President himself calls ''somebody else's civil war.''

Buchanan goes on to comment:

> Syria has not attacked us. Syria does not threaten us. Why are we joining a jihad to overthrow the Syrian Government?

Mr. Speaker, Iraq is another country in which America has again become involved to the detriment of our best interests.

A former commandant of the Marine Corps, who has been my adviser for the past 6 years, stated in a recent email to me, ''We should not put boots on the ground.'' He went on to say that the situation in Iraq is ''a Middle East issue that needs a Middle East solution,'' not more American troops.

Unfortunately, there are currently 750 American boots on the ground in Iraq, with authorization from the President for up to 770 in the future.

As our involvement in Iraq escalates, I am reminded of another important point made by Pat Buchanan:

> It is astonishing that Republicans who threaten to impeach Obama for usurping authority at home remain silent as he prepares to usurp the war powers—to march us into Syria and back into Iraq.

Last August, Americans rose as one to tell Congress to deny Obama any authority to attack Syria. Are Republicans now prepared to sit mute as Obama takes us into two new Middle East wars on his own authority?

Mr. Speaker, Marine Lieutenant General Greg Newbold wrote an insightful editorial for Time in April 2006, titled, ''Why Iraq Was a Mistake.'' From 2000 until 2002, General Newbold was director of operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff and describes himself as ''a witness and therefore a party to the actions that led us to the invasion of Iraq—an unnecessary war.''

In closing, I would like to quote a paragraph from General Newbold's editorial regarding the distortion of intelligence that drew America into the Iraq war in the first place:

> In 1971, the rock group The Who released the antiwar war anthem, titled, ''Won't Get Fooled Again.'' To us, its lyrics evoked a feeling that we must never again stand by quietly while those ignorant of and casual about war lead us into another one and then mismanage the conduct of it.
>
> Never again, we thought, would our military's senior leaders remain silent as American troops were marched off to an ill-considered engagement. It's 35 years later, and the judgment is in: The Who had it wrong. We have been fooled again.

Those are sad, sad words. We have been fooled again.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have the responsibility, based on the Constitution, to never get fooled again, but too many times we do not uphold our constitutional rights. I believe the words of Pat Buchanan and Greg Newbold articulate the many reasons that no President should bypass Congress and the Constitution to send our military into combat.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I have a photograph from the Greensboro News-Record. Here we go again in setting up our men and women in uniform that possibly could get killed in a foreign country. Mr. Speaker, this is a group of Army soldiers bringing a flag-draped coffin off of a plane.

Please, God, don't let us forget that those in uniform are our children, and we must protect them by meeting our constitutional responsibility.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and please, God, continue to bless America.

FOOD INSECURITY

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of summer food security programs for America's children because, unlike Congress, hunger doesn't take a summer vacation.

Today, in the United States, food insecurity is persistent and rampant. We are one of the richest and most powerful Nations in the world, yet one in five households with children experience food insecurity each year.

Any American suffering from hunger is cause for concern, but it is especially troubling to think that so many American children lying in bed at night are struggling to sleep because they are hungry.

Thankfully, most children in America who aren't able to get adequate sustenance at home are provided meals for free or at a reduced rate during the school year. In fact, 21 million children nationwide rely on free or reduced-price meals during the school year, and 825,000 of those children are from my State of Illinois.

But while we have worked hard to ensure our children are fed during the school year, we often overlook the fact that many of these same children lack access to these meals during the summer months. Of the many children who receive free or reduced-price lunches during the school year, only 14 percent currently access meals during the summer. This is why the USDA's Summer Food Service Program is so important.

As Members of Congress, it is imperative that we support and promote these programs so families who need help during the summer months can take advantage of them.

Recently, I had the opportunity to visit a Summer Food Service Program in my district with the Greater Chicago Food Depository and No Kid Hungry Illinois. I was able to see firsthand how the program is benefiting children in Illinois and across the country. These programs are working and making a positive difference for our local families.

Take, for example, the story of Maria and her husband from Chicago Heights. Maria works part-time at a laundromat while her husband works full-time in a lumberyard. These two hardworking Americans are doing all they can to provide for their children. But times are still tough and food is more and more expensive. To help pick up the slack, Maria and her children visit the Lunch Bus.

The Lunch Bus is a great program that not only provides lunch for low-income children during the summer, but also provides a safe place for those children to play and meet other kids. There are families all over America like Maria's family that work hard every day to provide for their children; but oftentimes, despite their hard work, difficult circumstances cause them to come just short.

We in this Congress have a responsibility to stand up for these hardworking families and to ensure no child in America goes to bed hungry. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the bipartisan Summer Meals Act, which will expand the USDA summer nutrition program to help more children across this country access quality meals during the summer months.

Rather than slashing these funds, we need to focus on positive steps we can take to end hunger across the country. The best way we can reduce the amount of Federal Government spending on food nutrition programs is by supporting legislation that creates jobs and helps families earn a living wage.

Moving forward, it is incumbent on all of us to promote summer food nutrition programs and to ensure that the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act, which expires next year, is reauthorized at sufficient levels.

□ 1015

As I said, Mr. Speaker, hunger does not take a summer break, and neither should we when it comes to taking care of America's children.

I will do all I can to make sure these children have access to nutritious meals all year round, and I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

STRATEGIC ENERGY POLICY—UTILIZING NATURAL GAS AT HOME AND ABROAD

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in a dramatic shift from just a short time ago, the United States is reducing its dependence on

foreign sources of energy. It has the opportunity to become a major force in the international energy market. It is being made possible through the development of our domestic energy resources, namely the expansion of unconventional resources, such as shale gas and oil.

Through remarkable innovations, the U.S. has been able to access oil and gas from shale formations that were previously inaccessible or uneconomical to produce. As a result, we have quickly moved from energy dependence and a weaker footing to energy abundance and strategic leverage both domestically and abroad.

At a time when the economy has not recovered at an acceptable pace, gas production in particular areas, such as the Marcellus shale in Pennsylvania, have provided a key source of economic relief and job creation. As a result of the Marcellus, Pennsylvanians and Americans across the country are benefiting from lower heating costs, businesses are able to produce goods more efficiently, and manufacturers are looking to relocate to the United States to create products, support economic expansion, and grow jobs that were previously headed overseas.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we are to sustain the same level of growth and expansion, policymakers must make smart choices for the future so that we support rather than hinder this opportunity. To start, we must continue to expand gas utilization domestically.

The Marcellus shale, for example, has changed where, in the United States, gas is transported and utilized and how it is transported from region to region. This reconfiguration requires new infrastructure, including pipelines for transmission and transport and new processing facilities, and this all requires long-term planning and investment.

Additionally, because the domestic production of natural gas is far surpassing U.S. demand, most economists agree that a modest expansion of natural gas exports would serve to stabilize domestic prices and supply, which is critical to sustaining the rapid growth in the industry that we have witnessed. Furthermore, each gas export terminal is a multibillion-dollar investment that creates construction jobs in addition to the more permanent positions within the natural gas value chain. That means jobs for steelworkers, turbine manufacturers, pipefitters, and others, which will help communities across the country.

Given the situation in Ukraine and events in the Middle East, we are reminded that our energy resources can also provide significant geopolitical benefits. Exporting even a small amount of these plentiful resources overseas to our allies will strengthen not only our domestic economy but our national security. President Obama, Secretary of State Kerry, and leaders of the European Union have clearly stated that additional global supplies of natural gas will benefit Europe and our strategic partners. For this reason, I am proud to say the House recently passed H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act. This bipartisan bill would streamline the permitting process for natural gas exports.

In February 2014, the United States Department of Commerce reported that our national trade deficit for 2013 improved by $63.1 billion in comparison to 2012. However, despite this improvement, figures for the month of April are now showing that imports are increasing and that exports are decreasing, and as a result, the trade deficit is now at a 2-year high. With the U.S. Department of Commerce having acknowledged that increased petroleum exports are a key factor that can contribute to a lower trade deficit, it makes perfect sense to allow additional LNG exports in order to further reduce the trade deficit. In addition to its economic and international benefits, natural gas has helped to significantly lower our carbon emissions, which decreased by 3.8 percent last year in the United States, down to 1994 levels, according to government data.

The United States needs a smart energy policy that enables the citizens to continue receiving the benefits of abundant, low-cost energy, but also one that utilizes these resources as a tool of strategic leverage to improve our environment and shape international events to the benefit of America and its allies.

Mr. Speaker, we have made a smart and strategic decision in the House with the passage of H.R. 6. Let's continue to advance similar policies to further leverage the many benefits of our domestic energy resources. Let's do it for the good of the American people and our Nation's strategic competitiveness in the world.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Export-Import Bank, the official export credit agency of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, it is so frustrating to see this normally bipartisan effort to support the American economy get hijacked. I would bet, Mr. Speaker, that this bill could pass on suspension, that two-thirds of this House would be willing to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, if we were to put it to a vote on this floor—but no. Instead, we are forced, once again, to yield to a minority of the majority—the Tea Party—which demands the decapitation of an economic development and jobs creator giant—the United States of America's Export-Import Bank.

Why is this? Is it because the Bank doesn't work? No. It is an example of how government effectively could partner with the private sector. The Bank puts U.S. exporters on equal footing when foreign competitors have foreign export aid, and it bridges the gaps in the private market.

The reality is that, in the global marketplace, our competitors are aggressively using their export banks. Milwaukee, Wisconsin, which is my district, is still very much a manufacturing economy—the second in the Nation relying on this sector. Every day, workers in Milwaukee compete against foreign workers with extensive and aggressive foreign export credit agency backing.

Today, the United States Export-Import Bank supports an estimated 205,000 export-related jobs in the United States. My fellow Republican Wisconsin colleagues—Representative RYAN and Representative SENSENBRENNER—not long ago urged Bank financing because ''all steps should be taken to reinvigorate the economy and bring jobs to the United States.'' With higher than average unemployment in Milwaukee, the need for the Bank has not changed. Not only does the Bank support jobs, but it makes a profit from its operation and pays funds back to the U.S. taxpayers—$5 billion since 1990.

Opponents don't acknowledge that. Instead, they call for gimmick accounting, or, as my CPA and tax attorney colleague Representative BRAD SHERMAN calls it, ''fairytale value'' accounting. Further, opponents claim that the Bank exclusively helps big corporations, yet 90 percent of the Bank's activities help small business, and that number is on the rise. Just ask Apple Steel Rule Die in Milwaukee, a company you have never heard of because it is not a big company. In fact, new reports from The Brookings Institution show that the failure to reauthorize the Bank hurts small and medium-sized businesses the most.

I hear Delta testify against the Ex-Im Bank, and then, hypocritically, turn around and use foreign export credit agencies for their fleet. By the way, Delta would qualify to use more foreign export credit to buy foreign-made Airbus aircraft if Congress does not reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. For real, colleagues, do any of us believe that Delta will turn down foreign support to buy an Airbus plane or a plane from the Chinese? Come on now. I have got a bridge to sell you.

Opponents also say the Bank only supports 2 percent of exports. Exactly. The Bank's mission is limited. It does not compete when private financing is available. The Export-Import Bank's fees are higher than U.S. commercial bank fees. It is not in competition. It works in concert with banks here in the United States. This is further proof that the Bank is working. However, that 2 percent still supports a lot of economic activity in Milwaukee. When I am back in my district, unions and businesses—large and small—are hand in hand, saying reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

We use the rhetoric of jobs an awful lot around here in Congress. Now is the time to take a powerful stand for U.S. jobs and U.S. workers. Actions speak louder than words. I urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

COMMEMORATING THE MEMORY AND HEROIC SACRIFICE OF STATEN ISLAND FIREMAN LIEUTENANT GORDON ''MATT'' AMBELAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart but also with a swelling of pride that I rise before this House today to honor the memory and the heroic sacrifice of one of the FDNY's bravest—Lieutenant Gordon ''Matt'' Ambelas.

Lieutenant Ambelas, a veteran Staten Island fireman with 14 years of distinguished service, tragically gave his life this past Fourth of July weekend. He was attempting to rescue victims trapped in a horrific blaze in Brooklyn.

Lieutenant Ambelas leaves behind a devoted wife and two beautiful girls. He is New York's first firefighter to fall in the line of duty since 2012. While a family and a community mourn the excruciating loss of one of their finest native sons—one of their most dedicated protectors—Lieutenant Ambelas is a testament to the uncommon courage and sacrifice at the very core of the entire FDNY family and to the harrowing dangers they face in keeping America's greatest city safe every day.

Lieutenant Ambelas died after searching the 19th floor of a burning Brooklyn housing complex, determined to leave no innocent victim behind, as the flames spread rapidly from floor to floor. Undaunted by the danger that would have melted the courage of most any man, Matt faced it, undeterred, head on.

So I join all of my constituents in Brooklyn, on Staten Island, and all New Yorkers in acknowledging the immense debt of gratitude we all owe to Matt and his brothers in the FDNY, who put our safety above their own day in and day out.

While standing among those honoring Lieutenant Ambelas at his funeral on Staten Island last week, I was humbled by the incredible valor of Matt's actions. We watched as Matt's brothers in uniform, especially the Beach Boys of Ladder 81 on Staten Island and the Hooper Street Gang of Ladder 119 in Brooklyn, paid their final respects to the fallen hero. Seeing firsthand the mixture of strength and despair on their faces, I saw Matt's wife, Nanette, and their beautiful daughters, Giovanna and Gabriella. This was a very stark reminder that not only do we owe an enormous debt of gratitude to fallen heroes like Matt but also to the loving families that bear the immeasurable sacrifice right along with them.

When our Nation was viciously attacked on 9/11, 343 FDNY firefighters gave their lives. Since then, 18 more, including Matt, have fallen in the line of duty. Each loss, while a weight on our hearts, adds yet another angel to that storied brotherhood of heroes. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in the remembrance and commemoration of a true American hero in every sense of the word.

May God bless Lieutenant Ambelas. May He bring comfort to his young family. May He protect all of our brave FDNY firefighters, and may the noble sacrifice enshrined in Matt's memory never be forgotten.

To you, Nanette, please know that you, Gia, and Gabby are in my thoughts, in my prayers, and my heart is broken for your enormous loss.

□ 1030

PAWS FOR CELEBRATION

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman famously said that if you want a friend in Washington, get a dog, and I can tell you that many of our Nation's animal shelters and rescue groups would be more than happy to introduce you to a new friend.

Between 5 and 7 million companion animals enter animal shelters nationwide every year, and the hardworking individuals at these shelters and rescues try to make sure that each of these animals makes its way to a forever home.

I have been so fortunate that my entire life I have had rescue dogs as part of my family. As a girl, it was Scotty Daisy. As a newlywed, my husband and I adopted Samantha and Walter, and as a family, with my three sons, we welcomed Bison into our family.

I want to honor the hard work of volunteers and staff at animal shelters and rescue groups across the Nation, and I encourage my colleagues to join me today at this year's Paws for Celebration event on Capitol Hill.

This event, sponsored by the ASPCA and hosted by the Congressional Animal Protection Caucus, will feature adoptable dogs and cats from shelters and rescues from around the Washington, D.C., area.

It will be a great opportunity for Members of Congress to take a moment and thank the shelter and rescue community for their hard work and dedication to our Nation's homeless pets.

Who knows? You might even find that friend in Washington you have been looking for.

HAMAS AGGRESSION FORCES ISRAEL TO DEFEND ITSELF

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, 400 rocket attacks from Gaza in the past 3 weeks—Israel has made several attempts to defuse the issue and the situation.

This is how Hamas responded: ''We will not agree to quiet in exchange for quiet. If Israel does not agree to our demands, I expect we will continue this battle.''

Can you imagine that? Demands from Hamas that Israel not respond to rocket attacks. That is the only way you will get quiet for quiet between Israel and Hamas.

Now, we all know where this recent exchange started. On June 12, the abduction and subsequent murder of three Israeli teenagers, suspected by Hamas members, inflamed the situation, and then it was pushed over the edge by a murder of a Palestinian boy by Jewish extremists, Mr. Speaker.

There is a difference between how both sides act. From the Israeli Prime Minister, ''I unequivocally condemn the murder of a Palestinian youth in Jerusalem. Murder, riots, incitement, vigilantism—they have no place in our democracy.''

Israel quickly tracked down and arrested the teens' suspected murderers—tracked them down and arrested them and is prosecuting them.

What is the response from Hamas? What is the like response? In response, they launched nearly 400 rockets at Israel since June 14. For a month, this has been going on—into their population centers, not into military targets, Mr. Speaker, but population centers.

Now, last week, I attended a briefing with Israeli Ambassador Ron Dermer to discuss the ongoing operation in Gaza, and one of the things I found interesting was all the members that were there from Israel had on their phones an application which sounded an air raid siren every time one sounded in Israel. We could scarcely get through the briefing because they were just continually going off all around the room.

I imagined myself in my hometown, hunkered down in my basement against a rocket attack. No civilization should live this way.

Interestingly enough, we viewed surveillance video of Hamas members using their own people as human shields. The Israelis actually send a warning shot—this is the building we are going to hit, this is where you are making rockets, and we are going to attack it next.

You would think that people would run from the building, knowing it is going to be blown up, but what does Hamas do? They send people, Mr. Speaker, to the building.

I would remind everybody the responsibility for civilian casualties, when those civilians are used as human shields, lies with the party that deliberately places them at risk, namely, Hamas.

Understand, they are placing their launch sites and their factories next to mosques, next to churches, next to hospitals, next to schools. The plan is—their intent is to make sure that, when Israel responds, responds to an attack, that there are maximum casualties of civilians, so that Americans will think that the Israelis are bad, that the narrative is that Israelis are using an unmeasured response—response.

Remember, it is a response, Mr. Speaker. No other country faces daily rocket attacks against its civilians, nor would any, nor should any other nation tolerate such violence, and we strongly condemn the continued rocket fire into Israel and the deliberate targeting, again, Mr. Speaker, of citizens.

Now, this can all end. President Mahmoud Abbas can renounce the Hamas-backed unity government. How are we ever going to get to peace when their unity government is unified with terrorists, Mr. Speaker?

Since the beginning of July, the Palestinian terrorists have fired hundreds of missiles and projectiles at the population centers in Israel and, just recently, rejected the cease-fire negotiated by Egypt.

What is it that they want? Well, we know what they want. They want Israel obliterated from the map, Mr. Speaker.

For our administration, who has at times been with Israel—but not enough times—I would urge them, instead of calling on restraint for Israel, asking Israel to restrain—they are responding, Mr. Speaker, to attacks on their civilian population.

Instead of asking them to restrain, demand the PA denounce, renounce Hamas and start supporting Israel and give them the necessary resources to meet this threat.

CHILDREN AROUND THE WORLD

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about children and to talk about children around the world, here at home, and I guess what is most on many Americans' minds because of the visuals that they have seen, unaccompanied children coming into my State, the State of Texas.

I was down at the border some weeks ago, maybe just 2 weeks ago, and I looked at the reality of what many people see on television, and what I looked at was impoverished, frightened children, 12 years and under, children with diapers, children who were frightened and without their parents.

In addition, I saw the lovingness of volunteers from Catholic Charities to save the children, to many residents in the border community reaching out and helping.

Now, we are about to engage in a debate based upon the President's recommendation of what they need to humanely treat these children. Frankly, I believe that many in America have gotten the wrong information through various excerpts and commentaries that have been made by people who are uninformed.

I am very glad in Houston, on this past weekend, we had over 80 religious leaders from all denominations, communities, people who drove into Houston from counties way beyond Houston, all standing up and acknowledging their commitment to the humane treatment of children. They were from diverse backgrounds. They were ethnically diverse and racially diverse, as I said, religiously diverse.

Ministers like Dr. Terrance Grant Malone and Dr. Freddie Haynes, Dr. John Ogletree, Dr. D.Z. Cofield, pastors from Faith Temple, I believe, in Polk County—if I have it correct—and individuals from the United Methodist Church, Catholic Charities, Episcopal Church, people who are in the midst of Ramadan from the Islamic Muslim faith, all ready to help these children—that is the America that all of us know.

That is the America that the Statue of Liberty stands in the harbor of New York and has said, over the years, to bring me your forlorn.

That is the same America who can stand alongside of Jordan, who is taking thousands and thousands of Syrians; or Turkey, that is taking thousands upon thousands of Syrians—not the America who listens to the fears and wrong information about disease.

These children are medically checked, but if you will check the documents, you will find that, in spite of the poverty, El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala immunizes at least 90 to 95 percent of their children; but yet we doublecheck, and we immunize again.

So I think it is important to understand that this law that has, in actuality, been at the center point of my friends on the other side of the aisle wanting to change, with the introduction now of the humane law, is a law that should stay in place and that we should give children of any country, contiguous or noncontiguous, at least due process rights because these are children who in actuality have fled violence or human trafficking or sex trafficking and they are sometimes unable to articulate that in a short period of time.

They need counsel, and they need courts that understand. To rush through the decision, to have a court make a decision in 72 hours is absolutely absurd and impossible.

To only increase immigration judges by 40, I have introduced H.R. 4940 that increases immigration judges by 70. At this point, immigration judges have 1,660 per court versus a district court that has less than 500 cases, and they are overwhelmed. There is no way that you can process these children presently, and the expedited proceedings are not going to work.

Where is our claim to due process for these children? I look forward to working deliberatively, having these children in the process that they are in. By the way, they are in a deportation process. They are not just here to stay.

Putting them in a humane condition, debunking the myth of disease, and having these children go and find that these children will appear in court by having lawyers and enforcing the border with the border security bill, H.R. 1417, that this House and this House leadership refuses to put on the floor of the House, which passed over almost 2 years ago.

If you want border security, pass the border security bill that we have written.

Finally, Mr. Speaker I want to care about American children. The violence must stop. I want to work with those who are being shot by guns across America. Let's stop the gun violence.

We need a Marshall Plan for the children who are being shot by guns in our country. Care for children all over the world.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Steve Walker, Fairview Village Church, Eagleville, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, I pray for each Member of this body to be mindful of Your will. You have blessed us with great freedoms and given the Members of this House great responsibility. With this responsibility comes even greater challenges.

Therefore, I ask, Lord, bless our Representatives. May every man and woman have the courage to speak their mind, the stamina to stay the course, and the determination to stand their ground, for conviction is not bendable. Progress is not made when men are not bound on principle.

Lord, I ask that this body be not just a group of representatives but, rather, a collection of free men and free women with a desire to guide a free Nation.

May they be strong in faith, abounding in wisdom, and righteous in nature. Lord, grant the home of each Member peace.

I pray in the name of my Lord and Savior Christ Jesus.

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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN 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.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar.

The Clerk will call the bill on the calendar.

CORINA DE CHALUP TURCINOVIC

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 306) for the relief of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 306

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR CORINA DE CHALUP TURCINOVIC.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Corina de Chalup Turcinovic shall be eligible for issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Corina de Chalup Turcinovic enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), she shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully and shall, if otherwise eligible, be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for issuance of an immigrant visa or the application for adjustment of status is filed with appropriate fees within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBER.—Upon the granting of an immigrant visa or permanent residence to Corina de Chalup Turcinovic, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by 1, during the current or next following fiscal year, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act or, if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 202(e) of such Act.

(e) DENIAL OF PREFERENTIAL IMMIGRATION TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN RELATIVES.—The natural parents, brothers, and sisters of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

WELCOMING REVEREND STEVE WALKER

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERLACH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pastor Steve Walker, the Family Ministry pastor for the Fairview Village Church in Eagleville, Pennsylvania, which serves thousands of area residents in southeastern Pennsylvania.

A native of the State of Washington, Pastor Walker received his undergraduate degree from the University of Washington and then proudly served in the United States military.

In 1991, Pastor Walker began working full time in the ministry, and since then, has served as a children's pastor in Tacoma, Washington; as an associate pastor in Topeka, Kansas; and as the lead pastor in Carson City, Nevada—all before starting his current position in Eagleville.

On a more personal note, Pastor Walker and his wife of over 30 years, Shari, have raised two terrific daughters, Ashley and Stephanie. Pastor Walker also demonstrated tremendous courage and unshakable faith as he battled cancer in 2003. He has since conquered the disease and has emerged from that battle with a renewed passion for serving the church, his congregants, and the community.

It is therefore my privilege to welcome Pastor Walker, his wife, Shari, and daughter Stephanie to the House of Representatives today and to thank him for serving as our guest chaplain.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

THE BANDITS OF HAMAS KEEP ON SHOOTING

(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. Madam Speaker, the Hamas terrorists in Gaza keep shooting their rockets into Israel. Israel has used defensive weapons to intercept some. However, Iranian-backed Hamas keeps on reloading its six-shooters and firing into civilian areas.

The Israeli Government is shooting back and is headed to Gaza to stop the bandits.

Our government wants a cease-fire. Cease-fires in the past have just given Hamas time to obtain more ammo rockets from Iran. Also, Hamas shields its command centers underneath schools and hospitals in Gaza. So it cowers behind women, children, the elderly, and the sick.

Hamas wants Israel annihilated.

Israel is following the first natural right of a nation—it is protecting its people. Now it has taken the fight to the terrorists, as it has a right and an obligation to do.

The United States should be helping Israel eliminate this terrorist group instead of criticizing Israel for protecting its citizens from murder. The only way to stop this war against Israel is for Hamas to be defeated.

And that's just the way it is.

NO DEVOLUTION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, you have heard the term ''reinvent the wheel.'' We have some people around here who want to un-invent the wheel. The Tea Party—''small government at any cost''—radicals have what they think is a brilliant new idea. It is called ''devolution.''

We will devolve the duty, the obligation, and the funding of the national transportation system to the 50 States. Oh, what a great idea. Well, no. Actually, we tried it in the last century. It failed pretty miserably. Here it is: 1956. This is the brand spanking new Kansas Turnpike. Oklahoma said they would build—oh, they ran out of money, so Oklahoma didn't build their section. Kansas did. For 3 years, cars crashed through the barrier at the end of this and landed in Emil Schweitzer's farm field. That is devolution. They want to go back to that.

Dwight David Eisenhower said, no, that is not acceptable. He passed a bill for a national transportation system, funded by a user fee, and the highway got completed.

Now we want to go back to that era? We want to compete with the world by spending less on transportation, by having less Federal coordination, and by passing a pathetic Band-Aid bill today with pretend money that will limp us through the next 9 months?

No. We need a substantial investment in our national transportation system—putting millions of people back to work, making us first class again, and competing with the rest of the world. No devolution.

IRS WITH OBAMACARE DESTROYS JOBS

(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. Madam Speaker, the American people know the IRS cannot be trusted.

The IRS has been corrupted by this administration, undermining the integrity of its longtime employees. Former IRS employee Lois Lerner arrogantly refuses to answer questions, and now the IRS is claiming to have lost hard drives containing emails that could lead to revealing the truth.

House Republicans know that if the IRS implements ObamaCare the American people's security will be placed at risk. The House will vote on a bill that reforms the Internal Revenue Service, keeps them in check, and restores accountability. This piece of legislation prohibits the IRS from targeting people based on their political beliefs, and it restricts the agency from enforcing ObamaCare.

The President's broken promises have already caused pain for hard-working American families, destroying jobs. We must do all that we can to prevent future injustices.

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

INVEST IN AMERICAN WORKERS AND NATION-BUILDING AT HOME

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, today, the House will consider legislation to prevent the highway trust fund from going broke. This action is critical, as a broke highway trust fund will result in no highway trust fund and will further result in the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs this construction season. Unfortunately, the measures under consideration in the House and Senate are weak, temporary fixes.

To effectively address America's crumbling infrastructure, the American Society of Civil Engineers estimates the need for $3.6 trillion by 2020. Historically, this type of bold investment has created jobs and transformed the American economy. When the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was signed into law, only 7 percent of the funds dealt with infrastructure projects. These projects accounted for nearly two-thirds of jobs created under the Act.

Congress is failing the American people by not making the investments we need to stay globally competitive. Let's invest in American workers and American manufacturers and make a real commitment to nation-building right here at home.

CHINA TIBET VISAS

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, for over five decades now, the Chinese Communist Party has ruled Tibet harshly and has treated the Tibetan people with great disdain.

The current regime says that Tibet is open to all visitors, but the truth is that actual access is highly restricted and is subject to arbitrary closures. It is difficult for tourists to access the region, and it is almost impossible for journalists and diplomats to get in to report on conditions.

When Chinese officials get visas to the U.S., they are not kept out of certain States or cities. They are free to travel our Nation, as are Chinese tourists and reporters. It is time that the Chinese Government lives up to its word and allows access to Tibet, not only for Americans, but for the many religious pilgrims from nations around the world.

I am a proud cosponsor of Congressman MCGOVERN's bill, H.R. 4851, the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act of 2014. The bill restricts access to America for those Chinese Government officials who are responsible for blocking travel to Tibet. This is a matter of basic fairness and is critical to ensuring that human rights are protected in Tibet.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, unless Congress acts, on September 30 the Export-Import Bank will go out of existence. This is a government program that has been around for 80 years—since Franklin Roosevelt—helping businesses export products and create jobs in America.

Last week, Congressman JOHN LARSON and I joined the largest Chamber of Commerce in the State of Connecticut, along with three small exporting businesses, pleading with Speaker BOEHNER to please bring up a bill to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank, which has happened routinely on a bipartisan basis over the last 80 years.

Madam Speaker, I want to make two points. Number one, this program does not cost the taxpayers money. Last year it returned $1 billion to the Treasury. Secondly, our largest competition—China and Germany—are doubling the sizes of their export-import programs because they understand that that is a way to grow their economies and to take away jobs and customers from our country, from America.

Please, Mr. Speaker, listen to the 850 business groups all across the country, led by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Bring up the Export-Import Bank reauthorization for a vote, and let's get this economy growing again.

MICHAEL T. MCCULLOCH

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Michael T. McCulloch, a social studies teacher at R.J. Reynolds High School in Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Every year, a teacher from North Carolina's Fifth District spends a week accompanying me as I go about my legislative duties. The Teacher in Congress program includes attending committee hearings and floor debates, as well as researching at the Library of Congress and with House staff, learning how this institution works.

Mr. McCulloch has taught for 19 years and hopes to use this experience to learn about the inner workings of our legislative branch and how our country's governmental structure was formed.

I commend Mr. McCulloch for his commitment to teaching the next generation about the revolutionary ideas on which our Nation was founded. It has been a pleasure to get to know him, and I hope this week proves fruitful for him and his students.

□ 1215

INDIA'S SANITATION CRISIS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, recent news has been filled with stories about the impact of India's sanitation crisis, like the NPR story about the horrific murder and rape of two young girls that could have been prevented if they didn't need to sneak out into the night to relieve themselves, leaving them vulnerable to attack.

Today, The New York Times has a heartbreaking piece directly linking the root cause of India's malnutrition crisis to the lack of adequate sanitation.

Many of the 162 million children under the age of five who are malnourished are suffering less from a lack of enough food and more from poor sanitation, and sadly, even those children who are lucky enough to survive are left with mental and physical deficits that will haunt them their entire lives.

This crisis that leaves women vulnerable, needlessly ends lives early, and undermines economic growth has solutions. I would strongly urge my colleagues to join me and Judge POE in sponsoring the Water for the World Act to make American efforts more effective, preventing the needless loss of a child's life every minute and the threat to young women and girls.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ALFRED SETTLE DOCKERY, III

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

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, I rise today in memory of Alfred Settle Dockery, III, who passed away in Raleigh last week. Settle was a kind-hearted man who was passionate about improving his community.

Settle grew up in Rockingham, North Carolina, and graduated from the College of Design at NC State University. He was a member of the 1967 football team, the highest ranked team in school history, at number three in the Nation. Settle scored a touchdown in the first NC State win at Carter-Finley Stadium.

After college, Settle began his career as a landscape architect, eventually moving to real estate development. He was a member of the original Raleigh Greenway Commission and a member of the Raleigh Hall of Fame Board of Directors.

He was a well-known man who took pride in his work and wanted to make Raleigh a better place to live. Settle was a loving father, husband, and grandfather, and he will be deeply missed by all that knew him.

FREEDOM RIDERS

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, this summer, we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act. Passage of this law was the culmination of years of courageous work by a diverse group of men and women who banded together to fight against racism and inequality.

One group, the Freedom Riders, deserves our sincere applause. Starting with a handful of participants, they grew into a national movement, traversing the South, challenging segregation laws.

These brave young souls included many courageous students. Notable among them was our colleague, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS, as well as many brothers of Phi Beta Sigma fraternity, of which he is a member.

As we honor the 50th anniversary of Freedom Summer, as well as Phi Beta Sigma's centennial anniversary, we are reminded that the voices and actions of a few youth today can and will build a better future for all of us tomorrow.

I thank the Freedom Riders for the America they have made better for all of us.

SECURE OUR BORDERS NOW

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I was recently contacted by a constituent of mine, Lois Doyle. She shared with me the tragic passing of her daughter, Amanda, at the hands of a drunk driver. Words cannot fully express my sympathy for her family and her loved ones.

This is a tragedy that could have and should have been prevented. No driver should have ever got behind the wheel after drinking, but this drunk driver was in Texas illegally. He should not have been in the country. He should not have been driving.

To make things even worse, the illegal driver was released on bail and has fled the country and will never stand trial. This tragedy would have been avoided had our border been secure. This was a preventable and avoidable tragedy.

Mr. President, please secure our borders now.

INCREASED VIOLENCE AGAINST ISRAEL

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

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, I have been horrified, as many have, to see the increased violence in Israel against Israel. The bombings in Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and the specific targeting of the Ben Gurion Airport are unbelievable to me, and my heart goes out to the millions of people who are suffering on both sides. This senseless violence has to stop.

Hamas has been using human shields to protect its terrorist infrastructure, and despite claims to the contrary, Hamas does not have Palestinian interests at heart.

The United States stands with the Israeli people and has invested in the Iron Dome missile defense system that has worked to save the lives of thousands of men, women, and children all over the country.

Thousands of rockets from Gaza were fired at Israel. Thank God the Iron Dome intercepted at least 90 percent of the rockets that would have fallen on schools, on homes, on synagogues, on mosques.

Frightened parents are sending their children away from home to safety amid these attacks.

I believe that Israel has, of course, the right to defend herself and her people from these senseless terrorist attacks.

Israel agreed to a recent call for cease-fire. Hamas did not. I hope we have a cease-fire, but until then, Israel has the right to defend herself and her people.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DIVISION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise today because Sunday, July 20, marks the 40th anniversary of the division of the Republic of Cyprus.

I fully support the reunification of Cyprus, and it is encouraging that the Government of Cyprus remains fully committed to the U.N.-sponsored process to reach an enduring settlement that would reunify Cyprus based on a bizonal, bicommunal federation in accordance with relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions.

The occupation of Cyprus has led to thousands of Greek Cypriots being denied their fundamental right to return to their homes, freedom of worship continues to be severely restricted, and access to religious sites blocked.

Cyprus is an important ally of the United States, and its newest discovery of offshore gas reserves in the Eastern Mediterranean will strengthen cooperation with the United States and with our ally, Israel, and offer an alternative source of energy supply to Europe.

As a strategic partner of the United States, Madam Speaker, Cyprus can help us promote security and stability in this volatile region.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN ROBERT ROE

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today with the sad news that former Congressman Robert Roe passed away today at the age of 90.

A native of Passaic County, New Jersey, Bob served in the Army during the Second World War. He was elected to represent the Eighth District in 1969. Some of our longer-tenured colleagues will remember Bob for his noted ability to reach across the aisle.

During his time in Congress, he rose to the chairmanship of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. He also chaired the Committee on Public Works and Transportation from 1991 until his retirement in 1993.

A true public servant, he wasn't in it for power. When he became chairman of Public Works, he lasted only one term, in part because he exhausted himself writing the greatest highway bill in the history of the country.

However, that highway bill, through it, he achieved changes to the transportation policy to focus on connecting different modes. His favorite term was ''intermodal transportation,'' redefining how we invest in our infrastructure with this emphasis on safety and planning.

It is ironic that today, this day, we are going to vote on a transportation bill, the day he went to his Maker.

Bob is truly a legend in our era. He left big shoes to fill for all of his successors in Congress, myself included.

The building I am in, in Paterson, New Jersey, was named after him, the Robert A. Roe Federal Office Building, a fitting tribute to a great American.

My family loved him. We offer condolences to his entire family and all 35 nieces and nephews.

COMMEMORATING THE 240TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLACKWATER BAPTIST CHURCH

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

Mr. RIGELL. Madam Speaker, last month, my wife, Teri, and I had the pleasure of attending a joint church service which brought together Blackwater Baptist Church and New Oak Grove Baptist Church. That occurred in Virginia's Second Congressional District, which I have the privilege to serve.

The two churches were celebrating the 240th anniversary of Blackwater Baptist, and what a service and celebration it was.

What was particularly enjoyable and noteworthy is that one has a largely White congregation, the other a largely African American congregation, and that is relevant, and, indeed, it is central to my point because Blackwater Baptist Church, which stood at the American Civil War, once had a slave balcony in its sanctuary.

Now, the pastors of the two churches, Greg Hammer and Tyrone Johnson, they are remarkable men. They bring their two congregations together once a year for a joint church service. They are close friends, and they talk often about their Christian faith, which binds them together.

They also have the courage to talk about race, to celebrate the progress that we have made, and to take on responsibly the challenges that remain in our country.

Madam Speaker, this is what we need more of in America, and I commend them both and their congregations.

SMART GUNS

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise once again to highlight the harmful, hypocritical influence of the gun lobby in America.

Just last week, The New York Times columnist, Joe Nocera, relayed the story of Andy Raymond, a Maryland gun dealer who faced death threats and hate mail from pro-gun radicals, all for trying to sell a gun that could save lives, the smart gun.

Smart gun technology is a breakthrough, one that could prevent thousands of accidental deaths and keep criminals from using stolen guns, yet intimidation and threats keep these products from the market while the gun lobby stands idle.

Last month, Senator MARKEY and I called on the NRA to denounce these so-called activists and their threats. They are all that stands between consumers and safer gun technology, and we cannot allow harassment and threats to continue while 45 Americans are shot, on average, in a gun accident every single day in America.

Smart guns can stop this.

AMERICANS WANT LOWER LEVELS OF IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, a new Gallup poll has found that, by a 2 to 1 margin, Americans want to decrease immigration levels, not increase them. The recent survey shows that 41 percent of Americans support a decrease in immigration. Just 22 percent want it to go up.

Only a minority, approximately one-quarter of Independents and Democrats expressed a desire to increase immigration, and a Rasmussen poll found that people earning under $30,000 support a reduction in immigration by a 3 to 1 margin.

When is the President going to listen to the American people? They know that when a country has lost control of its borders, it has lost control of its future.

EXTENSION OF MAP–21

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

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, later today, the House will move forward on an extension of the current transportation authorization, MAP–21. This will ensure that Federal funding is available to meet our infrastructure needs through spring of next year.

For some 700,000 construction workers, including roughly 6,000 in Nevada, this is welcome news. Nonetheless, this short-term fix is only a Band-Aid on a sore that continues to fester.

For businesses, State departments of transportation, local governments, and transit authorities, this kind of unpredictability, which has gotten fairly common in Congress, hurts our economy and the ability for the public and private sectors to plan to meet our Nation's needs.

The clock is ticking, but there is still time to avoid a manufactured crisis again next year. If we work together, put all funding options on the table, and consult with stakeholders, we can get serious about building needed infrastructure, creating jobs, and investing in our future.

□ 1230

REMEMBERING RAYMOND P. MONGILLO, SR.

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, Raymond P. Mongillo, Sr., was a Middletown Township, Bucks County businessman. He was a public servant and a United States Army veteran of the Korean war. He passed away on July 8, 4 days after his 82nd birthday. He had dedicated and devoted many years in service to his community, to veterans organizations, and to his church.

Ray was a leader in the effort to preserve Middletown Township's quality of life and served for 24 years on the Middletown Board of Supervisors. He was very instrumental in saving Styer's farm and orchard from future development. Aiming for the best outlook, he said:

> The main thing is preserving it. We'd like to keep it going in its present form, as a farm store with pumpkins and hayrides.

And so it is, and it stands as a monument to Ray's hard work.

He leaves behind his wife of 61 years, Margaret, five children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, nieces, nephews, and many friends—and he has left a space that will be very hard to fill.

THE MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, as we debate the bipartisan H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, I would like to draw your attention to another important bipartisan effort, the Marketplace Fairness Act.

Over a year ago, the Senate passed that act with strong bipartisan support from 69 Senators. As you know, essentially what it says is that we will treat retailers the same, whether they are brick-and-mortar retailers in our downtown or Internet retailers, and if the State has passed a sales tax, then it would apply to all transactions.

This is important. When I talk to Vermont's small business owners, they tell me stories about the incredible unlevel playing field that they face. Folks come in, browse, shop, and then go online to buy. The difference is the sales tax avoidance.

These brick-and-mortar businesses are absolutely essential to the vitality of so many communities in Vermont and in so many communities in your State. This is hurting our small businesses, which make up about 60 percent of our State's private sector workforce.

Madam Speaker, I urge us to act on the Marketplace Fairness Act.

OBAMACARE HAS GOT TO GO

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, the people of Virginia's Sixth District are hardworking, busy running small businesses, teaching, raising families, earning a living, and trying to make ends meet. It is Congress' duty to make

their lives as uncomplicated by government as possible. Time and time again, however, we have seen ObamaCare doing the very opposite.

Across my district, hourly employees are seeing cutbacks in their workweeks. Multiple employers are weighing the costs of offering health coverage to their employees. I have received countless complaints from folks whose insurance was canceled or whose premiums increased.

It is offensive that the White House dismisses these experiences as ''anecdotal.'' The people in my district do not consider their lives, their businesses, and their health care to be anecdotal. Delays and exemptions have proven that this law is flawed and unworkable.

ObamaCare has got to go and be replaced by patient-centered health care reform.

SUPPORT FOR UNDERAGE ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, the current surge of children seeking entrance to the United States and the protection of our laws is a humanitarian challenge that we cannot ignore. The reasons for this surge are complex, ranging from a misunderstanding of the 2008 law signed by President Bush to discourage human trafficking to the consequences of our drug wars.

Our focus should be the interests of the children. Any person in this country is assured due process and the protection of our laws. Shortcutting these protections would be a tragedy and a crime. Each case must be decided on an individual basis, taking the child's best interest into account. Sending children back to be likely victims of murder or other crimes would be morally unacceptable and would cause new waves of refugees.

As in the aftermath of World War II when the United States helped rebuild Europe, taking the moral and humanitarian road will benefit us in the long run, whether this means finding homes for these children in the United States or helping their countries of origin develop the infrastructure to receive them back. This will create safe, friendly, and stable neighbors.

I urge Americans to support the humanitarian road that will benefit the children and our country.

IRAQ

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, for a decade, the United States, the international community, and the Iraqi people sacrificed immeasurably in support of the Iraqi people and their future. Generations of Americans and Iraqis bear the indelible marks of this conflict. Unfortunately, the gains wrought at such cost are now jeopardized by the shortsightedness and malfeasance of Iraq's political leaders.

To survive, Iraq needs a government that is inclusive and representative. And if we are to support Iraq militarily or in any other way, our Nation must know that we are supporting such a government, a condition that I do not believe the Maliki regime meets.

Moreover, if the U.S. is to assist Iraq beyond current efforts, the President must seek a new Authorization for the Use of Military Force from Congress. I believe that authorization and that debate is absolutely essential, and I am concerned about the slippery slope we are going down.

We must not become further embroiled in another Iraq conflict without both a thorough debate and a legitimate partner in the Iraqi Government.

OUR FAILING INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, Republicans talk a lot about the need for the Federal Government to provide businesses with certainty so they can plan for the future. I agree with them. So why do they continue to block a long-range plan to fix our crumbling roads and bridges?

Across the country, one of every nine bridges is structurally deficient, and the American Society of Civil Engineers recently gave our national infrastructure a grade of D-plus. In my district alone, 129 bridges have been deemed functionally obsolete, and 65 are structurally deficient. Every American who drives a car, rides a train, or crosses a bridge knows we need to act.

Our national infrastructure was once the envy of the world. In a lot of communities today, it is an embarrassment. A strong, long-term investment in infrastructure provides States, cities, and businesses the certainty they need for the future. It will keep Americans safe and help commerce move more efficiently, and it will put tens of thousands of workers back on the job.

Madam Speaker, we should take this opportunity to create jobs and certainty for a change and enact a multiyear transportation bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

PERMANENT INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3086) to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3086

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act''.

SEC. 2. PERMANENT MORATORIUM ON INTERNET ACCESS TAXES AND MULTIPLE AND DISCRIMINATORY TAXES ON ELECTRONIC COMMERCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1101(a) of the Internet Tax Freedom Act (47 U.S.C. 151 note) is amended by striking '' during the period beginning November 1, 2003, and ending November 1, 2014''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxes imposed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3086, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The clock is ticking down on a key law that protects Internet freedom. On November 1, 2014, a temporary moratorium on State taxation of Internet access will expire.

In 1998, Congress temporarily banned State and local governments from newly taxing Internet access or placing multiple or discriminatory taxes on Internet commerce. With minor modifications, this ban was extended three times with enormous bipartisan support. The most recent extension passed in 2007.

If the moratorium is not renewed, the potential tax burden on consumers will be substantial. The average tax rate on communications services in 2007 was 13.5 percent, more than twice the average rate on all other goods and services. To make matters worse, this tax is regressive. Low-income households pay 10 times as much in communications taxes as high-income households as a share of income.

The Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act converts the moratorium into a permanent ban on which consumers, innovators, and investors can permanently rely by simply striking the 2014

end date. This legislation prevents a surprise tax hike on Americans' critical services this fall. It also maintains unfettered access to one of the most unique gateways to knowledge and engines of self-improvement in all of human history.

This is not an exaggeration. During the 2007 renewal of the moratorium, the Judiciary Committee heard testimony that more than 75 percent of the remarkable productivity growth that increased jobs and income between 1995 and 2007 was due to investments in telecommunications networks technology and the information transported across them.

Everyone in Silicon Valley knows Max Levchin's story. He came to America from the Soviet Union at age 16. His family had $300 in its pocket, and he learned English by watching an old TV set he hauled out of a dumpster and repaired. Ten years later, he sold PayPal, the well known Internet payments platform he cofounded, for $1.5 billion.

That is the greatness of the Internet. It is a liberating technology that is a vast meritocracy. It does not care how you look or where you come from. It offers opportunity to anyone willing to invest time and effort. That is precisely why Congress has worked acidulously for 16 years to keep Internet access tax-free. Now we must act again once and for all.

The Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act has 228 cosponsors. The Judiciary Committee reported it favorably by a vote of 30–4. Nevertheless, small pockets of resistance remain. They argue that the Internet is no longer a fledgling technology in need of protection. But it is precisely the ubiquity of the Internet that counsels for a permanent extension. It has become an indispensable gateway to scientific, educational, and economic opportunities. It is the platform that turned Max Levchin from an impoverished immigrant into a billionaire. The case for permanent tax-free access to this gateway technology is stronger today than it ever has been.

Opponents also claim that this legislation will lower State revenues. Seven States currently enjoy an exemption from the moratorium. This legislation lets these grandfather clauses expire. But these grandfathered States had no reasonable expectation of maintaining their special status. The original moratorium included a grandfather clause to give States that were then taxing Internet access some time to transition to other sources of revenue. Some discontinued taxing Internet access in support of a national broadband policy. For those that still haven't, it has been 16 years, time enough to change their tax codes. If the revenue grandfathered States now reap is truly essential, it should be straightforward for the State to recoup it through a different form of taxation.

It is important to note that the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act does not address the issue of State taxes on remote sales made over the Internet. It merely prevents Internet access taxes and unfair multiple or discriminatory taxes on e-commerce, whether inside the taxing State or without.

I would like to specifically thank Mr. CHABOT, Ms. ESHOO, Subcommittee Chairman BACHUS, and Subcommittee Ranking Member COHEN for their work on and support of this legislation.

This bipartisan legislation is about giving every American unfettered access to the Internet, which is the modern gateway to the American Dream. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ladies and gentlemen, the Internet Tax Freedom Act, enacted in 1998, established a temporary moratorium on multiple and discriminatory taxation of the Internet as well as new taxes on Internet access. This moratorium is due to expire on November 1 of this year.

□ 1245

Since 1998, Congress has extended the moratorium on three occasions. Unfortunately, however, H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, responds to the impending expiration of the moratorium by making it permanent and ending the act's grandfather protections for States that impose such taxes prior to the act's enactment date.

The approach taken in H.R. 3086 is problematic for a number of reasons. First, Congress, instead of supporting this seriously flawed legislation, should really be focusing on meaningful ways to help State and local governments, taxpayers, and local retailers. The House can do that by addressing the remote sales tax issue.

In addition to extending the expiring moratorium on a temporary basis, the House should take up and send to the Senate legislation such as the Marketplace Fairness Act, which was mentioned earlier today on the floor of the House by the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH). That bill incentivizes remote sellers to collect and remit sales taxes as well as require States to simplify several procedures that would benefit retailers. Such legislation would enable States and local governments to collect the over $23 billion in estimated uncollected sales tax each year.

The measure would also help level the playing field for local retailers—who must collect sales taxes—when they compete with out-of-State businesses that do not collect these taxes. Retail competitors should be able to compete fairly with their Internet counterparts at least with respect to sales tax policy. The House should do its part and adjust the remote sales tax disparity before the end of this Congress.

In addition, this legislation will severely impact the immediate revenues for the grandfather-protected States and all States progressively in the long term. The Congressional Budget Office, for example, estimates that this bill will cost certain States ''several hundred million dollars annually'' in lost revenues.

Indeed, the Federation of Tax Administrators estimates that the bill will cause the grandfather-protected States to lose at least $500 million in lost revenue annually. These States include Texas, which would lose $350 million a year in revenue; Wisconsin, which would lose about $127 million per year; Ohio, which would lose about $65 million per year; and South Dakota, which would lose about $13 million per year.

Further, this bill would become effective during the mid-cycle for the grandfather-protected States. Because these States have to balance their State budgets, they will need to cut spending or raise taxes to balance their budgets.

Should this become law, State and local governments will have to choose whether they will cut essential government services—such as educating our children, maintaining needed transportation infrastructure, and providing essential public health and safety services—or shift the tax burden onto other taxpayers through increased property, income, and/or sales taxes.

Meanwhile, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that the permanent moratorium will deny the non-grandfathered States almost $6.5 billion in potential State and local sales tax revenues each year in perpetuity. H.R. 3086 will burden taxpayers and services while excluding an entire industry from paying their fair share of taxes.

Finally, the bill ignores the fundamental nature of the Internet. The original moratorium was intentionally made temporary to ensure that Congress, industry, and State and local governments would be able to monitor the issue and make adjustments where necessary to accommodate new technologies and market realities.

The act was intended as a temporary measure to assist and nurture the fledgling Internet that back in 1998 was still in its commercial infancy. Yet this bill is oblivious to the significantly changed environment of today's Internet.

The bill's supporters continue to believe that the Internet still is in need of extraordinary protection in the form of exemption from all State taxation. But the Internet of 2014 is not the same as its 1998 predecessor. Today's Internet is considerably different in terms of both the types of accessibility and the accompanying technology.

The Internet then was access primarily a slow, unreliable dial-up service. But now technology has provided many types of methods to access the Internet, and we can anticipate that

the Internet and its attendant technology will continue to evolve. By permanently extending the tax moratorium, however, Congress severely limits its ability to revisit it and to make any necessary adjustments.

Simply put, a permanent moratorium is unwise, and so I urge my colleagues to think about this carefully and oppose H.R. 3086.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for his leadership on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3086, a bill that would make permanent the Internet Tax Freedom Act, which was passed a number of years ago, around the time when I came to Congress the first time.

The Internet is an essential part of our everyday lives. Americans use it to run small businesses, to do research, apply for jobs, listen to music, communicate with friends and family, check the weather and traffic, and a whole bunch of things. It is really a part of virtually all Americans' lives nowadays.

Madam Speaker, since 1998, Congress has made sure that access to the Internet remains tax-free. Unfortunately, this protection expires in November, as has been mentioned, at which point taxes will go up on every American who wants to get online.

Now is the time to make this policy of having access to the Internet free of taxes permanent. Now is the time to protect Internet access.

Madam Speaker, the Internet is an essential component of our economy. It drives innovation, job creation, and has resulted in a higher standard of living for virtually every American. The bill before us today provides certainty to Americans by making the current law of the land permanent and protecting access to the Internet from new taxes.

Madam Speaker, there is common ground in this Chamber today. We all agree that the Internet is an essential part of our lives and an incredibly powerful tool for communication, education, and job creation. Let's not make accessing the Internet more costly and more difficult.

Madam Speaker, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act protects all Americans' access to the Internet from new taxes, and I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN, a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, after nearly two decades, it does make sense to make this moratorium permanent. The moratorium is one of the reasons for the huge growth in the digital economy. The Internet wouldn't be what it is today without affordable Internet access. And, by the way, this tax relief is not to companies. It is to individuals who access the Internet.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the Judiciary Committee for ensuring that the moratorium is made permanent before it expires. But the work on discriminatory taxes is not done. Wireless access to the Internet is still vulnerable to discriminatory taxation. The average tax is 17.2 percent—it goes as high as 25 percent in some States—and a disproportionate number of low-income Americans access the Internet only through wireless devices.

We have the Wireless Tax Fairness Act that I introduced. It has 220 cosponsors. So, in addition to voting for this moratorium on Internet taxation, I would encourage my colleagues to ask for a vote on the Wireless Tax Fairness Act that, after all, is sponsored by a majority of this House.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for their leadership on this issue.

Now I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) for his statement and thank him for his leadership on this issue as well.

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act. I believe that this permanent extension is necessary to ensure the Internet remains accessible for all Americans.

Madam Speaker, the Internet economy is growing and changing every day, and this pro-growth legislation will support the vibrant online marketplace of goods and ideas by preventing State and local tax policies from creating barriers to access.

Americans use the Internet every day to communicate, to work, and to get an education. They shouldn't have to pay an unnecessary and unfair tax to do so.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his work on this important bipartisan bill. I urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. JUDY CHU, a distinguished member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 3086 in its current form.

As a former member of the Board of Equalization, which is California's elected statewide tax board, and as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I support a temporary—not a permanent—extension of the current moratorium.

Madam Speaker, when the Internet was in its infancy, Congress rightfully put the moratorium in place to outlaw any burdensome tax regulations on Internet access. The Internet has grown tremendously since then, and it will undoubtedly evolve over time. As it evolves, Congress should be called upon to revisit these issues. But I believe that a permanent moratorium would make reexamination of technology and market realities very difficult in the future.

A permanent moratorium would impede a State or local government's ability to make taxing decisions that are right for them. This is the message I have heard from States, counties, and cities. Take, for example, the city of Pasadena, which is the largest city in my district. Pasadena does not have any plans to impose taxes and fees on Internet access. However, it has concerns with a permanent extension that could shut the doors years down the line.

In fact, Madam Speaker, the National League of Cities, the League of California Cities, and the California State Association of Counties all oppose this bill. They are opposing it because they see a dramatic decline of sales tax revenue due to the increase in online sales that are not taxed, and that is why I also support the Marketplace Fairness Act. It would require large businesses to collect online sales tax.

I can tell you that this makes a dramatic difference in whether local government has the funds to fill the potholes and clean the streets. Since enacting its remote sellers sales tax law, my home State of California brought in $260 million in its first year of collection. This is an improvement, but the potential for future growth is even greater, with a little over $1 billion of use taxes still to be collected from remote sales in California alone.

□ 1300

With this act, we can stop the closing of businesses on Main Street and have a fighting chance to keep the jobs that they provide our communities. Keeping the Internet tax moratorium temporary helps in this fight. A short-term moratorium strikes the right balance between respecting the rights of local taxing authority and the ability for the Internet to grow.

Congress must reserve the flexibility to examine the Internet Tax Freedom Act from time to time. That is why I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member of the Judiciary Committee and a leader on technology issues.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, because I support ensuring that Internet access remains free from predatory taxes imposed by State and local governments looking to fill their coffers at the expense of their residents.

I think we just saw why this bill is needed because there are two different

philosophies. Especially for those who support this legislation, this is an area where we want to continue to have the Internet free, especially as the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN) said, that this goes to the user, and I think that is one thing that we need to understand here.

This legislation ensures that no person is discouraged from accessing the Internet and experiencing its transformative power. The Internet is a tool for democracy and education. It is an outlet for free expression and the megaphone for those who were previously ignored. It connects individuals and is a means for creative entrepreneurship.

The Internet allows for all boundaries to be transcended—cultural religious, geographical, and lingual. Our economy, the expressions of our freedom, and our role as a beacon of hope and democracy are all enhanced by free and open access to the Internet.

I want to applaud the work of the chairman in ensuring this Congress is doing everything in its power to promote an open Internet that can be accessed without predatory taxes and fees.

Again, this is about the people that we represent, moms and dads who have the dream of a better America where they are making it for their kids and not being imposed upon by government simply looking to fill their coffers at the expense of citizens.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee and my friend for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support today of this legislation, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act. This is a bill that has been stated before that will permanently eliminate any barriers created by the taxation of Internet access.

The current tax moratorium is going to expire shortly on November 1, which would then open the doors to taxation on Internet access. I think it is very important to make this very clear. This really protects consumers because the taxation would fall to them and their access to the Internet.

This issue should not be confused with the issue of sales taxes collected by jurisdictions and the discrepancies between Main Street and what is purchased on the Internet. That is not what this issue is about. This is clearly, I think, a consumer issue.

Now, whether for communication, commerce, business, education, research, the Internet is an integral part of the everyday lives of the American people and around the world as well, so we need to encourage its usage. We need to protect that usage, and I think we need to do everything we can to ensure that the access to the Internet is universal.

This legislation has widespread support in the House. It has been my pleasure to work with Chairman GOODLATTE as the Democratic lead on this effort. It has 228 bipartisan cosponsors in the House—I think that is the most eloquent statement about it—and there are 51 bipartisan cosponsors in the Senate. It has strong support of the communications, Internet, and e-commerce communities.

I think this is an affordability issue. It is a consumer issue. It is sensible. It is bipartisan, and I believe that it deserves the full support of the House.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) for her leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I am here to speak in strong support of Internet tax freedom. I am a believer in the power of the Internet. It means a lot for America. It means a lot for the world.

Because of our commitment to keeping Internet access largely unencumbered by taxes and government control, we have created something really cool—a dynamic market for goods and services and, most importantly, a marketplace for ideas.

Our rights to freedom of speech and freedom of association have grown as the Web opens new outlets for expression in advocacy. Whether it is a group of citizens organizing to petition the government for a redress of their grievances or somebody looking for the love of their life on an Internet dating site, the Internet is there, but we cannot get comfortable.

We cannot forget that the power to tax—and might I add the power to overregulate—is the power to destroy. That is why I am up here supporting the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, and I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and our numerous cosponsors on both sides of the aisle. This is good for America and good for the world.

Please join me in voting ''yea.''

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, the full committee chairman, and I would like to enter into a little bit of a colloquy.

I am an original cosponsor. I certainly want to prevent taxation of the Internet, but as you know, I represent one of the 36 districts in Texas, and in my district, my largest city is the city of Arlington, and they currently collect approximately $1 million a year in revenue from connection fees to the Internet in their city limits, and under this bill, that would be prohibited.

I had been led to believe that we were going to have the same grandfather provision that we have had for the last 16 years. Apparently, that is not the case.

Could the chairman enlighten me why we are not grandfathering existing local collection fees, and what might be done in conjunction with the other body if and when this goes to conference?

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. GOODLATTE. First of all, I thank the gentleman for his question, and I and others have been clear that we think these grandfather clauses should expire. When they first were adopted 16 years ago, it was with the intention that they be phased out. Of course, they have had 16 years, and we would like to have them do that.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Our goal is to have a clean, permanent moratorium signed into law as promptly as possible. If the gentleman from Texas can engineer a phaseout consistent with that goal, I am certainly willing to work with him in that objective.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. If the gentleman will allow me to be part of the process and inform me at such a time that it would be possible to offer an amendment or to work with you and the other body, I would certainly be more than willing to do that.

Mr. GOODLATTE. As this measure is considered in the Senate and then in conference between the House and Senate, we would look forward to working with you.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the ranking member and the chairman of the full committee. We seek opportunities on the Judiciary Committee to compromise and work together. This legislation would have been an excellent opportunity to be able to work together.

I appreciate the position of my chairman, but I know that Mr. CONYERS and myself worked on a compromise that I think and hope that, as we ultimately watch this bill make its way through the process, that we will be able to draw upon the Conyers-Jackson Lee compromise that makes this Internet Tax Freedom Act extended for a certain period of time.

We understand that there are frustrations on all sides. This bill would make permanent the Internet Tax Freedom Act, which imposes a moratorium on taxing Internet services, but as written would delete the existing grandfather clause which has been in place since the original passage of the bill in 1998 that allowed a number of States with unique circumstances, at the State and

local level, to impose tax on Internet access services.

Now, we can suggest that the present bill is a laissez-faire bill. Let me say that there is another principle of states' rights, and I have often heard it from my friends on the other side of the aisle. When it is for good, we should look at it as a reasoned answer to the uniqueness of the 50 States.

The Conyers-Jackson Lee amendment preserves the grandfather clause, so that Texas and other States could raise this very valuable revenue, but more importantly, it retains the moratorium for 4 years for us to be able to address this question in a fair manner. We offered this in the full committee, and there are many who support this compromise beyond the States that would be impacted.

A letter that I have received from the director of Citizens for Tax Justice writes in opposition to making permanent the Federal law—and I will include the letter for the RECORD—by banning State and local governments from subjecting Internet access to the same taxes they impose on other goods and services.

This letter goes on to say that it was decided that this infant industry needed special protection from taxes. Now, we are beyond that, but we are harming States.

I just want to use, as an example, the State of Texas will lose $280 million; cities will lose $51 million; transit, $18 million; special districts, $4 million; a total of $358 million. When we are putting more burdens on States, we need to not remove an opportunity where they can raise revenue innocently and in good conscience.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Why are we barring our States from doing their good due diligence, providing resources—needed resources—for schools and infrastructure and health care?

So I am well aware of the arguments on the other side, but listen to our arguments. We are not stopping the taxation issue; we are putting a moratorium for 4 years, so that we can reassess it.

I ask my colleagues to consider that as they consider this legislation. I rise in opposition to this legislation.

Madam Speaker, the bill would make permanent the Internet Tax Freedom Act, which imposes a moratorium on taxing Internet services, but, as written, would delete the existing grandfather clause that has been in place since the original passage of the bill in 1998 that has allowed Texas at the state and local level to impose tax on Internet access services.

At the markup in the Judiciary Committee, Ranking Member CONYERS and I offered an amendment to extend the moratorium and the grandfather protections for four years. Unfortunately it failed on a primarily party line vote in the Committee.

Now, the authors of this bill would deem to tell Texas what it can do or not do regarding its tax policy. At the heart of the notion of federalism is the right of states to legislate matters within their own jurisdiction.

The lines of authority between states and the federal government are, to a significant extent, defined by the United States Constitution and relevant case law.

The Constitution does, however, provide certain specific limitations on that power. In this instance, states would be prohibited from taxing Internet access.

H.R. 3086 would make the moratorium permanent but it would not extend the grandfather protections on which seven states, including Texas, still rely on.

The Conyers-Jackson Lee amendment preserved this "grandfather clause" so that Texas could continue to raise this very valuable revenue.

And the Conyers-Jackson Lee amendment retained the moratorium on taxation for four years instead of making it permanent.

Unfortunately, for Texas, this legislation would delete the existing grandfather clause that has been in place since the original passage of the bill in 1998 that has allowed Texas at the state and local level to impose tax on Internet access services.

The original intent of ITFA in 1998 was to encourage development of the Internet, which at the time was a new technology. The Internet is no longer an infantile industry.

Madam Speaker, as a practical matter this justification is no longer applicable given the substantial advancements in technology that have occurred since 1998.

Bundling non-Internet based services with Internet services creates a loophole for industry to avoid taxes altogether.

Again, the Conyers-Jackson Lee amendment would have preserved this "grandfather clause" so that the state can continue to raise this very valuable revenue. As written the bill raises significant federalism concerns and essentially tells Texas what to do—nobody messes with Texas.

I urge my colleagues to vote for fairness and judicial economy by opposing this legislation in its current form.

H.R. 3086: EFFECT ON TEXAS

State: $280 million
City: 51 million
Transit: 18 million
County: 5 million
Special districts: 4 million
Total: $358 million (per year)

JULY 14, 2014.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON LEE: Citizens for Tax Justice writes in opposition to making permanent the federal law banning state and local governments from subjecting Internet access to the same taxes that they impose on other goods and services. This ban was first enacted with the "Internet Tax Freedom Act" (ITFA) in 1998 and extended several times since then.

Both the "Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act" (H.R. 3086) and "Internet Tax Freedom Forever Act" (S. 1431) would make this ban permanent, thereby forever treating the Internet differently from other goods and services by barring state and local governments from deciding for themselves whether or not to tax it.

In 1998 Congress decided that the internet was an "infant industry" needing special protection from the taxes that state and local governments impose on other goods and services. Today, the infant of 1998 has the keys to the American economy, yet lawmakers are still coddling it by proposing to make the tax ban permanent.

Congress should allow the ban to expire as scheduled on November 1.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCINTYRE,
Director, Citizens for Tax Justice.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, INTERNATIONAL CITY/COUNTY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, GOVERNMENT FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS,

June 17, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON LEE: On behalf of local governments across the nation, our organizations want to express our opposition to H.R. 3086, the "Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act (ITFA)." Instead, as the expiration date for the current moratorium on taxing Internet access approaches, and Congress considers changes to ITFA, our organizations recommend a shorter-term extension of ITFA, as a sensible solution that respects state and local taxing authority. In addition, any extension must maintain both the long-standing grandfather provisions that preserve existing state and local revenues, as well as certain general business taxes that were not intended to be part of the moratorium.

Over the next several years, most of the services known as telecommunications and cable services will transition to broadband. As a result, the scope of the services that ITFA shields from state and local taxation will greatly expand, even if ITFA's language remains unchanged. In light of this substantial expansion and the need to protect the fiscal strength of state and local governments, we encourage you to support a temporary extension of ITFA, rather than making it permanent, as H.R. 3086 would do. That would allow time to assess more fully (1) the transition from telecommunications and cable services to ITFA-protected broadband services; (2) its impact on state and local governments' tax bases and revenues; and (3) its impact on the relative tax obligations of industry sectors to which ITFA does not apply. A temporary extension of ITFA ensures that Congress has the opportunity to revisit the moratorium to correct any unintended consequences.

For these reasons, our organizations urge you to support a fair, short-term extension of the Internet tax moratorium. We look forward to assisting you and your staff in these efforts.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW D. CHASE,
Executive Director, National Association of Counties.

CLARENCE E. ANTHONY,
Executive Director, National League of Cities.

TOM COCHRAN,
Executive Director, U.S. Conference of Mayors.

ROBERT J. O'NEILL,
Executive Director, International City/County Management Association.

JEFFREY L. ESSER,
Executive Director, Government Finance Officers Association.

STEPHEN TRAYLOR,
Executive Director, National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors.

[From the Hill, July 14, 2014]

CONGRESS POISED TO SLAM STATES ON INTERNET ACCESS CHARGES

(By Michael Mazerov)

The House is slated to vote this week on a bill to permanently bar states from applying their normal sales taxes to the monthly charges that households and businesses pay companies like Comcast or Verizon Wireless for Internet access—potentially costing states roughly $7 billion a year in potential revenue.

For starters, the bill would strip Hawaii, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Texas, and Wisconsin of at least $500 million in annual state and local revenue from their existing taxes on these charges.

Beyond costing states the $7 billion a year in potential revenue to support education, healthcare, roads, and other services, the bill would violate an understanding between Congress and the states dating back to the 1998 Internet Tax Freedom Act (ITFA): that any ban on applying sales taxes to Internet access charges would be temporary and not apply to existing access taxes.

Enacted when Internet commerce was still in its infancy, ITFA sought to balance Congress' desire to encourage development of the Internet against states' and localities' need to finance essential services. Thus, it imposed only a temporary ''moratorium'' on new taxes on Internet access and protected existing taxes through a ''grandfather'' clause.

Congressional extensions of ITFA in 2001, 2004, and 2007 maintained those two key features. This latest ITFA legislation, though, eliminates both—the first time Congress has seriously considered doing so.

Every state would feel the impact. The seven states with taxes would start losing revenues this year, forcing some to cut services or raise other taxes to keep their budgets balanced. The remaining states would continue to lose as much as $6.5 billion in potential revenue each year from their inability to tax Internet access charges.

The forgone revenue would likely grow substantially over time as more people sign up for Internet access and current subscribers trade up to faster, more expensive, service.

The House bill would have other, unintended effects. Eliminating the grandfather, for example, would put at risk numerous other state and local taxes that Internet access providers pay on the things they buy in order to provide Internet service, such fiber-optic cable, or gasoline for their vehicles. Almost all of these taxes existed before 1998, so the grandfather protects them from legal challenge. But if Congress eliminates the clause, Internet access providers could challenge these taxes in court as indirect taxes on access service and therefore voided by ITFA.

The bill's proponents argue that banning taxes on Internet access charges is necessary to close the ''digital divide'' between low- and high-income households. Keeping monthly Internet access as inexpensive as possible by exempting it from roughly $2–$4 in taxes will encourage low-income people to subscribe and service providers to extend broadband service to low-income neighborhoods, they claim.

But there's scant evidence to support this argument. Studies haven't found a significant difference, in either the share of households with broadband or the availability of broadband service, between states that tax access and those that don't. And numerous studies find that Internet access costs are a smaller cause of the ''digital divide'' than unfamiliarity with computers and the Internet and a belief that the Internet is irrelevant to the person's life.

In fact, a permanent ITFA would likely impede the goal of getting more people online—especially low-income people who don't have Internet at home. Many people first use the Internet in public schools, libraries, and community centers, all of which rely on state and local tax revenue. The less state and local revenue that such institutions receive, the less they could provide Internet service.

Some in Congress argue that states and localities should accept a permanent ITFA as part of a deal that would also include enactment of the Marketplace Fairness Act, which would empower states to require large Internet merchants to charge sales tax on all taxable sales. Any extension of the moratorium, however, must include the grandfather clause. Eliminating that clause would threaten to invalidate many existing taxes on Internet access providers, as noted earlier.

Congress' proper course would be to end, not extend, the ban on state and local taxation of Internet access. The Internet is no longer an infant industry needing protection from taxes that apply to other services for which Internet access is a close substitute. Cable television service is widely taxed, for example, but if someone decides to pay Verizon $50 a month so that they can stream Netflix to their TV, ITFA bans the taxation of the access charge. This unequal treatment doesn't make sense.

Even if Congress wants to renew ITFA, surely the terms should be no more favorable than in 1998—a temporary exemption for taxes on access service, with pre-1998 taxes still grandfathered—and must include the Marketplace Fairness Act, which the Senate has passed with broad bipartisan support.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), who has been a steadfast proponent of Internet tax freedom.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing this piece of legislation forward, and I appreciate the bipartisan manner in which it is done.

The Internet is working. It is working. It is one of the great things about our economy. It is one of the great things that is happening in this country. It is creating jobs, and it is creating excitement with the younger generation. It is providing for innovation. We are leading the world in what we are doing.

Access is not necessarily available to everybody. We have people from inner cities to Indian reservations to rural communities to those who are just seeking to try to be part of this community and have access and get information and be informed and be educated and allowed to engage in commerce.

Since 1998, this has been the position of the United States of America, and if you look at the Internet, it truly is interstate commerce. We can be standing side by side, right next to each other, and you can send a tweet or a Facebook message or an email, whatever sort of electronic communication, and it literally can zoom around the country—hopefully through Utah—and then back to the person standing right next to you.

□ 1315

But in order for all that to work, the magic of the Internet and all that to work, it needs to be unimpeded. It needs to keep those costs as low as possible to ensure the maximum amount of access so those in our communities who are still trying to get in there, from our seniors, the rural communities, again, to our inner cities.

The wisdom that happened in 1998 has been reaffirmed multiple times. Only two people in the history of this piece of legislation have ever voted against this piece of legislation. The majority of the House of Representatives are cosponsors on this piece of legislation that is before us today. So, I urge its passage.

There are some other pieces of legislation that I would like the body to look at. I think we do have to deal with the remote sales tax issues. I think there are transactions that happen remotely. I would like to see parity in that—another topic for another day, but something that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later.

The issue before us today is are we going to allow the freedom for Internet access to happen at the lowest cost possible without the government coming in and thinking, oh, this is another bucket of funds that we can just tax on. The consequence is we would have less people involved and engaged. Companies are going to take care of this, but individuals who are trying to access the Internet, we need to keep those costs as low as possible.

Think about your telephone bill. We don't want that to be lit up. You know how that is lit up with all these different taxes. We don't want the Internet to be lit up like a Christmas tree with all these different taxes. It is interstate commerce. It is the purview, I think, of the United States Congress. That is why this bill is so needed. That is why I proudly joined as a cosponsor and why I urge its passage today.

And again, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Members on both sides of this body for bringing this bill forward. I urge its passage.

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

I want to conclude by pointing out that we might be going in the wrong direction with this misguided legislation. It will devastate State revenues, especially those States currently protected by the grandfather clause, and force State governments to eliminate essential governmental programs and services and burden taxpayers.

Furthermore, 11 national organizations are concerned with the fiscal impact on our State and local governments: the National Governors Association, the National Association of

Counties, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and 15 other labor organizations: the AFL–CIO, AFSCME, the American Federation of Teachers, the UAW, SEIU. Fifteen national labor organizations and 11 national, local, and State government organizations all join with us who are urging my colleagues to reject this seriously flawed legislation.

Please join us in making sure that we, the people, prevail on this measure in the House of Representatives.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LIST OF OPPONENTS OF H.R. 3086

There is a long list of opponents of this bill. These opponents are concerned with the fiscal impact on our state and local governments. Opponents include such state and local groups as—the National Governors Association, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Federation of Tax Administrators, the League of California Cities, the California State Association of Counties, the International City/County Management Association, the Government Finance Officers Association, the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors, and the Multistate Tax Commission.

Also opposing this bill are labor groups such as—the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), the Communication Workers of America (CWA), the Department for Professional Employees (DPE), the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF), the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), the International Union of Police Associations (IUPA), the National Education Association (NEA), the Services Employees Union International (SEIU), the United Auto Workers (UAW), and the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW).

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

Madam Speaker, passing the permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act would increase access all across America for millions of Americans, especially lower-income Americans, increase growth and increase opportunity, increase jobs in this country.

Now is the time to act. A permanent ban on taxation of Internet access is crucial for protecting the future of our digital economy. If the ban on Internet access taxes is not renewed by November 1, the potential tax burden on Americans will be substantial. It is estimated that Internet access tax rates could be more than twice the average rate of all other goods and services. Low-income households could pay ten times as much as high-income households as a share of income.

The last thing that Americans need is another bill on their doorsteps. A tax on Internet access would burden millions of Americans who rely on the Internet to conduct business, communicate, educate, and live.

Over the past 14 years, Congress has extended ban after ban on States taxing Internet access. The measures have been met with enormous bipartisan support. Only five ''no'' votes were cast in the history of these renewals in the House and the Senate.

As price rises, demand falls. If the ban lapses, State telecommunications taxes could take effect, and those rates are already too high. Former White House Chief Economist Austan Goolsbee estimated that a tax that increased the price of Internet access by 1 percent would reduce demand for Internet access by 2.75 percent.

The permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act merely prevents Internet access taxes and unfair multiple and discriminatory taxes on e-commerce. It does not tackle the issue of Internet sales taxes.

Madam Speaker, this is a great issue for the Congress to move forward on in a bipartisan fashion that will help to create jobs and economic growth and foster continued greater access of the Internet. After all, isn't that what we want? We want every American to have opportunity to access this in the most affordable way so that they can have the educational opportunities, the employment opportunities, the recreational opportunities, the social opportunities that are created by the Internet.

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

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, several weeks ago, I joined my colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee in supporting the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act when it was reported out of committee by a vote of 30 to 4.

It is clear that there is broad bipartisan agreement that we should not allow the current moratorium on Internet access taxes to expire. While I joined my colleagues in moving this legislation forward to provide clarity and certainty in this area, I also have serious concerns that Congress has failed to resolve another critical issue related to state taxation and the Internet: e-fairness and the current exemption for state and local sales tax collection for online purchases.

Since the Internet Tax Freedom Act first passed in 1998, Congress has made far too little progress in developing a coherent policy that addresses the intersection of state taxation and the Internet. Aside from extending this tax moratorium three times since it first passed, Congress has yet to pass legislation like the Marketplace Fairness Act or similar legislation that would allow states to tax e-commerce sales at the same rate as sales from brick-and-mortar stores. Instead we have seen states attempting to set a patchwork of policies that simply doesn't work. A federal solution is needed from Congress.

In the meantime, adoption of the Internet has exploded since ITFA first passed in 1998, and today, 75 percent of American households subscribe to broadband Internet services, and hundreds of billions of dollars worth of commerce is done over the Internet annually. The Census Bureau recently announced that total e-commerce sales for 2013 were estimated to have increased nearly 17 percent (16.9 percent) from 2012, totaling $263 billion in 2013.

Given the importance of the Internet to consumers and to economic growth, it is Congress's responsibility to determine a federal approach to e-fairness, and I am disappointed that we are simply looking at this bill in isolation without regard to the other issues related to Internet and taxation.

While I support an extension of the current moratorium on Internet access taxes, I believe we cannot move this legislation forward while also continuing to allow the Internet to serve as a sales tax loophole. The issue of e-fairness is a related issue that we must commit to tackling, and I know there is bipartisan support for doing so.

This is a critical jobs issue that I continue to hear about from small businesses in my district.

It is the role of Congress to ensure that our nation's tax policies and regulation don't unfairly burden one business model over the other. Yet, brick and mortar businesses can't fairly compete right now because states do not have the ability to efficiently collect the taxes owed from online purchases. Only Congress can fix this and I believe we must continue to move forward on legislation like the Marketplace Fairness Act.

I hope that House Leadership does not consider our work on Internet tax policy complete after voting today on the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act and I look forward to continuing to work with members on both sides of the aisle to work to find a solution to move forward on both ITFA and e-fairness legislation like the Marketplace Fairness Act before the end of this year.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act (ITFA). I want to commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for bringing this legislation to the floor today.

H.R. 3086 which permanently extends the moratorium on Internet access taxes and prohibits discriminatory taxation of internet commerce has 228 bi-partisan cosponsors. Originally passed in 1998 and extended three times since with broad bi-partisan support. H.R. 3086 encourages the flow of commerce and information over the internet and improves our nation's ability to compete in the global economy.

The original intent of this law was to protect and nurture what once was a fledgling industry. Today, access to the internet has become the engine of our 21st century global economy. The internet is one the primary drivers of U.S. economic growth innovation and productivity and it is indispensable for finding jobs and accessing education and health care resources. Permanently extending the ITFA protects citizens from a fee to access this indispensable tool while continuing to encourage the growth of a key driver for American global competitiveness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3086.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5021, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 669 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 669

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, modified by the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. House Resolution 669 provides a closed rule, as is customary for bills that are reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, for H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014.

On July 10, the Ways and Means Committee marked up H.R. 5021. The committee ordered the bill favorably reported by voice vote.

The bill is simple. It extends our transportation programs and our reforms enacted by MAP–21, and it pays for the extension without raising taxes on hardworking American taxpayers.

This extension is crucial. Prior to the expiration of MAP–21 later this fall, the highway trust fund is expected to encounter a funding shortfall. The Secretary of Transportation has warned that, as early as August, payments from the trust fund to the States will begin to be delayed.

Let's be clear: this bill is just an interim remedy for our current situation. It is not a solution to our transportation funding problem.

As a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I can testify to the work that Chairman SHUSTER and the committee are doing to provide a multiyear authorization bill. It is a deliberative, thoughtful process. The underlying bill advances that process.

The underlying bill proposes policies that have previously received bipartisan support. Further, these policies have previously also been embraced by the Senate.

The bill extends the surface transportation programs and funding through May 2015. It provides stability and certainty for States. It continues our investments in infrastructure. It staves off job losses at the height of the construction season. And it allows the process to move forward toward a long-term solution.

Some have suggested or proposed a short-term patch for just a few months. There are some who would like to see this just provide enough time to get through the election. A short-term extension would guarantee a crisis. Even worse, that manufactured crisis is easily avoidable.

Central Floridians are still trying to dig their way out of years of economic downturn. We are focusing on improving our families' financial situation, and certainly we don't need a downturn in construction—and especially infrastructure construction in the State of Florida and in my particular area, central Florida.

A short-term extension is, at best, feeble and, at worst, irresponsible. Washington should not do less when it can do better. Washington should not add to the list of crises of its own doing by passing a short-term patch when a longer-term answer is within reach.

The task at hand remains avoiding the expiration of the existing transportation authorization. The existing authorization is actually a good bill.

MAP–21 included significant reforms to cut out Federal red tape and bureaucracy. It streamlined the project delivery process. It reformed and consolidated programs. It improved safety. It ended the process of earmarks in transportation bills.

MAP–21 set deadlines for slow-moving projects. It set a new NEPA funding threshold and expedited projects that were destroyed by disaster.

MAP–21 consolidated more than 100 programs by nearly two-thirds. It eliminated dozens of ineffective programs and provided more resources and flexibility to States. It also incentivized States to seek partners in the private sector to finance and operate infrastructure projects.

Further, MAP–21 passed the House by a strong bipartisan vote of 373–52, including the support of the gentleman from Colorado. It passed the Senate by an equally strong bipartisan vote of 74–19. The White House issued a statement that said they were pleased with the bill.

While we continue with a process that will lead to a multiyear authorization bill, there is no reason why we should not support an extension of MAP–21. Extending MAP–21 through next summer is simply an extension of another year of good transportation policy.

Once again, I rise in support of this rule and the potential this extension holds for producing a thoughtful process that results in a quality long-term authorization bill.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

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

Madam Speaker, today, we are considering the rule for H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014. While this bill provides an extension of Federal highway programs, frankly, our Nation deserves a long-term solution to support our transportation infrastructure needs that will allow for a more effective and efficient use of resources through public-private partnerships and long-term contracts. In effect, by engaging in short-term legislating, we are actually raising the cost of infrastructure projects across the country, making it less efficient rather than more than efficient.

Unfortunately, this bill is a closed rule, which I do not support. It limits debate. It doesn't allow Democrats or Republicans to come up with ideas for amendments to improve the bill. That should be what this legislative body is all about.

I have friends on both sides of the aisle who have ideas to make this more efficient, to save taxpayers money, and to get more infrastructure bang for their buck, ideas like a national infrastructure bank, a bipartisan bill by my colleague, Mr. DELANEY, that would allow for lower-cost financing with locally driven infrastructure projects, at no taxpayer cost.

None of us are even allowed to discuss for not 10 minutes, not 1 minute, not a single moment, any amendments under this closed rule, and I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''no'' on this closed rule.

In 2012, Congress passed the Moving Ahead for Progress program that my colleague, Mr. WEBSTER, mentioned, which reauthorized Federal surface transportation programs and maintained the solvency of the highway

trust fund through the end of September 2014.

That seemed like a little ways off at the time, but here we are in July of 2014, fast approaching insolvency of the trust fund in September of 2014. How inconvenient to members of the Republican Party that this might occur before an election. Suddenly, there is an impetus to do something about it, to actually address the issue or at least to kick the can down the road a few months until, conveniently, after the election when we actually have a national discussion about how to meet our infrastructure needs and to pay for them.

This bill is simply a very short-term highway trust fund patch. It only extends the highway programs through May 31, 2015, and transfers $10.8 billion to the highway trust fund.

As Transportation Secretary Foxx said, without a patch, tens of thousands of critical projects and 700,000 jobs will be jeopardized. In fact, States are already preparing to delay or halt ongoing projects if the funding runs out in September. My home State of Colorado alone has nearly 50 active construction projects that could be at risk if we don't pass some kind of patch.

But this approach is just another kick the can down the road approach, to have a national discussion about infrastructure, to encourage efficiency of our Federal dollars rather than forcing contractors to bid out higher amounts because of uncertainty about whether their contracts will be long-term or short-term.

There are several easy ways that we could pay for a long-term transportation fix. The simplest would be immigration reform. H.R. 15 would generate over $200 billion in the first 10 years and close to a trillion over 20 years that could be used to invest in infrastructure across our country.

Others have talked about using some kind of user fee. Traditionally, the gas tax has been used as a proxy for people who use our highways.

I am very disappointed that not only are we not considering any long-term solutions to reauthorizing MAP–21, but we are not even allowed to improve this current bill before us, not just to make it longer term, but to offer simple, efficient ideas to make it work better and get more bang for our buck.

Our Nation relies on Congress to pass measures that ensure that our roadways, bridges, and transit systems are the best in the world. This bill falls short on that account. The American Society of Civil Engineers has given our country's infrastructure a D-plus grade on its 2013 report. In this increasingly competitive global economy, a D-plus is not enough to get us by as a nation to create jobs and grow our economy.

My home State of Colorado has increasing transportation needs, as do many other States. In the wake of floods last September, rockslides, landslides, and mudslides caused damage to roadways and bridges in Colorado. Five hundred miles of roadway were affected at the peak of the flood and 120 bridges were damaged, resulting in over $500 million of additional repairs to our already beleaguered transportation infrastructure. While the Colorado Department of Transportation did an excellent job completing short-term fixes to get traffic moving, there remain many long-term projects along our canyons and roadways where we need permanent repairs to our roads. There simply isn't enough of an investment in this highway infrastructure bill to address our infrastructure needs.

Again, we don't necessarily need to spend more money. We can simply pass the Partnership to Build America Act—if it were allowed to be introduced as an amendment under this bill, I would be happy to—a bipartisan bill by Representative DELANEY with 70 sponsors from both sides of the aisle that would essentially help finance locally driven projects to the tune of $750 billion at a low interest rate by allowing U.S. multinational companies who have tax-deferred profits oversees to bring back their earnings to the United States, where they can invest them in growing employment and infrastructure here. It is a win-win scenario. Yet under this closed amendment process, we are not even allowed to bring up this bill.

This measure falls short on a number of accounts. Its short-term nature makes the growing importance of public-private partnerships more difficult. And yet if we could simply amend this bill and improve it or make it longer term, we could finally have a discussion about our national infrastructure.

The House majority continues to have a closed process where bills are constructed and not allowed to be improved upon by Republicans or Democrats here in the House. I know that we can do better, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose this rule, bring down this rule so we can have an open process regarding transportation funding.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I think it is important to note that the authorization is not ending next month. It is just the funds are running out. We have got to extend the funds. The authorization continues on through the end of the year.

That authorization was a good bill, as I explained in my opening remarks. MAP–21 was an excellent piece of legislation that consolidated a lot of programs, allowed States more flexibility, and gave them a pathway to create many of the infrastructure projects we need. This is just the money. And then we go a little bit further so we are not creating a crisis right before we adjourn.

So I think, in the end, this is a very good piece of legislation. It puts forth what is needed. We need money to finish the authorization we already have. That is what this does.

The administration policy from the Executive Office of the President's Office of Management and Budget says this: ''With surface transportation funding running out''—he is only talking about the funding. He knows that the policy still is in place—''and hundreds of thousands of jobs at risk later this summer, the administration supports House passage of H.R. 5021 . . . This legislation would provide for continuity of funding for the highway trust fund during the height of the summer construction season and keep Americans at work repairing the Nation's crumbling roads, bridges, and transit systems.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, the hallmark of a great country is a great infrastructure.

In its infancy, this country built interstate canals that helped commerce and life become strong and our economy vigorous. In the height of the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln met with Justin Morrill, then a Senator from the State of Vermont, and conceived the ambition of an intercontinental railroad. In the 1950s, President Dwight D. Eisenhower said that we needed an interstate highway system.

This temporary bill, where our only responsibility is to make sure we can preserve what we have by having the funds necessary to repair roads and bridges is an abdication of our responsibility. Congress can do better, and America needs better. Our bridges and our roads are falling apart. I recently visited two projects in Vermont that are in desperate need of repair, but this bill provides temporary funding for 8 months. Not only that, instead of basing it on user fees, which have always been the way we funded infrastructure projects that we all benefit by, it raids pension funds. It essentially creates a pothole in future pensions to fill potholes in our highways.

Some folks are saying that we need time in order to put together a long-term bill. Madam Speaker, we have had time. What we need is a decision. There are options out there. As the gentleman from Colorado said, we are not lacking options; what we are lacking is will. This has traditionally been an area of common agreement between Republicans and Democrats where, yes, it is always difficult to figure out what that revenue source is, but that difficulty is not an excuse for Congress to fail to do its job and give this highway trust fund a sustainable and long-term revenue source so that folks in Montpelier and folks in Austin, Texas, can put together those plans to repair our roads and bridges, put America back to work, and get this economy going.

I urge us to defeat this rule and to defeat this bill and for Congress finally to do its job.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the future of our transportation system in this country.

Back at home in Sussex, Bergen, and Warren Counties in the Fifth District of New Jersey, they are only asking the same thing that people across America are, and that is to have a safe and efficient transportation system of roads and bridges.

The highway trust fund is bankrupt. Our past highway bills have been filled with excessive Federal regulation and pork-laden projects, meaning that the maintenance of our roads and bridges has not been getting done. So we are here today because we don't have the money now to fix them.

Going forward, we have two clear choices. Either we can continue down the same path, the current path, passing a bill to bail out the trust fund to the tune of some $50 billion, or we can find a better way.

Personally, I get tired every year going and speaking to the Secretary of Transportation—it doesn't matter which party—and asking him: Can you tell me what exactly the needs are on Route 17 in Bergen County or Route 519 in Sussex or Warren County? I ask that question, and again and again they will say: Where's Route 17? Where's Route 517? Where's Route 519?

We are here saying we cannot continue to allow Washington, who doesn't know our needs and doesn't know our roads, to tell us how to run things. The solution to our current quagmire is to return the power back to the people who know better, back to the States. States, counties, and local officials are the ones that use these roads. They are in the best position to decide how to use these transportation dollars.

There is not one single Federal official here in Washington, elected or otherwise, who knows the needs of my community or your community with specific detail as well as the people who actually live there, who actually drive on those roads, and who actually have to maintain those roads.

So it is about time, after all these years, that we re-empower the States, re-empower the counties, re-empower the local officials, the people who live and use these roads, to make the transportation decisions, instead of people here in Washington who have no clue what the needs are, who have no idea what the problems are, who have no idea as to actually provide, what I said at the very beginning, what the people in my counties of the Fifth District want as a safe and efficient transportation system.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank Mr. POLIS for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule for H.R. 5021. This closed rule prevents an opportunity for us to address the larger issues related to passing a long-term surface transportation reauthorization, and that is what Mr. POLIS and Mr. WELCH are talking about. I agree.

The constituents that I represent in North Carolina feel that it is critical to extend the highway trust fund. This bill is only one piece of what must be done to strengthen our Nation's infrastructure and economy.

The need to pass surface transportation reauthorization funding is extremely critical. MAP–21 expires at the beginning of October. At the same time, each day brings us closer to a highway trust fund shortfall and risks putting major transportation projects on hold and stalling our economy.

□ 1345

The North Carolina DOT has indicated that the highway trust fund insolvency would jeopardize 108 projects and 20,000 jobs across my State.

Eastern North Carolina remains one of the poorest districts in the country despite the economic resurgence many other areas of the country have seen. Strengthening infrastructure helps encourage economic development, increase commerce and improve tourism. We cannot afford to halt construction, growth, and progress. We must find a way to provide consistent and robust transportation funding. We need a fix to the reauthorization act.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this closed rule so that we can have a larger conversation about the long-term surface transportation reauthorization.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a leader on transportation issues.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

I listened carefully to what you said, and you are right—this closed rule is a disservice. My respected friend from Florida, I think, is just wrong.

Madam Speaker, this is not a solution, and it is not a deliberate, thoughtful process. We have not had a single hearing on transportation finance in the Ways and Means Committee all year. We didn't have one the year before that. We haven't had a hearing in the 43 months that Republicans have been in charge. This is a perfectly predictable problem that was created by the halfhearted bill that they passed last Congress. We knew this was coming for months. Now we are here.

With all due respect, I, too, am disappointed that we have a rule that does not make in order broad discussion and amendment. We have been unable in this Congress to deal meaningfully with the looming transportation crisis. The gentleman is on the Transportation Committee. He doesn't have a bill. We are almost through this Congress, and we don't have a bill. America is falling apart. America is falling behind. We have failed to give America's communities the resources and a robust 6-year reauthorization plan.

We have done it before under the chairmanship of Bud Shuster and Ranking Member Jim Oberstar, and I was happy to have played a small role. That bill made a difference.

If we fail to come to grips with the funding level and, instead, in approving this rule and the underlying bill, this Congress is giving itself a ticket out of town to adjourn and pass it on to not just the next Congress but to the Congress after that. Make no mistake. In May 2015, you are not going to be in any different a place. It is going to be May 2017.

Congress has legitimate policy differences. I appreciate my friend from New Jersey. Some people think that the Federal Government should get out of the partnership that we have had and reduce or eliminate the Federal gas tax. They are willing to give up on the successful partnership and let each State decide what to do, when it wants to do it, or what it is able or not able to do. They would abandon all sense of a national vision and the ability to shape transportation policies. That is rejected by the mayors, rejected by county commissioners, rejected by State transportation officials. They want that partnership.

Frankly, there are some people who feel the gas tax ought to be adjusted to deal with inflation and increased fuel economy as well as the demands of a growing Nation with an aging infrastructure. Some people are comfortable with the Republican budget, which will have no new projects for 15 months and will doom us to a 30 percent reduction over the next 10 years. Those are legitimate policy differences, but we are not dealing with them here on the floor. We are shrugging our shoulders, passing them on to the next Congress and, frankly, to the Congress after that.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I agree with the people who build and maintain and use our transportation infrastructure. We should address this infrastructure question head on. American infrastructure used to be the best in the world and a point of pride, bringing Americans together. It is now a source of embarrassment and deep concern as we fall further and further behind global leaders.

We ought to reject this rule. We ought to allow full debate and, by all means, resolve the funding question now so we can go forward. America deserves no less.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to make sure we remind everybody that there were 373 Members

who voted for that halfhearted bill, including the gentleman who spoke against that bill but who voted for it just 2 years ago. Why? Because it was good policy. It set forth some policy moving forward in that MAP–21 allowed for more flexibility for the local communities to determine what they needed. It took 100 projects and silos and so forth and reduced them down by a major amount. It gave that flexibility to the States.

As for my State, we have the largest transportation program this year that we have ever had—$10 billion—which is $2 billion more than it was the year before. Why? Because this program and this project and this bill and the reauthorization worked, and all we are doing is extending that good policy. The policy already extends all the way through the end of the year. We are funding it. That is the real need, to finish funding it, and then we extend it another 5 months.

To me, it is a great piece of legislation that can be improved. It gives us the time as we come along and begin working on the reauthorization bill that we are getting ready to propose at some point in time in the future. The staff is already working, and the Members are giving ideas. I have met with the staff, and have given them some ideas that I thought would work, and that is happening right now.

This does not preclude us from continuing on. We don't have to have, really, even within the current timeframe, a new reauthorization bill until the end of the year. However, we do need funding. That is what this bill does. It provides the funding necessary to complete what, I think, was a very good piece of public policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman yielded back?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman reserved.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, our country's roads and highways are a vital asset to our economic competitiveness. Strengthening our transportation infrastructure will, of course, make our roads and transit systems safer, but it also will support commerce, create jobs, and strengthen our Nation's economy.

In my home State of Rhode Island, 20 percent of our bridges are in poor condition. Without any changes, 40 percent of the State's bridges will be structurally deficient by 2024, and, according to a report released yesterday by the White House, if Congress fails to act, over 3,500 jobs in Rhode Island will be jeopardized. This should not be allowed to happen, and Congress has a responsibility to provide the funding for these important transportation projects.

The highway trust fund is a critical resource that supports the building and repairing of our roads, highways and bridges, and hundreds of thousands of jobs all across our country. Although I support acting quickly to replenish the highway trust fund, I am very disappointed that this bill is being brought up under a closed rule, ensuring that we cannot consider alternative and more robust funding mechanisms.

Although the Highway and Transportation Funding Act presents a solution that will extend surface transportation authorization until next May and ensure the highway trust fund does not become insolvent next month, a short-term solution is not enough. We have to find a long-term solution to this issue that secures real investments in rebuilding America. Due to the nature of construction projects, of course, States, localities, and contractors need long-term financing to allow for the proper planning of infrastructure projects. The uncertainty has already put important transportation projects at risk, so this governing by crisis must end.

Earlier this month, I welcomed Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx to Rhode Island, and we discussed the urgent need to replenish the highway trust fund to help maintain Rhode Island's transportation infrastructure system and the absolute necessity of a long-term and sustainable funding model. We met with local, State, and Federal leaders and stakeholders to hear their concerns and to discuss a path forward.

This closed rule does not allow us to offer any solution to this problem. I urge my colleagues to reject this closed rule so that we can address this serious issue in a real way.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, if—or should I say when—we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will bring up legislation that will prevent employers from denying common birth control coverage to women, and it will fix the damage that has been done by the recent Hobby Lobby Supreme Court decision. Now more than ever, it is critical to protect everyone's right to health services, including that of basic contraception.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Madam Speaker, in January of this year, I joined over 90 of my House colleagues in filing an amicus brief with the Supreme Court in advance of the arguments in Hobby Lobby v. Sebelius.

The free exercise of religion is one of our country's foundational principles and greatest strengths, but so too is the fundamental commitment to equality and fairness—the core idea that the rights and privileges of one American never snuff out the rights and privileges of one's neighbor's.

We are disappointed in the Court's ruling that closely held corporations can now place themselves between patients and doctors. We are disappointed that it is yet another blow to women's health. We are disappointed in yet another threat to the economic security of women and families, and we are disappointed that, for the first time, our Supreme Court gave a religious exemption to a generally applicable law to a for-profit corporation.

For-profit corporations do not exist to advance the interests of individuals with a shared religious faith, and in fact, they are prohibited by law from hiring, firing, or structuring their memberships on the basis of religion.

I am proud to stand with Representatives SLAUGHTER, DEGETTE, and NADLER in offering legislation to keep private medical decisions between patients and their doctors, and I look forward to the day that our laws acknowledge that corporations are not people and that the constitutional rights of an individual are what this country is formed to enshrine and protect.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I just want to remind the audience or anyone listening that we are talking about a rule that is dealing with transportation funding and about extending it so that we can continue the jobs necessary and finish the projects that have been started in States and so that we can start new ones. That is what we are talking about here and not necessarily about the issue that was just presented.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, with due respect to my colleague from Florida, the gentleman is incorrect.

We have stated it and will offer the language on the previous question. So, as long as we can have the votes to defeat the previous question, we will be able to bring to the floor under the procedures of this body a bill that will ensure that women have access to contraception as part of basic health care. That is under the rules of this House—by defeating the previous question now being discussed and that I will offer—and we will be able to move forward on ensuring that women have access to comprehensive birth control.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

Madam Speaker, I rise, like my colleague Mr. KENNEDY, to urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that we can discuss a matter that is very urgent to the women of this country.

The most blessed moment of my life was the birth of my son, Ben. His life has brought me great joy as well as great responsibilities. The decision to bring Ben into the world was a private decision, made by his father and me. We didn't call our Congressman, and we didn't call my employer.

Now it appears, with the Hobby Lobby case, that the Supreme Court of the United States seems to think that

life begins at incorporation. I vehemently disagree. Employers belong in the workplace and not in the doctor's office or in our bedrooms. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the not my boss' business act, which will ban a corporation from using its owner's religious belief to deny health care coverage for contraception. No one should lose access to birth control because her company doesn't approve of it. A woman's family planning decision is not her boss' decision, and it is none of her boss' business.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a leader on the issue.

□ 1400

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman from Colorado and, as well, the manager of this rule.

I too rise to be able to push for voting ''no'' on the previous question, dealing with making sure that we fix the taking away of women's rights as it relates to choice and pass the it is not my boss's business legislation that gets us back right-side up, taking care of women and their rights, in particular, as it relates to their own body and their family choices as well, to make sure that they have the right to take care of their own family.

Let me also say that I would wish and had hoped that the present underlying bill, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act, was truly a bill that committed to the American people that we believe in the investment of infrastructure in creating jobs.

This is not what this bill is. This is a temporary fix, saying to the American cities and transit centers, our transit facilities, and buses and highways and freeways, that you are only a side thought here in the United States Congress. We will give you a small amount of money, transferring $9.8 billion from the general fund and $1 billion from the leaking underground storage tank trust fund, just to give you a temporary fix. We are going to put a finger in the dam.

We are not going to have a concerted, concentrated, responsible assessment of America's transportation needs so that we can fund it. We are not going to ask Houston metro what monies they need. We are not going to ask Texas what monies they need. We are not going to ask New York or California.

I would simply say we have got to get away from the I don't believe in government crowd and work with the people who understand that government has a role. The Federal Government has a role. It is a rescue facility. It is an SOS. It helps people in need, when the States are in need, and it helps to build infrastructure.

The highway system that President Eisenhower, a Republican, created—which we have been recognized for—here, we are nickel-and-diming, so I hope that we will get down to the table, work with those of us who are concerned.

Finally, vote ''no'' on the previous question because it is not your boss's business. If you want to have family planning, it is certainly not your boss's business.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security, I rise in to speak on the rule and in support of the underlying bill, H.R. 5021, the ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act,'' which reauthorizes federal-aid highway and transit programs for eight months—through May 31, 2015—by transferring $10.8 billion from in other federal funds to the Highway Trust Fund to cover projected trust fund shortfalls over that time.

Instead of this temporary extension, I would have strongly preferred that we were debating a comprehensive, fair, equitable, and long-term transportation reauthorization bill the nation desperately needs. We have had two years to do so.

Democrats want such a bill as does the President. But apparently our friends across the aisle do not since they have spent the last two years wasting time on advocating policies wanted by no one except for the right-wing extremists of the Tea Party.

But I support this emergency but temporary measure because as the Department of Transportation has reported, if we do not act now highway trust fund balances by the beginning of August will reach dangerously low levels and result in a reduction of payments to states by an average of 28 percent.

Many states have already begun to cancel or delay planned construction projects, threatening 700,000 thousands of jobs, including 106,100 jobs in my home state of Texas.

The funds to be transferred are $9.8 billion from the General Fund and $1 billion from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund. The cost of the transfer from the general fund of the Treasury is offset through an extension of customs fees and ''pension smoothing,'' which is a euphemism for allowing some large corporations to underfund their pension systems.

Madam Speaker, the Highway Trust Fund was created in 1956 during the Eisenhower Administration to help finance construction of the Interstate Highway System, which modernized the nation's transportation infrastructure and was instrumental in making the United States the world's dominant economic power for two generations. Our national leaders then understood that investing in our roads and bridges strengthened our economy, created millions of good-paying jobs, and improved the quality of life for all Americans.

It is currently composed of two accounts that fund federal-aid highway and transit projects built by states. Federal funding from the trust fund accounts for a major portion of state transportation spending.

The Highway Trust Fund is financed by gasoline and diesel taxes, which until the last decade produced a steady increase in revenues sufficient to accommodate increased levels of spending on highway and transit projects.

However, those tax rates—18.4 cents/gallon federal tax on gasoline and a 24.4 cents/gallon tax on diesel fuel—have remained unchanged since 1993 and were not indexed to inflation so the value of those revenues has eroded over the years, and, combined with the fact that vehicles have been getting increasingly better mileage, the revenues deposited into the Highway Trust Fund beginning last decade have not kept pace with highway and transit spending from the trust fund.

Consequently, since 2008, Congress has periodically had to transfer at the 11th hour general Treasury revenues into the trust fund to pay for authorized highway and transit spending levels and avoid a funding shortfall. The total amount to date is $54 billion.

Obviously, this is practice is economically inefficient and injects uncertainty in the highway construction plans, projects, and schedules of state and local transportation agencies, not to mention the anxiety it causes to workers and businesses who economic livelihood is dependent on those projects.

Madam Speaker, the last transportation authorized by Congress for 4 years or more, SAFETEA–LU, expired on September 30, 2009, at the end of FY 2009. Because Congress and the Administration could not agree to a new reauthorization, it was necessary to resort to stop-gap temporary extensions on no less than eight occasions spanning a period of 910 days before Congress finally enacted the ''Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act'' (MAP–21 Act) on July 6, 2012, which reauthorized highway and transportation programs through Fiscal Year 2014, a little more than two years, or until September 30, 2014.

MAP–21 was intended as a short-term measure to give Congress and the Administration breathing room to reach agreement on a long-term reauthorization bill.

Yet, as Mr. LEVIN, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, has pointed out, since gaining the majority in 2010, his Republican colleagues have failed to take any action to sustain the Highway Trust Fund over the long-term and shore up vital infrastructure projects and has not held even a single hearing on financing options for the Highway Trust Fund.

Instead, House Republicans have wasted the nation's time voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act more than 50 times, waging a War on Women, voting to hold the Attorney General in contempt, pursuing partisan investigations into Benghazi, the IRS, and the Fast and Furious scandal originating in the Bush Administration.

Instead of doing their job, their big new idea is to sue the President for doing his job.

Madam Speaker, enough is enough. It is long past time for this Congress, and especially the House majority, to focus on the real problems and challenges facing the American people.

And one of the biggest of those challenges is ensuring that American has a transportation policy and the infrastructure needed to compete and win in the global economy of the 21st Century.

To that we have to do extend the reauthorization of current transportation programs and to authorize the transfer of the funds to the Highway Trust Fund needed to fund authorized construction projects and keep 700,000 workers, including 106,100 in Texas on the job.

But that is only a start and just a part of our job. The real work that needs to be done in the remaining days of this Congress is to reach an agreement on a long-term highway

and transportation bill that is fair, equitable, fiscally responsible, creates jobs and leads to sustained economic growth.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Supreme Court's Hobby Lobby decision took direct aim at women's rights by giving employers a legal right to make personal health decisions for their employees.

This devastating ruling opened the door to a wide range of discrimination and denial of basic health care services for women. Now, all closely held corporations, which represent 90 percent of American businesses, can legally impose their own religious beliefs on female employees.

That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of the not my boss' business act, which would undo this damage and prevent for-profit companies from using the religious beliefs of the owner as an excuse to discriminate against women and limit their individual health care rights and choices.

Ninety-nine percent of American women will make the decision to use contraceptives at some point in their lives. What rights do corporations have to deny them this choice?

The Hobby Lobby decision is a significant step backwards for women's health and equality, so I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question, so that we can bring up and consider this important legislation and move bosses out of the bedroom and back into the boardroom.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman from Florida has any remaining speakers.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. No, Madam Speaker, we don't.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this Congress seems committed to kicking the can down the road, avoiding discussions of real solutions, failing to solicit ideas from Members of both sides of the aisle to move our country forward, and just stumbling along.

I think we can do better as a Nation, and we need to do better with regard to our Nation's infrastructure.

Yes, this bill funds the highway trust fund until next May. That is important; but what happens after May 2015? Is that the magic month where we finally agree that we need to take long-term action to address our Nation's crumbling roads and bridges?

This Congress continues to manage self-imposed crisis to self-imposed crisis. That is no way to run a company. It is certainly no way to run a country.

As long as we kick the can down the road, we are reducing the certainty that developers and contractors need to plan for the future and increasing costs for taxpayers for supporting our existing infrastructure.

We are undercutting opportunities for public-private partnerships because of the lack of stability or even knowing when or if or in what form the highway trust fund will be funded in the future.

If we don't act to provide stability to the highway trust fund, we are not only putting our economy at risk, but the safety and well-being of all those who send us here as their representatives. It is not only a competitiveness issue. It is a safety issue for the American people.

Madam 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. When we defeat the previous question, we can send our colleagues back to work with regard to infrastructure and a long-term solution and address an issue that my constituents have been writing me about and that American women and men across the country have been crying out for.

Contraception was a tremendous leap forward for women and for the American people. It empowers women to make the reproductive choices that make sense for them and their families. It reduces the number of abortions. It helps ensure that children are planned and well-raised, yet the recent Supreme Court decision throws into jeopardy the availability of contraception as a basic part of comprehensive health care.

By defeating the previous question, we can bring to the floor a simple bill that I strongly support that would remedy that and ensure that women have access to contraceptive choices as part of their basic health care and prevent us returning to the pre-contraception era.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This rule provides for ample and open debate. It advances a bill that originally passed the House 373–52, one of the most bipartisan votes we have had since I have been here.

The underlying bill extends good public policy. That policy was supported, like I said, by 373 Members of the House, 74 in the Senate, and signed by the President.

While we must look forward to the passage of another multiyear transportation authorization, there is no reason we should not pass the extension. Certainty means ''the state of being free from doubt or reservation; confident; sure.''

Extending our transportation programs until next summer provides our States with certainty. It also ensures that our highway trust fund does not become insolvent at the end of this month.

This extension will keep our transportation construction workers on the job. It will keep our transit systems functioning at full capacity. It will continue our investments in our economy. It will do all these things, without raising taxes on the American people.

Most importantly, it advances the process of a multiyear transportation bill. I look forward to working with Chairman SHUSTER and other members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure as we focus on producing a long-term bill that strengthens our transportation programs.

The passage of this extension gives us the opportunity to work together and produce a solution that continues to deliver an unmatched transportation system for the American people. It is our responsibility to make sure that that happens.

This bill is the last chance to fulfill our responsibility to the American people and to provide our States with certainty before the highway trust fund reaches insolvency.

I urge all Members of this House to vote for the rule, vote for the bill, keep our transportation systems operating, and let us work together for a long-term solution.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 669 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5051) to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions. 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5051.

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. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 192, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

YEAS—228

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

NAYS—192

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

NOT VOTING—12

Byrne
Campbell
Cantor
Carney
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Roskam
Williams

□ 1440

Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, O'ROURKE, PAYNE, NOLAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. POMPEO, MULLIN, JOHNSON of Ohio, and PETERSON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). 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 will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 186, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

AYES—231

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

NOES—186

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

Black
Byrne
Campbell
Cantor
Carney
Chu
DesJarlais
Garrett
Gohmert
Hanabusa
Kingston
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Williams

□ 1447

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

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

Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) kindly take the chair.

□ 1449

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, July 14, 2014, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 152, line 15.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. ROSKAM of Illinois.

An amendment by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

An amendment by Ms. WATERS of California.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, noes 258, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

AYES—161

Amash
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)

Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—258

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capuano
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellison
Ellmers
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Byrne
Campbell
Cantor
Carney
Chu
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Waxman
Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1453

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 338, noes 80, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

AYES—338

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters

Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—80

Beatty
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Clark (MA)
Clay
Connolly
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeLauro
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Long
Lynch
Matheson
McGovern
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Neal
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Tierney
Tonko
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Byrne
Campbell
Cantor
Carney
Chu
DesJarlais
Garamendi
Hanabusa
Kingston
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Royce
Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1457

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 244, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

AYES—170

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—244

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

NOT VOTING—18

Brady (TX)
Byrne
Campbell
Cantor
Carney
Chu
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Lewis
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Owens
Pallone
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Stivers
Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1500

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 235, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

AYES—184

Bachus
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—235

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

NOT VOTING—13

Byrne
Campbell
Cantor
Carney
Chu
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Sinema
Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1503

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1810

Mr. CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1810, a bill originally introduced by Representative Radel of Florida, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE FORMER LIBERIAN REGIME OF CHARLES TAYLOR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–135)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004, is to continue in effect beyond July 22, 2014.

Although Liberia has made significant advances to promote democracy, and the Special Court for Sierra Leone convicted Charles Taylor for war crimes and crimes against humanity, the actions and policies of former Liberian President Charles Taylor and other persons, in particular their unlawful depletion of Liberian resources and their removal from Liberia and secreting of Liberian funds and property, still challenge Liberia's efforts to strengthen its democracy and the orderly development of its political, administrative, and economic institutions. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 15, 2014*.

HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5021.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 669, I call up the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 669, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, modified

by the amendments printed in House Report 113–521, are adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5021

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-Aid Highways

Sec. 1001. Extension of Federal-aid highway programs.
Sec. 1002. Administrative expenses.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

Sec. 1101. Extension of National Highway Traffic Safety Administration highway safety programs.
Sec. 1102. Extension of Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration programs.
Sec. 1103. Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act.

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs

Sec. 1201. Formula grants for rural areas.
Sec. 1202. Apportionment of appropriations for formula grants.
Sec. 1203. Authorizations for public transportation.
Sec. 1204. Bus and bus facilities formula grants.

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

Sec. 1301. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

Sec. 2001. Extension of Highway Trust Fund expenditure authority.
Sec. 2002. Funding of Highway Trust Fund.
Sec. 2003. Funding stabilization.
Sec. 2004. Extension of Customs user fees.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the existing Highway Trust Fund system is unsustainable and unable to meet our Nation's 21st century transportation needs;

(2) MAP–21 included important reforms that must be built upon in the next reauthorization bill to increase the efficient and effective utilization of Federal funding;

(3) these reforms should include the elimination of duplicative Federal regulations and increase the authority and responsibility of the States to safely and efficiently build, operate, and fund transportation systems that best serve the needs of their citizens, including the ability of each State to implement innovative solutions, while also maintaining the appropriate Federal role in transportation; and

(4) Congress should enact and the President should sign a surface transportation reauthorization and reform bill prior to the expiration of this Act.

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-Aid Highways

SEC. 1001. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this subtitle, requirements, authorities, conditions, eligibilities, limitations, and other provisions authorized under divisions A and E of MAP–21 (Public Law 112–141), the SAFETEA–LU Technical Corrections Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–244), titles I, V, and VI of SAFETEA–LU (Public Law 109–59), titles I and V of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105–178), the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 (104–59), titles I and VI of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–240), and title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title), which would otherwise expire on or cease to apply after September 30, 2014, are incorporated by reference and shall continue in effect until May 31, 2015.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Except as provided in section 1002, there is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, a sum equal to 243/365 of the total amount authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under divisions A and E of MAP–21 (Public Law 112–141) and title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title).

(2) GENERAL FUND.—Section 1123(h)(1) of MAP–21 (23 U.S.C. 202 note) is amended by inserting ''and $19,972,603 out of the general fund of the Treasury to carry out the program for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' before the period at the end.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise expressly provided in this subtitle, funds authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b)(1) for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, shall be distributed, administered, limited, and made available for obligation in the same manner and at the same levels as 243/365 of the amounts of funds authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for fiscal year 2014 to carry out programs, projects, activities, eligibilities, and requirements under MAP–21 (Public Law 112–141), the SAFETEA–LU Technical Corrections Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–244), SAFETEA–LU (Public Law 109–59), titles I and V of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105–178), the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 (104 –59), titles I and VI of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–240), and title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title).

(2) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) under this section shall be—

(A) available for obligation and shall be administered in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) subject to section 1102 of MAP–21 (23 U.S.C. 104 note), as amended by this subsection.

(3) OBLIGATION CEILING.—Section 1102 of MAP–21 (23 U.S.C. 104 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(ii) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) $26,800,569,863 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.'';

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (10) by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2012''; and

(ii) in paragraph (12) by inserting '', and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, only in an amount equal to $639,000,000, less any reductions that would have otherwise been required for that year by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), then multiplied by 243/365 for that period'' after ''those fiscal years'';

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting ''and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' after ''2014'';

(ii) by striking paragraph (1)(A) and inserting the following:

''(A) amounts provided for administrative expenses and programs; and'';

(iii) in paragraph (2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by inserting ''or, for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending May 31, 2015, that is equal to 243/365 of such unobligated balance'' after ''unobligated balance of amounts'';

(iv) in paragraph (5) by striking ''section 204'' and inserting ''sections 202 and 204''; and

(v) by inserting ''or period'' after ''the fiscal year'' each place it appears;

(D) in subsection (d) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015'';

(E) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by inserting ''and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' after ''2014''; and

(II) by inserting ''or period'' after ''the fiscal year'' each place it appears; and

(ii) in paragraph (3) by striking ''section 133(c)'' and inserting ''section 133(b)''.

SEC. 1002. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other law, there is authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account), from amounts provided under section 1001, for administrative expenses of the Federal-aid highway program $292,931,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.

(b) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds authorized to be appropriated by this section shall be—

(1) available for obligation, and shall be administered, in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, except that such funds shall remain available until expended; and

(2) subject to the limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, specified in section 1102 of MAP–21 (23 U.S.C. 104 note), as amended by this subtitle.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

SEC. 1101. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.—

(1) HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(1) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) $156,452,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.''.

(2) HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 31101(a)(2) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) $75,563,014 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.''.

(3) NATIONAL PRIORITY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(3) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) $181,084,932 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.''.

(4) NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.—Section 31101(a)(4) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.''.

(5) HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 31101(a)(5) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) $19,306,849 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.''.

(B) LAW ENFORCEMENT CAMPAIGNS.—Section 2009(a) of SAFETEA–LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note) is amended—

(i) in the first sentence by inserting ''and in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' after ''fiscal years 2013 and 2014''; and

(ii) in the second sentence by inserting ''and in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''fiscal years 2013 and 2014'',

(6) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31101(a)(6) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) $16,976,712 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.''.

(b) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—Section 403(f)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''ending before October 1, 2014, and $1,664,384 of the total amount available for apportionment to the States for highway safety programs under section 402(c) in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''each fiscal year''.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23.—Section 31101(c) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended by inserting ''and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''fiscal years 2013 and 2014''.

SEC. 1102. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS.—Section 31104(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (8);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting ''; and'' ; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) $145,134,247 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.''.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31104(i)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (H);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (I) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(J) $172,430,137 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.''.

(c) GRANT PROGRAMS.—

(1) COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(1) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and $19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015''.

(2) BORDER ENFORCEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(2) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and $21,304,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015''.

(3) PERFORMANCE AND REGISTRATION INFORMATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(3) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015''.

(4) COMMERCIAL VEHICLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND NETWORKS DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(4) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and $16,643,836 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015''.

(5) SAFETY DATA IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(5) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and $1,997,260 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015''.

(d) HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(k)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''and up to $9,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''2014''.

(e) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—Section 31144(g)(5)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''and up to $21,304,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''per fiscal year''.

(f) OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—Section 4127(e) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1741) is amended by inserting ''and $2,663,014 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''2014''.

(g) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—Section 4134(c) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 31301 note) is amended by inserting ''and $665,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''2014''.

SEC. 1103. DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.

Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting ''and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' after ''2014''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking ''for each'' and all that follows before ''the Secretary of the Interior'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,''.

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs

SEC. 1201. FORMULA GRANTS FOR RURAL AREAS.

Section 5311(c)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by inserting ''for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' before ''shall be distributed''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by inserting ''for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and $16,643,836 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' before ''shall be apportioned''.

SEC. 1202. APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5336(h)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and $19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' before ''shall be set aside''.

SEC. 1203. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FORMULA GRANTS.—Section 5338(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''and $8,595,000,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $8,595,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $5,722,150,685 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and $128,800,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $128,800,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $85,749,041 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) by inserting ''and $6,657,534 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''2014'';

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''and $4,458,650,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $4,458,650,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $2,968,361,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''and $258,300,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $258,300,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $171,964,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'';

(E) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) by striking ''and $607,800,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $607,800,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $404,644,932 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'';

(ii) by striking ''and $30,000,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $30,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,''; and

(iii) by striking ''and $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $13,315,068 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'';

(F) in subparagraph (F) by inserting ''and $1,997,260 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''2014'';

(G) in subparagraph (G) by inserting ''and $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''2014'';

(H) in subparagraph (H) by inserting ''and $2,563,151 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''2014'';

(I) in subparagraph (I) by striking ''and $2,165,900,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $2,165,900,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $1,441,955,342 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'';

(J) in subparagraph (J) by striking ''and $427,800,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $427,800,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $284,809,315 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,''; and

(K) in subparagraph (K) by striking ''and $525,900,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $525,900,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $350,119,726 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,''.

(b) RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION AND DEPLOYMENT PROJECTS.—Section

5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $70,000,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $70,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $46,602,740 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015''.

(c) TRANSIT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Section 5338(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $7,000,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $7,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $4,660,274 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015''.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT.—Section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $7,000,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $7,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $4,660,274 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015''.

(e) HUMAN RESOURCES AND TRAINING.—Section 5338(e) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015''.

(f) CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.—Section 5338(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $1,907,000,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $1,907,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $1,269,591,781 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015''.

(g) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 5338(h) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''and $104,000,000 for fiscal year 2014'' and inserting '', $104,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and $69,238,356 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'';

(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and not less than $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' before ''shall be available''; and

(3) in paragraph (3) by inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and not less than $665,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' before ''shall be available''.

SEC. 1204. BUS AND BUS FACILITIES FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5339(d)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and $43,606,849 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''$65,500,000'';

(2) by inserting ''for each such fiscal year and $832,192 for such period'' after ''$1,250,000''; and

(3) by inserting ''for each such fiscal year and $332,877 for such period'' after ''$500,000''.

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

SEC. 1301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5128(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) $28,468,948 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.''.

(b) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND.—Section 5128(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively, and by adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) by striking ''From the'' and inserting the following:

''(1) FISCAL YEARS 2013 AND 2014.—From the''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) FISCAL YEAR 2015.—From the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Fund established under section 5116(i), the Secretary may expend for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015—

''(A) $125,162 to carry out section 5115;

''(B) $14,513,425 to carry out subsections (a) and (b) of section 5116, of which not less than $9,087,534 shall be available to carry out section 5116(b);

''(C) $99,863 to carry out section 5116(f);

''(D) $416,096 to publish and distribute the Emergency Response Guidebook under section 5116(i)(3); and

''(E) $665,753 to carry out section 5116(j).''.

(c) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRAINING GRANTS.—Section 5128(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''and $2,663,014 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' after ''2014''.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 2001. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''October 1, 2014'' in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting ''June 1, 2015'', and

(2) by striking ''MAP–21'' in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014''.

(b) SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.—Section 9504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''MAP–21'' each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014'', and

(2) by striking ''October 1, 2014'' in subsection (d)(2) and inserting ''June 1, 2015''.

(c) LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—Paragraph (2) of section 9508(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''October 1, 2014'' and inserting ''June 1, 2015''.

SEC. 2002. FUNDING OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (7) and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

''(5) ADDITIONAL SUMS.—Out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is hereby appropriated—

''(A) $7,765,000,000 to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund; and

''(B) $2,000,000,000 to the Mass Transit Account in the Highway Trust Fund.

''(6) ADDITIONAL INCREASE IN FUND BALANCE.—There is hereby transferred to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund amounts appropriated from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund under section 9508(c)(3).''.

(b) APPROPRIATION FROM LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 9508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ADDITIONAL TRANSFER TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Out of amounts in the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund there is hereby appropriated $1,000,000,000 to be transferred under section 9503(f)(6) to the Highway Account (as defined in section 9503(e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9508(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (3)''.

SEC. 2003. FUNDING STABILIZATION.

(a) FUNDING STABILIZATION UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—The table in subclause (II) of section 430(h)(2)(C)(iv) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''If the calendar year is:	The applicable minimum percentage is:	The applicable maximum percentage is:
2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017	90%	110%
2018	85%	115%
2019	80%	120%
2020	75%	125%
After 2020	70%	130%''.

(b) FUNDING STABILIZATION UNDER EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The table in subclause (II) of section 303(h)(2)(C)(iv) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1083(h)(2)(C)(iv)) is amended to read as follows:

''If the calendar year is:	The applicable minimum percentage is:	The applicable maximum percentage is:
2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017	90%	110%
2018	85%	115%
2019	80%	120%
2020	75%	125%
After 2020	70%	130%''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(f)(2)(D) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1021(f)(2)(D)) is amended—

(i) in clause (i) by inserting ''and the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014'' after ''MAP–21'' both places it appears, and

(ii) in clause (ii) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2020''.

(B) STATEMENTS.—The Secretary of Labor shall modify the statements required under subclauses (I) and (II) of section 101(f)(2)(D)(i) of such Act to conform to the amendments made by this section.

(c) STABILIZATION NOT TO APPLY FOR PURPOSES OF CERTAIN ACCELERATED BENEFIT DISTRIBUTION RULES.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—The second sentence of paragraph (2) of section 436(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''of such plan'' and inserting ''of such plan (determined by not taking into account any adjustment of segment rates under section 430(h)(2)(C)(iv))''.

(2) EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—The second sentence of subparagraph (B) of section 206(g)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1056(g)(3)(B)) is amended by striking ''of such plan'' and inserting ''of such plan (determined by not taking into account any adjustment of segment rates under section 303(h)(2)(C)(iv))''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2014.

(B) COLLECTIVELY BARGAINED PLANS.—In the case of a plan maintained pursuant to 1 or more collective bargaining agreements, the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(4) PROVISIONS RELATING TO PLAN AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If this paragraph applies to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract, such plan or contract shall be treated as being operated in accordance with the terms of the plan during the period described in subparagraph (B)(ii).

(B) AMENDMENTS TO WHICH PARAGRAPH APPLIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—This paragraph shall apply to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract which is made—

(I) pursuant to the amendments made by this subsection, or pursuant to any regulation issued by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of Labor under any provision as so amended, and

(II) on or before the last day of the first plan year beginning on or after January 1, 2016, or such later date as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

(ii) CONDITIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to any amendment unless, during the period—

(I) beginning on the date that the amendments made by this subsection or the regulation described in clause (i)(I) takes effect (or in the case of a plan or contract amendment not required by such amendments or such regulation, the effective date specified by the plan), and

(II) ending on the date described in clause (i)(II) (or, if earlier, the date the plan or contract amendment is adopted),

the plan or contract is operated as if such plan or contract amendment were in effect, and such plan or contract amendment applies retroactively for such period.

(C) ANTI-CUTBACK RELIEF.—A plan shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of section 204(g) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1054(g)) and section 411(d)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 solely by reason of a plan amendment to which this paragraph applies.

(d) MODIFICATION OF FUNDING TARGET DETERMINATION PERIODS.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—Clause (i) of section 430(h)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''the first day of the plan year'' and inserting ''the valuation date for the plan year''.

(2) EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—Clause (i) of section 303(h)(2)(B) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1083(h)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking ''the first day of the plan year'' and inserting ''the valuation date for the plan year''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (d) shall apply with respect to plan years beginning after December 31, 2012.

(2) ELECTIONS.—A plan sponsor may elect not to have the amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (d) apply to any plan year beginning before January 1, 2014, either (as specified in the election)—

(A) for all purposes for which such amendments apply, or

(B) solely for purposes of determining the adjusted funding target attainment percentage under sections 436 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and 206(g) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1054(g)) for such plan year.

A plan shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of section 204(g) of such Act and section 411(d)(6) of such Code solely by reason of an election under this paragraph.

SEC. 2004. EXTENSION OF CUSTOMS USER FEES.

Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''September 30, 2023'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''September 30, 2023'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, extends Federal surface transportation programs and ensures the solvency of the highway trust fund through May 2015. H.R. 5021 is a clean extension of the surface transportation programs and continues the MAP–21 reforms.

We have an immediate, critical need to address the solvency of the trust fund and extend the current surface transportation law. This bill does that in a responsible way, with policies that have all previously received strong bipartisan and bicameral support. If Congress fails to act, thousands of transportation projects and hundreds of thousands of jobs across the country will be at risk. This legislation provides much-needed certainty and stability for the States.

This bill in no way precludes Congress from continuing to work on addressing a long-term funding solution and a long-term reauthorization bill, which remains a top priority for the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. However, this legislation is the responsible solution at this time, ensures that we don't play politics with these programs, and enables us to continue making improvements to our surface transportation system.

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

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 5021 on those matters within the committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 5021, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill, or any other similar legislation, and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2014

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014. I appreciate your willingness to support expediting the consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

I acknowledge that by forgoing action on this legislation, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction and will not be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I will include our letters on H.R. 5021 in the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill today is absolutely necessary to keep our surface transportation programs up and running. In less than a month, the highway trust fund will go belly up and force-feed our States rationed payments for their transportation and infrastructure investments. This would starve our national economy, put States in a desperate situation, and

cost jobs. Congress must act now to avert this unnecessary crisis.

The bill under consideration today will help States get through the remainder of the construction season. It will also provide time for Congress to come together and pass a longer-term surface transportation law so that we don't find ourselves in this crisis mode again.

But this needs to happen sooner rather than later because this bill leaves our highway, transit, and safety programs on autopilot. While the driverless car may be the wave of the future, it is no way to run our transportation programs, and I know the chairman has driven those cars on autopilot.

Passing extension after extension only brings us more of the same, and our States have already said that the status quo isn't meeting their needs.

A long-term, robust surface transportation bill is the only way we are going to address our greatest infrastructure challenges. It is the only way we will be able to build on what works and reform what isn't. It is one of the few sure-fire ways to boost our economy, create jobs, and help us compete with our global rivals.

''Starving the beast'' simply doesn't work when it comes to transportation and infrastructure policy. We need greater investment in our roads and bridges. We need an increased focus on moving freight across our borders and overseas.

We should grow regional collaborations to build significant projects, and we must bring every possible transportation job back to the U.S. to be done by American workers.

It is worth noting that this debate is about far more than accounting, dollar signs, and trust funds. It is about the men and women who work in these industries and have to face needless uncertainty about their futures. It is about those that rely on public transit systems. And it is about the driving public who must endure aging infrastructure and the car repair bills and safety concerns that come with it.

I am going to vote for this bill today not because it is the best solution, but because it does avert an immediate crisis and keeps the ball rolling forward.

I thank the members of the Ways and Means Committee for their work on this bill, and I look forward to working with our chairman, Mr. SHUSTER, to bring forward a robust, long-term surface transportation bill to vote on in the near future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, the debate we are having today is not really about the future of the highway trust fund. Unfortunately, today is about doing what Congress does too often—kicking the can down the road, avoiding one crisis while setting up another.

I recognize that more time is often needed to craft a more robust bipartisan solution, the result of which is often well worth the delay, but, Mr. Speaker, we must come to our senses. We must realize that another short-term patch is not really what our State governments are calling for; this is not really what the American Trucking Association or the Chamber of Commerce is calling for; and this is not what the American people sent us here to accomplish.

For close to 50 years, the highway trust fund was self-sustaining. Those who used the roads paid for the roads. But we have been stalled in the 20th century. The fuel tax, which traditionally paid for highway improvements, hasn't been changed since 1993, while construction costs have grown more expensive, cars have become more fuel efficient or run on alternative fuels, and infrastructure needs have continued to rise.

In the Highways and Transit Subcommittee, we have had hearing after hearing where State transportation officials, mayors, Governors, truckers, transit operators, economists, and experts in transportation policy have testified with unwavering support for a long-term, fully funded surface transportation bill. That should be our goal.

But at the end of the day, we can't let the quest for the perfect stand in the way of the good or the acceptable. In this case, we have an obligation to keep our highway projects going, our transportation moving, and our economy growing. Since this is the only option we have today, this is what we will do.

We need to stop the patches and budget gimmicks and come up with a viable, real solution on how we fund the trust fund. History shows that it is hard to do before an election. Perhaps it will be easy to do after that.

So I ask my colleagues to consider this question: Which is the more responsible path, more budget gimmicks or raising revenue to actually pay for needed spending?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), ranking member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend from West Virginia for yielding, and I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work on this bill. I know that they both wanted a long-term bill and that they have worked for a long-term bill.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that we have a bipartisan, bicameral bill, but I think that for all concerned, it expresses bipartisan disappointment. We had 2 years to do a bill since MAP–21, and all we have been able to produce is an 8-month stopgap fix.

At the same time, the States and the localities we represent are probably grateful for small favors today. The administration had already announced rationing because of the insolvency of the trust fund as of August 1, with only what little money would come in to replenish the trust fund for each State.

We were staring at both an insolvent trust fund and a loss of the construction season at the same time. That would have been an economic catastrophe, with the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs. We must use this moment to face that we cannot rebuild our bridges, roads, and transit systems on pension-smoothing stopgap extensions.

The State backlog of projects will be left untouched by this bill. Because we have produced a climate of uncertainty, States won't dare start up the real work that needs to be done on their roads, bridges, and transit because they are getting a patchwork bill. Patchwork bills yield patched-up roads and bridges and deteriorating transit.

At the very least, we owe it to the country to revisit this bill as soon as possible and as early as October. The delay in MAP–21 got us today's stopgap measure. Congress needs a spur under its saddle to avoid another delay.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), from a State in which a referendum arose that increased the user fee to fund the highway system.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his work on H.R. 5021, which I rise in support of this afternoon, which provides greater certainty and sufficient funding for infrastructure projects across the Nation. Without an immediate solution for the highway trust fund, our State highway departments are left wondering if there will be adequate funding to continue any infrastructure improvement.

In March of this year, the Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department warned that, without congressional action to remedy the highway trust fund shortfall, continuing with highway and infrastructure contracts that were scheduled for April letting would have threatened the ability to pay contractors. As a result, 10 vital projects totaling over $60 million were either put on hold or forced to find alternative methods of temporary financing.

My colleagues have described similar scenarios in their own States, meaning that across the Nation new infrastructure projects have already ground to a halt, threatening general contractors, their employees, suppliers, and putting at risk the jobs that are both directly and indirectly supported by these projects.

I think most lawmakers can agree that ensuring that we have a reliable and modern infrastructure on land, water, rail, and air is critical. With the Senate announcing last week an agreement with Chairman CAMP and House leaders to enact a short-term funding

solution, we can now turn our attention back to a multiyear transportation bill that will provide long-term assurance to States for financing infrastructure improvements.

In moving forward with a long-term bill, we can spend time with stakeholders and constituents—the ultimate users of the infrastructure—and allow them to weigh in on what is being considered. As we return our focus to long-term legislation, we must also examine how to reform the highway trust fund so that taxpayers will know how their dollars are being spent. With costs increasing and funds at a premium, we owe our constituents a more transparent system that demonstrates effective use of their money on infrastructure improvement.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 5021, and I look forward to working on a long-term, comprehensive transportation bill to ensure our Nation's future growth. We can't continue to beat the drum to attract businesses, add jobs, and improve the economy if we are not willing to use our authority to invest in our Nation's infrastructure.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, allow me to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL and Subcommittee Chair PETRI and Ranking Member ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act for 2014.

In particular, the bill before the House this afternoon would do two things: first, it would provide a total of $35.3 billion for highway, public transit, and surface transportation programs; secondly, it would extend surface transportation programs authorized under MAP–21 through May 31, 2015.

I support this bill because it takes almost 60,000 construction jobs in Texas out of harm's way, and it ensures that over 3,500 active highway and transit projects in Texas will not be slowed or stopped by the highway trust fund's shortfall.

However, my support for this bill is reluctant, as I believe we have missed another opportunity to craft a long-term highway program yet again. While I am pleased that we have come together to address the impeding highway crisis, we are also kicking the can down the road again.

Today, 65 percent of our Nation's roads are rated at less than good condition, and 25 percent of our bridges require significant repair. In Texas alone, we have over 300,000 miles of public roads, 8 percent of which are in poor condition.

The measure before us today all but ensures that we will be having this exact same debate again sometime in the next Congress; rather, what we need to do is adopt a long-term plan that will provide certainty, increase transit investments, and keep workers in our construction industries on the job. When we return from the August recess, I urge my colleagues to work together and begin crafting a long-term surface transportation bill. We have seen again and again legislating by crisis is not effective.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

As our roads erode and our transit systems decay, we owe our constituents no less than acting in their best interest and enacting a long-term bill as soon as possible.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA), one of the committee's true experts on infrastructure, a mayor of a small city, and a construction business owner.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation that will keep our highway trust fund solvent until we agree on a long-term solution.

If we fail to act, the money to fund surface transportation projects will soon run dry. That could result in the stoppage of more than 7,000 projects. We would lose countless jobs across the country, and in my home State of Pennsylvania as well.

I have always supported a highway bill of a least 5 years or more, but in the absence of one, I support this proposal to give us time to work out a longer-term funding solution. We need a plan that will meet our transportation needs while also providing contractors and builders the guidance they need to invest in equipment and employees.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN), a very valued member of our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for bringing this before us today.

This short-term highway trust fund fix is crucial for keeping our highway and transit systems solvent, and I intend to vote for it. Letting the highway trust fund become insolvent would be irresponsible and cut 700,000 jobs and increase congestion. But once our work is done here today, we do need a long-term, creative solution to fund our much-needed transportation projects in this country.

Over 64 percent of the roads in Los Angeles are in utter disrepair, costing each resident driver nearly $832 a year. My own dad, who was a county supervisor in Los Angeles for 40 years, used to offer people a dollar for every pothole they could find in his district. If he made that offer today, he would go broke.

To fill this funding gap, I support looking at different ways of funding our roads in addition to the gas tax, such as vehicle miles traveled, which charges drivers by the miles that they travel.

For our national economy, we need to focus on freight infrastructure. Freight bottlenecks cost us approximately $200 billion a year. Yesterday, I introduced the National Freight Network Trust Fund Act for a long-term fix that creates dedicated funding for our freight infrastructure.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this short-term fix and join me in looking forward to solving this problem long term.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), who is from one of the most innovative States in funding and moving projects forward at a very fast pace.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation.

Last year, I was honored to be conferee a for MAP–21, the highway bill, and I am proud of the bill that our conference committee produced and was subsequently signed into law. Our Nation's transportation projects are being completed faster, and States like my home State of Indiana receive more Federal funding than they had in the past.

We do need a long-term solution to fund our infrastructure. Today, however, we need to support this extension. This funding is critical for projects such as Interstate 69, which runs through my district.

With construction season underway, we need to ensure that every State can continue with the summer construction projects that are ongoing. This legislation is necessary to keep thousands of Americans working to rebuild our infrastructure—improving the flow of commerce and ensuring the safety of Americans as they travel.

I would like to thank Chairman CAMP and Chairman SHUSTER for their leadership, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1530

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), a distinguished member of our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we can pretend that we care about the future of America and its transportation system. We used to be number one in the world, widely recognized. We are now rated 26th, and we are moving down quickly.

The system is falling apart. There are 140,000 bridges that need repair or replacement, and 40 percent of the pavement on the National Highway System has failed to the point at which

you have to dig it up, not just resurface it. There is a $70 billion backlog in our transit systems just to bring everything up to a state of good repair. That is not even to begin to think about building a 21st century transportation system to compete with the rest of the world. For the Chinese, 9 percent of their GDP goes to transportation. They want to be able to move people and goods more efficiently and to out-compete us. Even Brazil, 6 percent. India, 6 percent. The United States of America, 1 percent. We have got to get serious about this.

Today, we are going to do a little shuffling around of some money, and say, oh, we can pretend, by pension smoothing and this and that, that we are creating money so we get around not creating more debt or deficit here. Come on. Really, it is pretty phony stuff. Let's get real about how we are going to fund our transportation future.

We are fighting with people who believe in a theory called ''devolution.'' That is, they want to devolve the duty of building a national transportation system to the 50 dispersed States and let them figure it out. We tried that. This is 1956. The brand new Kansas Turnpike ended in Emil Schweitzer's farm field for years because Oklahoma couldn't afford their part of that system until the Eisenhower bill passed, and we had a highway trust fund.

We know this works—user-fee based, a national system, coordinating among the States, not having roads that disconnect at the border, not tolling the heck out of everything, which some people would have us do, not fragmenting the system. What are you going to say to the Port of Los Angeles, where 40 percent of the freight comes into the country? Oh, you figure out how to get the freight out of L.A. to serve the rest of the country, and you pay for it. No. This is a national obligation. It is international and national competitiveness. We have to get serious, and this bill here today is not serious or long term.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), a long-term member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, someone who fights every day for West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for bringing this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, more than 700,000 jobs and 6,000 road and bridge projects could be in jeopardy if payments from the Federal highway trust fund are delayed. I rise today in support of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act, which would prevent this catastrophic scenario.

In my home State of West Virginia, more than 200 projects are currently receiving Federal funding. If we fail to act now, we risk layoffs at the height of the summer construction season. Inaction would cripple the efforts of our State highway department to maintain our roads and bridges after a particularly harsh winter and to build new projects like U.S. Route 35, Corridor H, and the King Coal Highway in West Virginia.

American motorists, construction workers, and small businesses deserve certainty that the Federal Government will continue to invest in our Nation's infrastructure. Today's bill provides that certainty for the remainder of this construction season, but I wait, as most of us do, to complete the work on the longer term bill. I ask my colleagues to join me in passing the Highway and Transportation Funding Act.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished minority whip and a strong supporter of our infrastructure in this country.

Mr. HOYER. Those were the good old days, I tell my friend Mr. RAHALL, when I got an unlimited 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, there is some good news. The good news is this committee is chaired by someone who wants to invest in America, grow jobs, and expand our economy. I speak of my friend BILL SHUSTER, and I thank him for that. The other good news is that our ranking Democrat, NICK JOE RAHALL, has a history of making sure that America invests in its infrastructure.

The bad news is that this bill does not give what Mrs. CAPITO suggested it gives, and that is certainty. It gives a temporary, inadequate response to what is a long-term problem. I won't ask him the question, but I believe that Mr. SHUSTER absolutely agrees with me. We ought to find a fiscally sustainable funding source for our infrastructure and highway system.

Mr. Speaker, a well-maintained highway structure supports the growth of our economy and the creation of good jobs. That is why I have been advocating for a long-term, sustainable fix that makes investments in our roads and bridges and provides the certainty that needed repairs will be completed. I am for a big deal, not just for certainty in infrastructure but for certainty in the investment in our economy. I will continue to advocate that.

This bill, unfortunately, does not do that. It is better than doing nothing, but it does not do what we need to do. In fact, by implementing a short-term fix only until May, this bill promotes uncertainty for construction firms and other businesses that rely on projects paid for by the highway trust fund, which support American jobs. It also puts Congress in the position of having to deal with this issue next May, as next year's summer construction season is about to begin, without any certainty of what we will do.

Democrats would prefer to work with Republicans to pass a long-term fix now or, if we cannot do that, to reauthorize it for a few months so that we can return to this issue after the November elections and pass a long-term fix, but we cannot take the risk of allowing this fund to run dry this summer.

The highway trust fund supports the infrastructure improvements that enable manufacturers to move their products to market faster and help attract businesses and jobs from overseas. It helps us to Make It In America—manufacture it, grow it, sell it here and around the world. If we allow it to go broke, according to the Department of Transportation, our economy could lose as many as 700,000 jobs.

This bill, I think, will get some significant support from our side of the aisle but not because it is our choice, not because it is the right way to go. In my view, as I said, I don't want to hurt him with his party or with anybody outside of this Chamber, but I think Mr. SHUSTER agrees that we need a long-term solution. I urge my colleagues to work together in a bipartisan fashion to get a long-term, confidence-building resolution of this stop-and-jerk, or go-and-jerk, funding process that we are adopting.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do agree with the distinguished minority whip that we need a long-term solution to the trust fund and a long-term bill to provide certainty to this Nation when it comes to our transportation system.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), one of the newest members of the committee but one of the hardest-working members of the committee.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, supporting H.R. 5021 means protecting hundreds of thousands of jobs throughout this great country. More specifically, in Illinois, it means saving nearly 30,000 jobs and 4,000 construction projects that are already underway. Supporting this bill means improving our crumbling roads and bridges—a constitutional responsibility of this body's. Supporting H.R. 5021 means governing responsibly instead of creating yet another manufactured crisis that would add even more uncertainty and instability to a still struggling economy.

By extending this highway trust fund, which is not my first choice—if we extend this bill and these programs through May, we can continue working on that long-term highway bill that both sides of the aisle stand here and say that we need, and we can create jobs and keep up with our 21st century transportation needs. The highway trust fund has fallen short for many years, and we need to come up with long-term solutions.

I look forward to working with my colleagues from the other side of the aisle and with Chairman SHUSTER and his continued leadership.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, may I have the time remaining, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 1

minute remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), the distinguished former chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the distinguished ranking member. Thank you for your hard work in trying right now to put a Band-Aid on our bleeding transportation funding. Thank you for trying to get the transportation cart out of the ditch.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached the eleventh hour, and soon projects will be closing down across the country. It is unfortunate that we are at this juncture on the road to funding transportation responsibly. We had a chance for a 5-year bill, and we did not have the leadership, I believe, from the White House. In fact, President Obama was AWOL during that entire process. Now, today, we see the President has been at a bridge, and he is going to be at another site. He is out at a research thing, talking about transportation funding.

Where was the President when Mr. Oberstar—the distinguished gentleman who recently passed away and who was chair of the committee—offered a bill, and he came and cut his legs out from underneath the Democrat chairman? We would have had a longer term, fully funded bill. If it is to secure our borders, where has he been? He says he doesn't do photo ops, but he is doing them now, and he will do them on transportation. He doesn't need to be at the bridge. He needs to be here, working with these distinguished Members of Congress for a long-term solution. He was absent at the border, and he is absent as we need to secure our Nation's infrastructure. This is not acceptable.

I support this measure because it is an extension of what we did. It doesn't have deficit spending. It is responsible for paying for it, and it doesn't have earmarks. The last bill had 6,300 earmarks—not this bill. I support the measure.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. We have no more speakers on our side.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), a very distinguished member of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Thank you, Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. Speaker, transportation moves our economy, and modern infrastructure is a path to jobs and prosperity. I will vote for this stopgap measure, but I want to echo the words of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have called for a long-term, sustainable fix of our highway trust fund so that the United States of America can compete in the world's market.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, much has been said today in dislike of this temporary fix, and I could not agree more. It is not my preference. We all want to address this in a long-term, robust manner. That is also the opinion of the Transportation Trades Department of the AFL–CIO, who say that further delay will only maintain the status quo in keeping workers off the job, undercutting long-term planning and hindering the country in advancing to a 21st century transportation system.

There are very similar views, like views, expressed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce when they say in a letter to Members of Congress that, in the Chamber's view, the longer the pass, the easier it will be for Congress to kick the can down the road and avoid the tough question of how we will maintain Federal investment in highway public transportation and highway safety.

I hope we come back before next May and address this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 4 minutes remaining.

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

First, I want to start off by expressing my condolences to a former chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I guess, back then, it was Public Works and Transportation. Chairman Bob Roe, who chaired the committee in the eighties, passed away this morning, at 9:30, at the age of 90. I just want to say that my thoughts and prayers are with his family at this time.

□ 1545

I want to start in closing by thanking Chairman CAMP and Ranking Member LEVIN and the entire Ways and Means Committee for passing out, on a voice vote, H.R. 5021.

I would like to reiterate that H.R. 5021 is a clean extension of the surface transportation programs that continues the MAP–21 reforms. This extension is necessary to provide much-needed certainty and stability for States while we continue to work on addressing a long-term funding solution and a long-term reauthorization bill.

I am committed to that. I know that the Transportation Committee is going to work diligently with the Ways and Means Committee on funding a long-term solution to the funding and also to passing a strong long-term reauthorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

At the end of this month, States across the country will be forced to put road construction on hold if Congress cannot address the highway trust fund. At risk are hundreds of thousands of jobs in the construction industry.

A strong infrastructure is central to commerce, and at a time when millions of Americans are packing their bags to take a vacation or just traveling to work, we must ensure that projects can be completed so that the roads, bridges, and highways they travel on are modernized and safe.

The bill before us today, H.R. 5021, will provide enough funding to get us through May 21, 2015, giving States the ability to complete projects.

This bill is the only package with all provisions having a proven history of getting big bipartisan votes in both the House and the Senate. The three provisions—pension smoothing, custom user fees, and leaking underground storage tanks—have all been used previously in bills that received strong bipartisan votes.

Pension smoothing and LUST were included in the last bipartisan highway trust fund legislation. These are policies everyone is familiar with. They are policies that will provide the funding we need, and they are the only policies that will pass both the House and Senate in time to fund our highways after the end of this month.

A long-term solution would be my preference, and an important feature of my tax reform discussion draft would provide enough revenue to maintain the solvency of the highway trust fund for 8 years.

In the meantime, I hope all Members of Congress can work on a longer-term solution by the end of May next year. This won't be an easy task, so it is important that Congress has time to have a deliberative, open debate about bipartisan solutions, rather than trying to hit Americans who are already paying more for gas with a gas tax hike.

It is time to act now. State transportation departments have already started delaying or stopping certain highway projects to prepare for the fact that funding may fall short. Americans across the country deserve to see less gridlock on the roads and from their elected representatives.

These policies are straightforward and have a history of bipartisan, bicameral support.

I am encouraged that the White House issued their support for the House highway bill, so we have an opportunity to solve this problem today.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD the administration's statement of support.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 5021—HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014

(Rep. Camp, R-Michigan, and Rep. Shuster, R-Pennsylvania, July 14, 2014)

With surface transportation funding running out and hundreds of thousands of jobs

at risk later this summer, the Administration supports House passage of H.R. 5021. This legislation would provide for continuity of funding for the Highway Trust Fund during the height of the summer construction season and keep Americans at work repairing the Nation's crumbling roads, bridges, and transit systems.

However, this legislation only provides a short-term fix to the Highway Trust Fund. It does not address the continued need to pass a long-term authorization bill that creates jobs and provides certainty for cities, States, and businesses. Congress should work to pass a long-term authorization bill well before the expiration date set forth in H.R. 5021. The President has been very clear that increasing investment in the Nation's infrastructure is a top priority. That is why the President laid out a vision for a 21st century surface transportation infrastructure, the GROW AMERICA Act, which would streamline project approval processes and implement innovative transportation policies that will make better use of taxpayer dollars while supporting millions of jobs and positioning the Nation's economy for lasting growth. That proposal is fully paid for through existing revenues and by reforming business taxes to help create jobs and spur investment while eliminating loopholes that reward companies for moving profits overseas.

The Administration is focused every day on what can be done to expand opportunity for every American. In today's economy, that means building a first-class infrastructure that attracts first-class jobs and takes American businesses' goods all across the world.

Mr. CAMP. We also have strong industry support in a letter to Congress from 62 organizations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, American Road and Transportation Builders Association, the American Trucking Association, and the National Association of Manufacturers, which stated, ''A long-term Federal commitment to prioritize and invest in our aging infrastructure and safety needs is essential to achieve this goal. Keeping the highway trust fund solvent is the first step.''

Mr. Speaker, I will enter their statement of support into the RECORD as well.

JULY 14, 2014

TO MEMBERS OF THE U.S. CONGRESS:

The undersigned organizations representing every sector of the economy urge the House of Representatives and Senate to pass bipartisan legislation that will stabilize the Highway Trust Fund and prevent a shutdown of federal highway and public transportation investments across the country.

Our transportation infrastructure network is the foundation on which the nation's economy functions. American manufacturers, industries and businesses depend on this complex system to move people, products and services every day of the year.

As the World Economic Forum (WEF) noted in its 2013–2014 Global Competitiveness Report, infrastructure connects regions, integrates markets and provides access to markets and services. While this latest report places the U.S. economy fifth in its ''Global Competitiveness Index,'' America's infrastructure network now ranks 15th globally.

Shortchanging the Highway Trust Fund is not the path to future economic growth, jobs and increased competitiveness. The possibility of a deficient Highway Trust Fund that shutters 100,000 construction projects that support 700,000 jobs and puts all new highway, bridge and public transportation investments on hold will further harm an already fragile economy.

The U.S. economy requires a surface transportation infrastructure network that can keep pace with growing demands. A long-term federal commitment to prioritize and invest in our aging infrastructure and safety needs is essential to achieve this goal. Keeping the Highway Trust Fund solvent is the first step.

We urge Congress to avoid the immediate transportation cliff and improve the long-term fiscal condition of the Highway Trust Fund during 2014.

Sincerely,

National Association of Manufacturers, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, American Road & Transportation Builders Association, Associated General Contractors of America, National Retail Federation, American Trucking Association, U.S. Travel Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, NAACP, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, International Union of Operating Engineers, American Society of Civil Engineers, Laborers International Union of North America, National Association of Development Organizations, NAIOP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association, American Public Transportation Association, Airports Council International—North America, Transportation for America, Building America's Future.

Smart Growth America, Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance, The American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, Governors Highway Safety Association, American Highway Users Alliance, American Public Works Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, National Stone Sand and Gravel Association, Transportation Intermediaries Association, The American Society of Landscape Architects, American Iron and Steel Institute, National Utility Contractors Association, American Concrete Pipe Association, American Concrete Pavement Association, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, National Asphalt Pavement Association, Truckload Carriers Association, American Association of Airport Executives, International Bridge, Tunnel and Turnpike Association, Intelligent Transportation Society of America (ITS America).

Safe Routes to School National Partnership, League of American Bicyclists, Alliance for Biking & Walking, Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals, National Tank Truck Carriers, American Moving & Storage Association, NATSO, representing America's Truckstops and Travel Plazas, National Recreation and Park Association, Metropolitan Planning Council (Chicago, IL), American Traffic Safety Services Association, SMART—Transportation Division, Safe Kids Worldwide, PeopleForBikes—Business Network, PolicyLink, International Warehouse Logistics Association, The National Industrial Transportation League, The Coalition for America's Gateways and Trade Corridors, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Portland Cement Association, Associated Equipment Distributors, National Electrical Contractors Association National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA).

Mr. CAMP. A ''yes'' vote will avoid a last-minute crisis. We also need to fund important highway projects and ensure that thousands of jobs are not at risk.

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

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

I will support this bill because we are at the eleventh hour. No, it is not the eleventh hour; it is a few minutes before midnight.

Unless Congress acts by the end of this month, more than 100,000 transportation projects could be delayed and as many as 700,000 jobs put at risk, but this legislation is a patch when what our Nation's infrastructure needs is major repair. Doing nothing is not an option, but we should be doing much better.

The Republicans, I must say, in this House, talk a lot about the need for certainty, but they have riddled infrastructure funding with uncertainty. The fact that we are in this position illustrates just how little House Republicans have done, since they assumed the majority in 2011, to address the long-term problems facing the trust fund and our infrastructure.

Every Democrat on Ways and Means urged our chairman, Mr. CAMP, to hold a series of hearings on long-term financing options for the trust fund, yet the committee has not held a single hearing on this topic in the 3 years and 6 months the Republicans have been in the majority.

Since 2011, the committee has had nearly two dozen hearings on repealing or dismantling the ACA and, in the last 14 months, a half-dozen hearings on the IRS. Those are not the priorities that are going to lead to a long-term solution of the trust fund. The Nation, in a word, deserves better than this short shrift. It needs a long-term solution.

Democrats on Ways and Means proposed an extension until December 31 in order to pressure a long-term solution this year. All of us on the Democratic side voted ''yes,'' and all of the Republicans voted ''no.''

Let me end with a word on unemployment insurance. Senate Democrats and Republicans passed a bill to extend unemployment insurance that included an almost identical set of offsets as those included in today's legislation.

The House Republicans refused to take up that measure, at the same time calling some of them—the offsets—pie in the sky and opposing the plan.

Well, here we are today on the floor of the House, and 3 million Americans are still waiting for House Republicans to allow just one vote on a bipartisan plan to extend unemployment benefits. It is time that House Republicans get priorities straight.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time now be given to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguished member of our committee who has worked so hard with the rest of us on highway issues, to control.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

I am pleased that Congress is finally acting today, not with a looming crisis, but one that is already upon us. This is entirely predictable.

I have been arguing for months that Congress needs to act because the stopgap measure we did last Congress was designed to create precisely this Congress at precisely this time.

Sixty-two groups may have signed on a letter of support, but they prefer us to act meaningfully for long-term funding. They accept this because it is the only alternative to shutting down activities this summer.

My Republican friends are unwilling—not unable—but unwilling to resolve the funding contradictions. Revenues have failed to keep pace with the demands of an aging growing Nation, making no change for 21 years, as our infrastructure ages and falls apart, our Nation continues to grow and transportation patterns change. It is guaranteed that we should change as well.

This Congress has refused to address its responsibilities. The House Ways and Means Committee has not had a single hearing on transportation finance. One of our most important responsibilities, uniquely ours, one that is unlike so many other items we deal with, it is possible to resolve. We haven't had a hearing in the 43 months that the Republicans have been in charge of Congress.

Now, I understand there are conflicts within the Republican Caucus. There are some that appear satisfied with locking us into a slow, steady decline called for in the Republican budget—no new projects until October of 2015 and a 30 percent reduction over the next decade, at exactly the time the Federal partnership should be enhanced, not reduced.

There are others in the Republicans whose answer is to just abandon ship, to give up on the Federal partnership, slash the Federal gas tax, and abandon any hope of a national transportation policy and partnership to help States with projects that are multistate in nature or that need to be done whether economic times are bad.

That would be tragic and wrong to abandon the partnership that has meant so much, but it is part of what is driving some of our Republican Tea Party friends. Just because there may not be a majority in the Republican ranks for either approach does not mean that we should continue to dither.

Because Republicans friends are unwilling or unable to resolve this, we have frozen the Transportation Committee in place. They don't have a bill. They are not going to have a bill unless we resolve what the budget number is: increase, continue the downward slide, or abandon it altogether.

We will be no better off next May to resolve this question. In fact, we will be worse off because we will be in the middle of a Presidential campaign, with a new Congress, maybe new committee lineups.

So as one of the stakeholders told me as we filed out of the hearing room last week, May 2015 is really May 2017 and, I might add, at the earliest.

We should reject this approach to hand off our responsibilities. We should resolve the resource question, and we should commit that this Congress is not going to recess for August vacation, not going to recess to campaign in October, until we have worked to give the American people a transportation bill they need—deserve—to jump-start the economy, create hundreds of thousands of family-wage jobs, and strengthen communities and families across the Nation.

American infrastructure used to be the best in the world and a point of pride bringing Americans together. It is now a source of embarrassment and deep concern as we fall further and further behind global leaders.

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

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

In addition to the Statement of Administration Policy in support of the legislation which has been entered into the record, as well as a letter from 62 organizations in support of the legislation—including the American Trucking Association, American Farm Bureau, National Association of Manufacturers—I also have a letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which is the world's largest business federation, which represents more than 3 million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, is key voting this legislation and has written a separate letter in support of this bill.

I would enter into the RECORD the Chamber of Commerce letter regarding H.R. 5021.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2014.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting and defending America's free enterprise system, strongly urges you to vote for H.R. 5021, the ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014,'' which would extend federal surface transportation programs and provide for a short-term solution for the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) shortfall. By the end of July, Congress must send to the President a measure that generates the necessary cash flows to support continued outlays from the HTF and affords much-needed continuity in the short-term for economic development, international trade, and job creation.

Then, it is imperative to immediately turn to identifying and advancing a bipartisan, sustainable, and long-term solution to the HTF that can achieve bicameral success. The Chamber urges leaders of both parties to put politics aside and come together on a shared solution to the HTF's structural deficiencies. The user-supported HTF has been a bipartisan compromise from its beginning. It is the offspring of a Democratic-controlled House and Senate in the 84th Congress and the Republican Eisenhower Administration. For 58 years the HTF has served America's transportation infrastructure well and helped to create the world's largest economy; however, its long-term solvency has been compromised by a lack of action in both the legislative and executive branches.

The Chamber recognizes action on a short-term HTF fix as an important step and looks forward to working with you in the months ahead on a long-lasting remedy for the Highway Trust Fund. The Chamber urges the House to pass H.R. 5021, and may include votes on, or in relation to, this bill in our annual How They Voted Scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), one of the champions on our committee for infrastructure in America.

Mr. PASCRELL. I thank the ranking member, Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank our chairman, our ranking member who was just here a few moments ago.

It is ironic, as I said earlier today, when we take up the transportation and infrastructure legislation that, just a few hours ago, the champion of transportation and infrastructure passed away. He was the chairman of the Transportation Committee. At that time, it was the Public Works Committee. He left the Congress in 1992, so it is ironic.

Mr. Chairman, through the Speaker, you have to understand the frustration that exists on both sides of the aisle on this legislation. We know what is needed. We know what is going to happen by the end of August. Many projects throughout the United States of America will just shut down or begin to shut down. Bills will not be paid. That is not good. That is not acceptable.

On the other hand, when the dust settles, the very committee that we represent, where everything goes through—the Ways and Means Committee—will have voted for close to $1 trillion when the dust settles, unpaid for, permanent tax cuts, many of which are never meant to be permanent. Check the RECORD.

So we can do this and add $1 trillion to the deficit, and we can't come up with a bipartisan 5-year or 6-year transportation plan for our roads?

Let's wait until the bridges fall down. Then we will do something about it.

□ 1600

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, estimates as to how much we need to invest simply to maintain and repair our existing surface transportation system run as high as $177 billion per year. The actual capital spending in 2012 was only $103 billion.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman

from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ), who has been a valued member of our committee, and we are going to miss her.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, our manufacturers, small business owners, and everyday commuters require a modern transportation system. Simply put, our daily lives, our safety, and our economy all require a first-rate transportation system. But our Nation's infrastructure is crumbling, endangering travelers, lengthening commutes, and holding back economic growth.

In their latest report card, the American Society of Civil Engineers gave my own home State's roads and transit a D-minus. Sadly, Pennsylvania has the largest number of crumbling bridges in our Nation, at over 5,000. This is simply unacceptable.

With the highway trust fund running out of funds, we must act to ensure that important projects continue, that workers stay on the job, and that we do not fall further behind. But the bill before us is a temporary fix. Instead, this Congress should act on a robust transportation bill—not for a few months, but for years—a plan that will not only create jobs now but will help ensure our economic competitiveness and economic growth locally and nationally for years to come. We should do our job and pass a fully funded 6-year Federal transportation and infrastructure bill this year.

Putting this off does not make it easier. It does not build a stronger economy. While necessary, this bill is another missed opportunity by House Republicans who are short on vision, too willing to rely on fiscal gimmicks, and unable to find common ground to get the bill done—and done right.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The gentleman from Oregon has 5¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a valued member of our Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that we would be here passing a long-term transportation plan. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

However, I support H.R. 5021 as an initial step in strengthening the American infrastructure. This bill obviously provides immediate help to prevent default of the highway trust fund and prevents impending delays in transportation. Mr. Speaker, 30,000 people will continue to work in my State as a result of this bill and its passage.

So I commend us for at least reaching this agreement, keeping things moving, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter from the Associated General Contractors of America in support of H.R. 5021 and urging its passage.

THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Arlington, VA, July 15, 2014.

Re Support H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOEHNER: On behalf of the Associated General Contractors of America (AGC), I urge you to support H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014.

The Highway Trust Fund is running on fumes. The United States Department of Transportation (DOT) recently announced they will initiate cash management procedures for programs funded out of the Highway Account of the trust fund on August 1, 2014. This will force DOT to delay reimbursements to state departments of transportation for projects under construction or, in some cases, already completed. Further, if no additional revenue is found, the trust fund will not be able to support any new projects in 2015.

Bipartisan action is required to give states the funding certainty they need to issue highway construction contracts and to give the 10,000 construction firms engaged in highway, road and bridge construction the confidence they need to make hiring and capital investment decisions at the peak of the summer highway construction season. Providing revenue for the Highway Trust Fund will also guarantee the federal government can meet its obligations to reimburse states for highway and bridge construction projects already underway.

The looming insolvency of the Highway Trust Fund and the lack of long-term authorization stifles the economic impact of road construction. It undermines states' ability to best plan and manage their highway, bridge and transit construction programs It also stretches state budgets and may increase their borrowing costs.

To that end, AGC urges the House to pass bipartisan legislation that can provide the certainty states need to make investment decisions and the industry needs to make critical business decisions. Focus must then turn to finding a bipartisan, bicameral solution this year to fund a multi-year reauthorization of MAP–21.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. SHOAF,
Senior Executive Director,
Government Affairs.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), an eloquent spokesperson for rebuilding and renewing America.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today really demonstrates the House Republican fear of even trying. Their guiding strategic principle in this Congress is to do nothing and to be sure that no one else can do anything; and when they are eventually overwhelmed by a self-created crisis, as they have done with our transportation system, then to do next to nothing.

Bridges can literally fall down, highways crumble, public transportation systems are hobbled, but the House Republicans continue to reject a normal reauthorization of the Transportation Act of the type that, for decades, had broad bipartisan support in this House.

The only thing bipartisan about this last-gasp desperate effort to prevent a stoppage of transportation projects and the various groups that have endorsed it is that, after having had presented as a purported serious proposal by House Republicans that the way to stop the traffic slowdown was to have a mail or postal slowdown to finance it, they see this as a chance finally to at least prevent temporarily a total shutdown of our transportation project system. And so they are going along with it. I am not.

I realize that to have a sound transportation system, you can't do it week to week or month to month. There has to be some long-term planning. These bridges cannot repair themselves. These potholes don't fill themselves. We often hear that freedom is not free. Well, neither are freeways.

We have to have the revenue to have the kind of responsible national transportation system of the type that Dwight Eisenhower once provided the lead on when there was bipartisan support for reasonable public investment. Our competitors understand this. They are out there designing a 21st century transportation system that will be competitive, and we are being left in the potholes.

It is essential that we have a long-term bill, not this type of stopgap measure.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I appreciate my friend from Michigan putting into the RECORD what can only be regarded as reluctant letters of support. I wish that some of my colleagues would have had time to look at it. It is not a ringing endorsement of what is before us. It is a reluctant acknowledgement that that is all we have time for, that is all the Republicans will allow.

I have worked with those groups, with the road builders, with the Chamber, with the AFL–CIO, with the contractors, with elements large and small, local governments, transit. They are unanimous in their effort, in their regard that we should deal with this in the big picture. A number of them had letters before the Ways and Means Committee that it should be done this year, not kicked forward. That is why I asked our Republican chairman to allow us to hear from these people.

If we would have heard from Peter Ruane from the Road Builders in person; Tom Donohue from the Chamber; Rich Trumka from the AFL–CIO; Terence O'Sullivan, the eloquent leader of the Laborers'; from the AAA and the truckers, Bill Graves, they wouldn't endorse this approach. They would be

talking about our getting down to business. But the Republicans would not allow us a hearing, not for 43 months. So they are reduced to offering tepid letters of support so the whole system doesn't fall apart.

Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest that those are not a reason to move forward with this legislation and be happy. It is a sad commentary that this is the best that the Republicans think they can give us.

Those road groups who depend on moving freight, maintaining roads, who care about the health and well-being of our communities deserve better. Our families deserve better. The economy deserves better.

I hope that we will, in a moment, have a motion to recommit that will shorten the amount of time that we let this Congress off the hook and make sure that we don't adjourn this Congress without doing our job.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go through history. The former chairman of the Infrastructure Committee on the last large highway bill, SAFETEA-LU, that was passed, I had a dear friend from Minnesota named Jim Oberstar who served beside me and worked with me to write that piece of legislation. Finally, he became the chairman. What is impressive about that, this gentleman had more knowledge about transportation probably than anyone in this House has ever had, including myself.

I will tell you what was the biggest disappointment of his life is he wanted to write a transportation bill, a long-term transportation bill, and fund it. And guess who said no. Our President, Mr. Obama. His Secretary, a dear friend of mine, came down and said there is no way we are going to pass a long-term bill with full funding. He did not support Jim Oberstar.

What I wanted to do was to fully fund it, and I was opposed then by the seated President, George W. Bush.

In fact, if Mr. Oberstar had the opportunity, with the Senate being in the control of the President's party and the House being in the control of the President's party, we would not be here today. We would have infrastructure, bar none. We wouldn't be discussing what we are doing today.

This measure today is a stopgap measure. But this Congress has to wake up, and the President should have woken up then when he had control to pass legislation for the infrastructure of this country.

So, when we get accused on this side of not doing anything and making a stopgap measure, go back through history. This President has failed to recognize the importance. And for those interest groups, they should have been on him at that time in support of Mr. Oberstar.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say respectfully, this is a two-way street. We have to understand this is a really important piece of legislation to keep us going, but then we have to solve it permanently. Let's be leaders on infrastructure, which we do not have down on Pennsylvania Avenue right now at this time.

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

I would add to the gentleman from Alaska's remarks by saying the Ways and Means Committee proposed a tax reform discussion draft that actually funded the highway trust fund for 8 years. Now my friends on the other side would like to shorten this temporary measure, which goes through the end of May, to just go through the end of December, and that is wrong for a couple of reasons.

First, the Senate bill that is being considered has the same length of time as the current House bill, so that would be out of step with the direction that the Senate is trying to go. We are obviously trying to form a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation here.

The second is that, if we only were to pass this along for a few months, all of the problems that the Members on the other side talked about would only be made worse, that is, there would not be the ability to plan over the winter, for example, for spring construction projects. To just extend it for a few months, again, makes it so temporary and so short that you would immediately have companies, States, employers hedging their bets on whether funding is going to continue after that time.

The construction season isn't just in the good months of the year, it also goes through the winter, and that is why it is so important that we get through the end of May to June 1 to give the Congress time to really come up with a long-term solution, which clearly everyone prefers on both sides.

So with that, I urge support for the legislation and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation reports that the Highway Trust Fund will be unable to fully fund critical, ongoing highway programs as soon as August. This crisis stems from a fundamental mismatch between trust fund revenues and highway program spending that predates enactment of the last surface transportation reauthorization that Congress enacted. Since 2008, Congress has bailed out the Highway Trust Fund with more than $54 billion in transfers.

H.R. 5021 provides the necessary funds to keep the federal highway and transit programs running while Congress develops legislation to set these programs on a sound financial footing for the long term. I look forward to working with my colleagues to address the systematic factors that have been driving the Highway Trust Fund's bankruptcy.

Importantly, this bill follows a House budget rule that requires general fund transfers to the trust fund to be fully offset. It should not become a recurring practice for taxpayers to bail out the highway and transit programs because Congress and the President are unable to make the changes necessary to avoid future trust fund insolvency.

My primary concern is with using pension smoothing as an offset. Based on CBO scoring, the bill produces ten-year savings through changing pension law, but these changes will likely be more than offset by greater federal obligations in the future. Ultimately, allowing additional smoothing now increases future liabilities for the taxpayer guarantee of private-sector pensions. In addition, we are increasingly using 10 years of savings to offset one year of costs as this bill does. It is progress to offset these costs, but we need to be reducing spending and deficits and when we increase spending, we should be offsetting the cost in as short a timeframe as possible.

Again, I look forward to working with my colleagues on legislation that will set the Highway Trust Fund on a sustainable path going forward, so that we can avoid the kind of stopgap legislation we are considering today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the House is restoring a little sanity to this body by bringing up a clean extension of our nation's Surface Transportation Programs. These programs are too critical to our economy to become a political issue. The short-term Highway Trust Fund extension that the House is voting on today will keep workers on the job this summer and fall fixing our bridges, operating our transit systems and making our highways safer. Unfortunately, we're already behind the 8 Ball in preparing for surface reauthorization and have some serious work to do in deciding how we are going to fund the future of transportation in this country.

Developing a bill based on strong policy is always the best way to write legislation, but the most critical part of developing this next reauthorization bill is clearly finding a way to pay for it. Without that everything else is just talk.

As we prepare for reauthorization of MAP–21 we need to get serious about funding our nation's transportation system. We can't continue to provide grossly inadequate funding for our nation's infrastructure. We're failing to keep pace with our international competitors who are investing heavily in infrastructure, particularly rail infrastructure to move people, goods, and services in their countries. I agree we need to squeeze out every bit of efficiency we can through improved technology and innovation, but we are kidding ourselves if we don't think it will take a significant investment in our nation's infrastructure to truly solve the congestion problems we are facing.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee needs to take the bull by the horns and decide how we are going to fund all forms of transportation for the future. Our committee needs to have all possible options on the table to address our current shortfalls. The American Society of Civil Engineers has given our nation infrastructure a D grade. That is unacceptable for the greatest county in the world.

Transportation and Infrastructure funding is absolutely critical to the nation, and, if properly funded, serves as a tremendous economic and job creator. In fact, Department of Transportation (DOT) statistics show that for every

$1 billion invested in transportation infrastructure, 44,000 jobs are created, as is $6.2 billion in economic activity.

So, as the Transportation & Infrastructure committee prepares the next transportation reauthorization bill, I hope we can develop a long term bill with dedicated funding source for all modes of transportation so we can improve our nation's infrastructure, create jobs and improve the economy, and provide new and innovative transportation options for the traveling public.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014. Once again, Congress has failed to lead on a critical issue that impacts the lives of every American. We need to make bold investments in our transportation infrastructure, which is currently in a state of disrepair. It should be embarrassing to every member of Congress that the American Society of Civil Engineers recently gave our nation's infrastructure a grade of "D+."

Instead of working towards a multi-year reauthorization of our surface transportation programs, which expire on September 30, 2014, Congress is once again kicking the can down the road. If Congress does not act to replenish the Highway Trust Fund, payments to states for transportation projects would be cut drastically. This would have detrimental impacts on our already modest efforts to improve our infrastructure and we must not allow this to occur. While I am disappointed in the lack of progress made on a permanent solution to this problem, I support this measure as a way to avoid catastrophe.

While Congress plays an important role in funding transportation infrastructure projects, states have an obligation in this area as well. I'm extremely disappointed that the Michigan State Legislature adjourned for the summer without reaching agreement on funding ongoing road projects in Michigan. All of our leaders, from Congress down to states, cities, and municipalities, need to make infrastructure spending a top priority rather than continuing to play politics with this issue.

While I urge adoption of this measure, I also hope my colleagues will join me in having a serious discussion about how to provide a long-term fix to our nation's infrastructure problems. Our constituents demand action on this critical issue.

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I support efforts by Congress to continue funding the Highway Trust Fund. This fund provides $3.2 billion of necessary resources for building and maintaining California's transportation system and growing the state's economy. With the passage of H.R. 5021, San Bernardino County's Omnitrans will be able to move forward with the purchase of 15 new transit buses to link the cities of Fontana, Ontario, Montclair, and Pomona. Projects like this are crucial to the local economy and construction projects across California's 35th Congressional District will continue through spring of next year.

This short term investment is an important first step, but it is time we make significant long term investments in the country's infrastructure and Congress must now take up The GROW AMERICA Act. This legislation is a four year reauthorization proposal that provides increased and stable funding for our nation's highways, bridges, mass transits, and rail systems. This will provide critical investments to fix our failing roads and crumbling bridges to ensure the safety of our transportation systems. Sixty five percent of America's infrastructure is rated in less than good condition and one in four bridges requires significant repair. Congress must act now by investing in our infrastructure to increase safety, build our nation's transportation workforce, and increase opportunity for the middle class.

This legislation will provide $5 billion in funding over four years for the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery Act. The TIGER grant program will continue to be available for another four years, extending successful transportation projects that serve the diverse travel and goods movement to meet the needs or the residents and businesses of California.

The GROW AMERICA Act will also empower regional and local communities to make transportation investments that support the growth of the economy and quality of life of the residents of California's 35th Congressional District. According to the Department of Transportation only 8 percent of federal highway dollars are now controlled by regional and local interests and additional authority over resources at the local level would increase the success of our transportation investments. This will ensure the public and interested parties can participate in the early development of transportation plans and review alternative development scenarios. Lastly, The GROW AMERICA Act will adopt local performance-based decision making to ensure regional priorities drive investment decisions and by implementing measures to reduce the amount of time to break ground on local projects.

This input from local stakeholders is very important for the communities I represent in the 35th Congressional District of California. As a major freight corridor for Burlington Northern-Santa Fe and Union Pacific Railroads, San Bernardino County needs additional investment in grade separation projects to reduce traffic congestion. It often loses out on infrastructure grants to larger metropolitan areas. The GROW AMERICA Act will take our role as a freight corridor into account when determining funding for the Inland Empire.

Again, I commend today's efforts to continue funding the Highway Trust Fund, but it is clear that the success of our economy relies on the strength of our infrastructure. I urge Congress take up the GROW AMERICA Act and make the critical transportation investments needed to create jobs and increase opportunity in California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 669, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1615

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Blumenauer moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5021 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle E—Modification of Extension Period

SEC. 1401. EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2014.

In this title, including the amendments made by this title any reference to "May 31, 2015" shall be treated as a reference to "December 31, 2014".

Add at the end of the bill the following:

TITLE III—SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 3001. SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING NEED TO PASS LONG-TERM TRANSPORTATION FUNDING BILL.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House of Representatives finds the following:

(1) The Highway Trust Fund is projected to become insolvent before the end of the fiscal year.

(2) The user-fee principle upon which the Highway Trust Fund was established is eroding.

(3) Since 2008, Congress has transferred $54 billion from the general fund to the Highway Trust Fund.

(4) The primary funding mechanisms for the Highway Trust Fund have not been fundamentally addressed since 1993.

(5) Due to a decline in per capita miles driven, a decline in the purchasing power of highway excise taxes, and increased fuel efficiency, Highway Trust Fund revenues have not kept pace with the needs of United States infrastructure.

(6) United States infrastructure is falling behind the rest of the world.

(7) In 2013, the United States was ranked 25th globally in overall infrastructure quality.

(8) Short-term surface transportation extensions increase costs of transportation projects, limit the ability of state and local governments to plan infrastructure improvement, and ultimately have resulted in the degradation of United States infrastructure.

(b) SENSE OF HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) any long-term transportation reauthorization bill should, at a minimum, fund infrastructure spending at least to current levels plus inflation through fiscal year 2020, and

(2) by the end of calendar year 2014, the Committee on Ways and Means and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives should each report legislation reauthorizing the surface transportation programs within their respective jurisdictions, and the House of Representatives should pass a long-term surface reauthorization bill to ensure the sustainability of the Highway Trust Fund and improve United States infrastructure.

In section 2001, strike "June 1, 2015" each place it appears and insert "January 1, 2015".

In the quoted matter proposed to be inserted by section 2002(a), strike the first dollar amount and insert "$5,550,000,000".

In the quoted matter proposed to be inserted by section 2002(a), strike the second dollar amount and insert "$1,450,000,000".

Strike section 2003 and insert the following (and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly):

SEC. 2003. CLARIFICATION OF 6-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF OVERSTATEMENT OF BASIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 6501(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) An understatement of gross income by reason of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis is an omission from gross income; and'', and

(2) by inserting ''(other than in the case of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis)'' in clause (iii) (as so redesignated) after ''In determining the amount omitted from gross income''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to—

(1) returns filed after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) returns filed on or before such date if the period specified in section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to such amendments) for assessment of the taxes with respect to which such return relates has not expired as of such date.

SEC. 2004. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON RETURNS RELATING TO MORTGAGE INTEREST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 6050H(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C), by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (I), and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraphs:

''(D) the unpaid balance with respect to such mortgage,

''(E) the address of the property securing such mortgage,

''(F) information with respect to whether the mortgage is a refinancing that occurred in such calendar year,

''(G) the amount of real estate taxes paid from an escrow account with respect to the property securing such mortgage, and

''(H) the date of the origination of such mortgage, and''.

(b) PAYEE STATEMENTS.—Subsection (d) of section 6050H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting '', and'', and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) the information required to be included on the return under subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F) of subsection (b)(2).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns and statements the due date for which (determined without regard to extensions) is after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 2005. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO MEET DUE DILIGENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6695 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) FAILURE TO BE DILIGENT IN DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD TAX CREDIT.—Any person who is a tax return preparer with respect to any return or claim for refund who fails to comply with due diligence requirements imposed by the Secretary by regulations with respect to determining eligibility for, or the amount of, the credit allowable by section 24 shall pay a penalty of $500 for each such failure.''.

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

At the end of title I, as amended, add the following:

SEC. 1402. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In this title, including the amendments made by this title—

(1) any reference to a dollar amount relating to the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, shall be treated as a reference to that dollar amount multiplied by 0.3786008230453; and

(2) any reference to ''$^{243}/_{365}$'' shall be treated as a reference to ''$^{92}/_{365}$''.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to the dollar amount referred to in the matter proposed to be inserted by section 1001(c)(3)(B)(ii).

Mr. BLUMENAUER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to suspend the reading.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this may be the last chance Congress has to honor our commitments to provide answers about transportation funding and develop a framework that will guide the Federal partnership that has meant so much. The motion won't kill the bill, and it won't delay the bill. It simply reduces the funding to the amount necessary for Congress to do its job before we adjourn for the year. It is so that we cannot duck our responsibilities and hand this off not to the next Congress but to the Congress after that.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, in May of next year there will be no transportation bill, there will be no funding, and Congress will be even more nervous and confused with a transportation problem that will be more complex. It will be more expensive, and the politics, I am sad to say, will be harder, not easier.

My good friend, the chair of the Ways and Means Committee, does have a proposal. He has never had a hearing on it. And it was dismissed when it was announced by his own Speaker, if I quote: ''Blah, blah, blah.''

This is a sad moment for me. But it is not too late for us to do something about it. We need to move forward and have a tighter timetable. Let's finally have a hearing in Ways and Means. Let's have a proposal going forward. I am perfectly willing to work in August to do this. I would be happy for us to add days in September. We shouldn't recess in October to campaign and leave a big question mark. It is true that it takes time to put these things together, but we won't be putting it together next spring, mark my words.

The Republicans need to enable us to find out where they stand. Will they finally have a hearing on my friend Mr. CAMP's proposal? Will they slash the highway trust fund and abandon the responsibilities? Or will they just use the Ryan budget and reduce transportation 30 percent over the next 10 years and no new projects for 15 months?

Those are all legitimate issues. They deserve to have a day in court, and if we get down to work, we could resolve it. I am confident we can do it, and it will be just as easy, if not easier, to do now than waiting until next year when the clock will be ticking, when half the United States Senate will be running for President, and we will have a new lineup, other than the Speaker, who may be happy to have avoided it. It is not going to be any easier.

I respectfully suggest that we honor those 62 groups that want us to move. Look, they would much rather have us do it this year.

We had infrastructure that was once the envy of the world. Now it is a source of embarrassment. We are 27th in the world and sinking. Our problems are getting more expensive, and they are getting harder. I know how hard the job that the chair of the T&I Committee has. I respect him, I respect the committee, but they need to know exactly how much money they have got so they can fashion a bill, and if they did that, they would be able to crank one out, I am confident, in a month or two. But right now, after an entire Congress, they don't have a bill. We don't have a bill.

Those 62 groups and organizations don't have a path. What they have is a great big question mark next May when we start this all over again. This shouldn't be a partisan argument. I disagreed when President Bush shut it down. I disagreed that President Obama didn't move forward, but it is not Republicans versus Democrats. It is not House versus Senate. It is time for us to all come together and work as the stakeholders would have us do.

In fact, we don't even have to have any courage. We can just follow what those experts who represent truckers, AAA, local government, and contractors have offered as guidance. Read the special commissions that have reported to President Bush. This is not rocket science. It is will, it is action, it is deciding exactly how much we are going to spend and when.

Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully request that the House approve this motion to recommit, give us enough time and money to avoid the summer shutdown but not enough to let this Congress off the hook and hand it off to the 115th or the 120th Congress, but we do our job so America can do its.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do rise in opposition to the motion to recommit, and I just want to say I have high regard and great respect for the gentleman from Oregon and his passion for infrastructure. As long as I have been here, he has certainly been a strong advocate. Leaving the committee to go to Ways and Means, I know his passion is on the Transportation Committee, but now he is on the committee that certainly can help the process and move it forward.

But I strongly oppose this motion to recommit. It shortens the length of the time of the extension, and I am afraid that putting all our eggs in a lameduck basket will cause us great problems, and I don't believe it will be successful. And then what do we do then? We are going to be doing another short-term and another short-term extension. So shortening the length is not appropriate, I believe.

I think this is the best strategy. It cuts funding. I don't believe that that is in our interest. If we don't get this into next year, we are going to lose that funding because somebody will take it for something else, and if we are not successful in lameduck, then we are going to be going into the next construction season and then we will have trouble working out a solution to that when you cut the funding. It also increases taxes, and that is something right now that I just don't believe this country can accept.

We have an immediate, critical need to address the solvency of the trust fund and extend the surface transportation law so that we can get through this construction season and we can continue with the planning season to move us into next year. I am confident that we are going to be able to do something next year because I believe we have to do something, not on just this issue, but on many issues that we have kicked the can down the road.

As the distinguished former chairman of the Transportation Committee pointed out, my colleagues, not Mr. BLUMENAUER, but many of my colleagues on the other side, went and kicked the can down the road and passed a massive stimulus bill that put about 5 or 6 or 7 percent of that into highway funding when we all know that was where the need was.

Former Chairman Oberstar wanted to do a bill, but again, his own party left him. His own party was irresponsible on that and, again, passing a stimulus bill which I believe hasn't worked, and if it would have been directed to transportation and to infrastructure, we would see a very, very different economy today.

I also add that extending these programs through May in no way precludes Congress from continuing to work on addressing a long-term funding solution—which I believe we have to do. It in no way precludes us from moving on a long-term reauthorization bill, which we continue to work on in the committee, and which is a top priority for the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

However, I believe this legislation is the responsible solution at the time and ensures we don't play politics with these programs, and it enables us to continue to make improvements to our surface transportation system.

So, Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this motion. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'', and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. 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 passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 227, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

YEAS—193

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

NAYS—227

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

NOT VOTING—12

Byrne
Campbell
Carney
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Rush
Southerland
Williams

□ 1652

Messrs. FORTENBERRY, REICHERT, FINCHER, and DUNCAN of South Carolina changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. YARMUTH and CLEAVER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BLUMENAUER. 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 367, noes 55, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

AYES—367

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—55

Amash
Blumenauer
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Carter
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Collins (GA)
DeSantis
Doggett
Duncan (SC)
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Hall
Harris
Holt
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Jones
Jordan
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Lummis
Matheson
McClintock
McDermott
Meadows
Messer
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Nugent
Olson
Peters (CA)
Pompeo
Posey
Ribble
Salmon
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Stockman
Stutzman
Waters
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Yoho

NOT VOTING—10

Byrne
Campbell
Carney
DesJarlais
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1659

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4719, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–522) on the resolution (H. Res. 670) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, VETERANS' ACCESS TO CARE THROUGH CHOICE, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230, the conference report on Veterans Access and Accountability.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Gallego moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to recede from disagreement with section 601 of the Senate amendment (relating to authorization of major medical facility leases).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's notice will appear in the RECORD.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

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

Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1703

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 152, line 15.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman form Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my dear friend from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for yielding.

I rise to speak on this bill, but not to offer an amendment. I don't offer an amendment because, to offer an amendment, I would have to identify an offset within the body of this bill. This bill is deeply and harmfully underfunded. Therefore, I will not seek to take from an object that already is underfunded to fund the elimination of the Election Assistance Commission.

At the outset, I want to say that I served on this subcommittee for 23 years. I know a little bit about the subject of this committee. Not only that, I was the sponsor of the Help America Vote Act with Bob Ney, my friend from Ohio. That bill overwhelmingly passed with over 350 bipartisan votes. Unfortunately, too frequently, bipartisanship eludes us in this body today.

I voted against Ryan-Murray because I said at that point in time it did not provide sufficient resources to meet the responsibility this Nation has to stay strong, stay free, and to grow our economy and grow jobs for our people.

As I said, I was the sponsor of the Help America Vote Act. Within that bill, we created the Election Assistance Commission. Again, it was overwhelmingly supported by both sides of the aisle and the United States Senate and signed into law by President Bush. The offices and programs covered under that program were focused on trying to assist States and local governments to ensure the appropriate administration of elections.

Is there anything, I ask my colleagues, more important in a democracy than ensuring that elections are well run and that every voter's vote counts? I suggest to you there is not.

The Election Assistance Commission, established by the Help America Vote Act in the aftermath of the 2000 Presidential election debacle, to be specific, had 357 Members of this body vote for it. The appropriations bill on this floor today, however, would essentially eliminate that commission.

I am not surprised because, frankly, when the Republicans became the majority in this House, it was at that point in time they started focusing on the elimination of the Election Assistance Commission, as I said, designed to make our elections more efficient, fairer, and more honest.

Initially, my Republican colleagues suggested that the duties of the Election Assistance Commission would be done by the Federal Election Commission, which has a totally different responsibility, and that is a responsibility to make sure that the funding of elections is done appropriately and within the law.

I am going to vote against this bill not simply because of the zeroing out of the Election Assistance Commission. Very frankly, I am chagrined and disappointed that my Republican colleagues too often are trying to undermine America's right to vote, undermine America's incentive to vote, undermine the facilitating of Americans voting. Frankly, I don't understand that.

The Election Assistance Commission, for the first time in history, said that for over 200 years States and localities had run Federal elections. They were concurrent with State elections and local elections. But they ran our elections with no assistance from us—for President, Vice President of the United States, United States Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives. We did not participate.

Under HAVA, we have contributed a substantial sum of money so that they could update and make efficient the election systems that they had. But recently, the Republican Party, Mr. Chairman, has refused to recommend appointments for the Commission, and now they want to eliminate the Commission.

Mr. Chairman, in a country that looks at the right to vote and the exercising of franchise as central to our democracy, I would urge us to defeat this bill, to re-fund this critically important agency, and to do what we ought to do as Americans and as Members of this Congress.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''National Security Council and Homeland Security Council—Salaries and Expenses'' for the National Security Council is hereby reduced by $4,200,000.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the amount available for the National Security Council staff by $4.2 million, or by approximately one-third.

The National Security Council staff is the President's staff. They serve solely to provide advice to the President on national security matters. They have no authority to manage programs. They have no authority to allocate funds or otherwise decide spending levels. And they have no authority to determine or dictate congressional access to classified information involving sensitive military matters or operations. As the President's staff, it is appropriate that they are accountable to him, just as our staff is only accountable to us. Therefore, they are not subject to congressional questioning nor other forms of oversight.

Over the past few years, the size of the National Security Council's staff has grown, and it appears that they have moved beyond their Presidential advisory role to involve themselves in decisions which are not in their purview. Over the last few months, we have had several instances in which the National Security staff has mandated that the Department of Defense and other agencies selectively withhold information from congressional oversight committees.

While the President has constitutional authority as Commander in Chief to provide for the Nation's defense, this Congress was vested exclusively with the constitutional authority to fund that defense, a constitutional authority that is vested in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that all appropriate oversight committees are not restricted from the information they need to have to do their jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition, and I would strongly emphasize that I join with my chairman and colleague from New Jersey in support of his amendment. So that there is clarity as to the purpose of his offering this amendment, I would reiterate two of his remarks.

Over the last few months, we have had several instances in which National Security staff has mandated that the Department of Defense and other agencies selectively withhold information from congressional oversight committees, and in one case specifically, excluding the Appropriations Committee. As the chairman rightfully pointed out, the Congress is vested exclusively with the constitutional authority to fund that defense, and the authority in this instance rests with the Appropriations Committee.

The committee has included clear direction in the Fiscal Year 2014 Defense

Appropriations Act and in the House-passed Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2015 for the Department to report on the conduct of various programs as well as the obligation and expenditure of associated funding.

□ 1715

This direction addresses not only funds expressly provided in the Department's appropriations bill but Department actions that may cause the reprogramming of funds provided by the Congress.

Accurate, complete, and timely reporting by the Department of Defense is essential for the committee to conduct its oversight responsibilities. It informs committee deliberations to prepare the annual appropriations bills. It helps prepare the committee for negotiations with the Senate, and at present, it will help the committee formulate recommendations on the recently submitted fiscal year 2015 budget amendment on the overseas contingency operations.

The committee's responsibilities for funding are specific. Article I, section 9 of the Constitution states:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law, and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

I strongly urge the adoption of the gentleman's amendment, which underscores the constitutional prerogative of the Congress as well as of the Committee on Appropriations.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me thank Chairman CRENSHAW and Ranking Member SERRANO for this opportunity to propose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the chairman for yielding and for bringing this to the attention of the full House. I will refer to the gentleman as ''chairman'' because I have the pleasure of serving on the Defense Subcommittee, and he acts as the chairman of that.

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman has said, the National Security Council and the National Security Adviser have gotten into a bad habit, I think, of bypassing the Appropriations Committee, including the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee, when it comes to issues of national security. I can tell you firsthand that I have had situations in which I have asked for an update on some matters, and they haven't been followed up on.

I want to thank the chairman for his leadership in all things defense. I want to encourage my colleagues to follow his lead, and I urge that we adopt this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
>
> SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into any contract with an incorporated entity if such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands, and such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity was previously incorporated in the United States.

Ms. DELAURO (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

My amendment would prohibit Federal contracts from going to entities incorporated in Bermuda and the Cayman Islands—the two nations most often abused as tax havens.

In the past few weeks, this body has accepted similar provisions for the Department of Defense Appropriations bill; the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill; and the Energy and Water bill. The latter passed on a rollcall vote.

As before, we should not be spending taxpayers' money on Federal contracts for companies that have renounced their American citizenship in favor of an island tax haven.

Let me quote from an article from Saturday's Washington Post by Allan Sloan, a senior-editor-at-large from Fortune, and the title of the article is: ''Tax-Dodging Firms Are Sticking Us with the Bill.''

He writes:

> These companies don't hesitate to take advantage of the great things that make America America—our deep financial markets, our democracy and rule of law, our military might, our intellectual and physical infrastructure, our national research programs, all the terrific places our country offers for employees and families to live—but inverters do hesitate, totally, when it is time to ante up their fair share of financial support for our system.

He is right, and we should not be rewarding bad behavior and gifting these firms with lucrative Federal contracts.

Nearly two-thirds of the companies that have established subsidiaries in tax havens have registered at least one in Bermuda or in the Cayman Islands. If a firm is going to abuse tax loopholes by pretending to be from these two island nations, we should make sure we are doing business with companies that are paying their fair shares instead.

We now have taken strong, decisive, and bipartisan action against these tax havens in three appropriations bills. I urge all of my colleagues to act here as well and stand for American businesses that are meeting their responsibilities to our Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, this is one of those issues that really gets you angry. Both sides believe that people should play by the rules, and what you have are people not playing by the rules. People in my district, people in Ms. DELAURO's district and people in Mr. CRENSHAW's district have to pay their taxes and pay their taxes where they live. They don't have the option of doing these kinds of things. For me, it is not only a legislative issue but a personal issue—the fact that these folks continue to get away with this kind of a situation.

This is an issue that Ms. DELAURO has been working on for years. It is one that she deserves a lot of credit for, and that is why we have to thank her for it.

I would like to take this opportunity to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Connecticut will control the remaining time of the gentleman from New York.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Thank you for your good work on this amendment. This will be the third bill that we have amended on it.

Mr. Chairman, seldom has a day gone by recently without a headline about some American company that is running for the border to avoid its tax bill. Indeed, today's New York Times has ''Patriot Flees Homeland,'' ''Drug Firms Make Haste to Elude Tax,'' and an excellent piece in Fortune magazine and The Washington Post that Ms. DELAURO referenced by Allan Sloan, entitled, ''Positively un-American tax dodges.''

It all gives new meaning to the term ''sunshine patriot'' when some corporation renounces its citizenship and

claims it is a citizen of the Cayman Islands or of Bermuda, where it does little or no business other than tax evasion.

The willingness of corporations to renounce their citizenship and leave America behind, at least in name only and at least when the tax bill is due but not when the desire for a government contract is there, has been recognized in the Senate Finance Committee, where Senator WYDEN will conduct hearings next week on the best legislative approach to put a stop to this. But we can do something today to put a stop to what are called ''inversions,'' which are truly perversions of the Tax Code. As Mr. Sloan writes, ''Inverters are deserters.''

Today, Members can respond to this desertion by denying them government contracts. I would like to do more, but I believe this legislation adopted now in these other appropriations acts—repeating it for every one of them—will do a great deal to send a message about those who shirk their responsibilities to America at the same time they ask other taxpayers to use their tax money to finance government contracts.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. The amendment says, if you renounce your citizenship and go abroad to avoid paying taxes, don't come with your hand outstretched to ask other taxpayers who stayed here and worked and contributed to the success of America—those that are proud to be American businesses and are paying their fair share—to pay for you to get a government contract. Don't ask them to put up their tax dollars to pay for your success.

We believe that this approach provides protection to the Treasury and responds to those corporations that have abandoned America.

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

I mentioned Mr. Sloan's article of this past weekend, and I just want to read this quote because I think it really puts this whole issue into perspective:

> How much mone are we talking about inverters sucking out of the U.S. Treasury? There is no number available for the tax revenue loss that is caused by the inverters and the never-heres so far, but it is clearly in the billions. Congress' Joint Committee on Taxation projects that failing to limit inversions from evading their responsibility like this will cost the Treasury at least another $19.5 billion over 10 years and possibly much, much more.

At a time when we struggle here day by day to look for the resources to extend unemployment benefits, to pass a highway trust fund, to increase the minimum wage, to increase the dollars for biomedical research, to look for funds for education in this Nation for our children, we have corporations that are siphoning off $19.5 billion. Not only do they do that, but they take with them, and we give to them, billions in Federal contracts. No more should we do it.

I and others long fought for this. We have passed through the appropriations process a ban on Federal contracts for U.S. companies that acquire businesses in lower tax jurisdictions, and then they claim that their headquarters are there despite still being U.S. companies. We can send another strong statement to these companies today as we have already done on Defense, on Energy and Water, on Transportation-HUD, by coming together and passing this amendment. I urge all of my colleagues to support it. Tell them that they are not allowed to give up their American citizenship and, yet, claim it for billions in Federal contracts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

> At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
>
> SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reinstall the Red Mountain sculpture on the plaza of the Hugo Black Courthouse in Birmingham, Alabama.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very straightforward amendment, which I am joined by my colleague, Ms. TERRI SEWELL, in offering.

The chief judge of the Northern District of Alabama, Karon Bowdre, and the U.S. marshal who was appointed under the previous administration but who serves under this administration, Martin Keeley, have designated this statue as a security risk. We are more concerned over the opinions of the senior officials in that bill than we are of the GSA's in not having that statue located where it poses a security risk to the employees and visitors to that courthouse. Accordingly, I ask for the support of this important amendment.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHUS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1730

Mr. CRENSHAW. I just want to let you know that we are happy to accept your amendment.

Mr. BACHUS. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. I want to thank the gentleman from my home State of Alabama for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment to prohibit funding in the underlying bill from being used to reinstall the Red Mountain sculpture on the plaza of the Hugo Black Federal courthouse in Birmingham, Alabama.

Despite the security concerns shared by both the United States marshal and the chief justice, Karen Bowdre, the GSA has planned to reinstall the sculpture. Both Chief Justice Bowdre and Marshal Keely believe that the sculpture is nonessential and will pose a serious security risk if reinstalled.

Chief Justice Bowdre noted, in correspondence to GSA, that the location of the statue will be roughly 10 to 12 feet from the only public entrance door, which is completely made of glass and, further, that the monument would create a fatal funnel where someone could hide behind the statue and possibly not be seen and cause a security risk.

Federal law clearly states that the United States marshals have the final authority regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch of the Federal Government. The Administrative Office of the United States Court has also agreed with the chief justice and the U.S. marshal that the final authority over these matters should lie with the U.S. marshal.

If the marshal and the chief justice believe that putting the sculpture back could threaten the safety of our court, then GSA should follow the law and not put the monument back up. Unfortunately, GSA is ignoring the concerns of the court and has plans to reinstall the statue.

Now, while I am a steadfast supporter of the arts, I also believe that the safety of our courts and the citizens must come first. This amendment simply reinforces that GSA must follow the law by prohibiting the reinstallation of the sculpture at the Birmingham, Alabama, Federal courthouse.

I want to thank my friend, Congressman SPENCER BACHUS from Alabama, for introducing this bipartisan amendment and urge my colleagues to join me in support of it.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MAFFEI) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. MAFFEI. Thank you, Ranking Member JOSÉ SERRANO.

Mr. Chairman, I am here because, on March 14, 2013, in my upstate New York district, a school librarian named Lori Bresnahan and a 10-year-old child were attacked in a mall parking lot.

The attacker was facing Federal child pornography charges and was out on bail and ordered to wear an electronic monitoring bracelet. He disabled the bracelet, left his home, stabbed Mrs. Bresnahan to death, and sexually assaulted the young girl.

In the days following the attack, it was revealed that the attacker had been removing and reassembling the GPS monitoring bracelet. The device sent out tamper alerts every time he disabled the device, but the Federal probation office responsible for monitoring this defendant before his trial failed to respond to 46 total tamper alerts.

On the day of the attack, he again disabled his bracelet, and the office again ignored the alert. If they had investigated any of these 46 tamper alerts, maybe this tragedy could have been avoided.

This appropriations bill funds the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the organization tasked with overseeing the system of Federal probation offices all over this country.

After this case, I wrote to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, asking them to investigate this gross negligence. In their response was, ''Nothing can excuse the deficiencies in the supervision of this case,'' but it also said, ''Reduced resources due to the sequester is harming the efforts to keep it from happening again.''

Mr. Chairman, we have addressed the sequester for now, but serious funding issues remain. The administrative office is continuing to use their funding to backfill cuts they have had to make in previous years.

We cannot allow funding issues to hamper efforts to prevent cases like this from happening again, and to be clear, this has happened again around the country.

I ask that the committee take note of the serious problem and ensure that the administrative office gets the funds it needs to enact real reform and protect our communities.

I want to thank particularly the ranking member's willingness to work with me, Chairman CRENSHAW and your staff and the minority staff, your willingness to work with me on this.

Tragedies do happen, but this one could have, should have been avoided, and I am dedicated to help Congress do anything in our power to make sure it never happens again in central New York or anywhere in this great country.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman is seeking to bring the salaries and expense of the courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services up to an appropriate level in part, as he mentioned, to address a tragic incident that took place in his district.

It highlights the problems the judiciary suffered while under sequestration and with the lower funding levels that agencies in the executive branch have also had to face.

We will work with the gentleman, the majority, and with the judiciary, as we do every year, to ensure that we can meet their funding needs and address the gentleman's concerns.

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

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) in a colloquy and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, in 2010, this body passed the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act, the HIRE Act. Included in that measure was the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act, or FATCA.

FATCA requires U.S. citizens living abroad to prepare tax returns that include both non-U.S. income and non-U.S. financial accounts. Additionally, FATCA requires financial institutions in other countries to report on assets held by American clients to the IRS.

If those institutions do not supply that information, they would be subject to a 30 percent withholding tax. In a recent report, nearly 77,000 institutions have agreed to hand over that information to the IRS.

The unintended consequences of this law are affecting over 7 million Americans living overseas. Due to the additional reporting burden, many institutions are simply denying access to our citizens.

Simply put, added regulations from the Federal Government are putting our citizens at a competitive disadvantage around the world, and foreign firms now view our citizens as too much of a hassle and a liability to hire, making America less competitive.

One of the solutions to this would be to switch from a citizen-based taxation to a territorial or to simply repeal FATCA.

The U.S. citizens who live and work abroad are our Nation's biggest spokesmen for our America and our way of life and what America stands for. They represent our country in areas of the world that typically see Americans in a skewed light. We, as those in government, should give them every opportunity to succeed throughout the world.

However, we have so many stories like the American living in Australia, where her husband is an Australian citizen and they share a mutual bank account, but they have to comply with IRS rules, and she has no income; or the gentleman from Thailand who has retired. He worked for a U.S. company for the last 15 years, and he has to abide by U.S. tax laws, even though he has been over there and he resides outside of the U.S.

What Fidelity Mutual told him is we can no longer accept your money and invest because you live outside of the U.S., but you are a U.S. citizen.

Mr. Chairman, this is unacceptable. We in government should do everything possible to bring certainty to our citizens, regardless of where they live, and as a sign of a true great Nation, it is the ability for the Nation's citizens to travel and work wherever they choose in the world, without being disadvantaged by their own government.

I look forward to working with my colleague from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

As you point out, this is an extensive regulation. It is going to have a profound and far-reaching impact on our economy.

I believe these regulations, as you pointed out, are fraught with unintended consequences. As you point out, the regulation is creating headaches for many Americans who must report their foreign financial activities on the U.S. tax return, so they spend countless hours to prepare and file their tax forms necessary to comply with the regulation.

Mr. Chairman, we don't need more burdensome regulations. We need some pro-growth tax reform, to make it easier for Americans, whether living at home or living abroad, to comply with our tax laws.

Now, it is good to go after tax dodgers, that is understandable, but this is overkill, and I look forward to working with the gentleman to address these unintended consequences.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SCHAKOWSKY

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term ''Fair Labor Standards Act.''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, all of us know that hardworking men and women in all of our districts are having a rough time these days. Many are paid low wages or wages that are not enough to meet their family's basic needs. Those problems are made even worse when workers are the victims of wage theft.

Billions of dollars are actually stolen from workers through wage theft, and wage theft occurs when workers are forced to work off the clock, denied earned overtime pay, or paid less than the minimum wage. Workers can lose pay because of illegal paycheck deductions, be denied their final paychecks, or not be paid at all.

Interfaith Worker Justice, based in Chicago, has been working to stop wage theft for years. In 2008, its executive director, Kim Bobo, wrote a book called ''Wage Theft in America: Why Millions of Working Americans Are Not Getting Paid—And What We Can Do About It.''

My amendment is one step we can take to do something about it. My amendment is simple. The idea is the same idea that has been offered on the House floor by my friend and colleague, Representative KEITH ELLISON, and is supported by the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

It says that Federal contractors have a duty to pay their workers their legally-earned wages and that corporations that don't pay their workers their legally-earned wages shouldn't benefit from Federal contracts. Similar language has successfully been added to the Energy and Water and Department of Defense Appropriations bills.

Wage theft has been documented. One study of workers in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York City found that 26 percent were paid below legal minimum wage levels, 76 percent were denied earned overtime, and 70 percent were not paid for work outside of their regular shifts.

The North Carolina Justice Center found that workers in that State lost $33 million in pay because of wage theft over the course of 5 years. The Economic Policy Institute found that, ''In total, the average low-wage worker loses a stunning $2,634 per year in unpaid wages, representing 15 percent of their income.''

This is a problem in many sectors, and that includes Federal contractors. A report by the Senate Health, Education, and Labor and Pensions Committee revealed that 32 percent of the largest Department of Labor penalties for wage theft were levied against Federal contractors.

National Employment Law Project found that 21 percent of Federal contract workers were not paid overtime and 11 percent had been forced to work off the clock.

Federal contract employees deserve to receive the dollars they have earned, the dollars that they need, the dollars they would spend in their communities, and the dollars that taxpayers awarded the contractors for those wages.

All workers should be safe from wage theft, but my amendment is much more modest. It just says that a contract under this FY 2015 Appropriations bill can't be awarded to a corporation found to be in violation of wage requirements under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

It says that corporations that cheat their employees out of hard-earned wages are not deserving of taxpayer-funded Federal contracts. It sends a clear message: obey the law, pay your workers the wages they have earned, or we won't give you the benefit of a taxpayer-financed Federal contract.

□ 1745

Allowing corporations to get away with violating the law is not just bad for their workers and taxpayers, it is unfair to the businesses that are competing for Federal contracts but won't engage in wage theft to get a competitive edge.

Do we really want to tell corporations that they can violate the law and steal wages from their workers and still get a Federal contract, or do we want to take a small stand by saying that only companies that play by the wage rules we have enacted will be eligible?

I hope we can agree that breaking the law in order to underpay workers is not acceptable, certainly should not be rewarded, and certainly not with taxpayer dollars. I urge my colleagues to help the workers who work for us. Support the Congressional Progressive Caucus amendment.

I certainly urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to modify or rebuild any portion of the White House bowling alley, including using phenolic synthetic material.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the FY15 Financial Services Appropriations bill.

But first, before I start, I would like to commend Chairman CRENSHAW for his tireless commitment to stopping the culture of spending and continuing the culture of savings that we have seen from his subcommittee chairmanship. Given our country's current fiscal situation, we need to be mindful of our limited resources and that we need to do more with less. And one of the most basic concepts in budgeting is balancing wants versus needs. A need is something that you have to have, something you can't do without. A want is something that you would like to have. A good example is calcium. You know, calcium is necessary for survival, but ice cream, on the other, hand is a want. Everyone needs calcium, but plenty of people would do just fine without ice cream.

What will my amendment do? It will demonstrate to the taxpayers that this Congress understands the difference between wants and needs. My amendment prohibits any funds from this bill being spent by the General Services Administration towards the renovation of the bowling alley in the White House Eisenhower Office Building.

With our Nation $17 trillion in debt, upgrading the President's private bowling alley shouldn't be a priority. A spiffy new bowling alley may suit the wants for Commander in Chief, but I think I speak for the taxpayers of the Seventh Congressional District when I assert that it is certainly not a need. I think when the administration came forward with this proposal, they rolled a gutter ball.

The hardworking Americans expect and deserve better. These are difficult times in our country. This is no time for business as usual.

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this has very little to do with a bowling alley. This is not even about the picture of Richard Nixon fully dressed, bowling at the White House. This is about this desire of Republicans and the Tea Party segment of Republicans, in some cases, to make Barack Obama seem like an illegitimate President.

The legitimacy of his Presidency has been questioned on and on. There were questions about his birthplace. There were questions about what he said his religion was. There were questions about whether he was old enough to be President. There have been questions about everything. So now, these petty attacks continue.

This is a nonissue. This is a nonstarter. First of all, this was about fixing up a bowling alley that has been there forever. I don't think the American public, with all due respect to the people in the gentleman's district, really spend a lot of time concerned about the fact that all Presidents—and I mean all Presidents—are not allowed just to pick up and go to a local place to have a beer or bowl a game of bowling or whatever. So this is not an issue that we should be dealing with.

But what is important about it is that GSA, furthermore, has canceled the project. The Federal contractor posting was pulled on July 9. So I am sure that the other side knows that this no longer is an issue, but it continues to be something that sounds good. I am sure people will be writing about it tonight, that the bowling alley was going to be built at the White House. No. This was an existing one that was going to be refurbished. That contract has been pulled back. That idea has been pulled back.

There just continues to be more and more and more of this petty attack on a President. And I think it is not so

much that he was elected President, which caused a lot of pain for a lot of people, but the fact that he was reelected. That really has turned a lot of people to a point where they will come up with anything.

So by tonight, we may see even the plumbing at the White House attacked, as we did a couple of years ago. And at that time, I remarked that there hadn't been any plumbers at the White House since the Nixon administration, and that was the truth. We have leaks. We have a White House that needs fixing, and this Congress wastes time on these kinds of issues.

So I would just hope that the gentleman would pull his amendment. If he doesn't, then I would hope we could defeat the amendment because it is just silly and not necessary at all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I suspect it is only silly if you are the people who don't care about the important expenditures of the taxpayers of the United States of America. This isn't some trivial issue. This is a question of priorities at a time where every family is struggling.

And the justification here in Time magazine of one of the individuals was this needs renovations. Would you believe it? According to their first-person testimony—and this is just the staffers and the President—there is no electric scoreboard down there, so you have to score by hand. And that is just debilitating when you are focused on bowling a 300 like I am.

Well, maybe we ought to have people who are focused on other kinds of things at this point in time. This is a serious issue in terms of the mispriority of spending Federal dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to assert the appropriate priorities in terms of our spending, and I urge a ''yes'' vote.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, just in closing, it is silly. And I am not suggesting the gentleman is silly.

We spend money, large amounts of money on the military and on other things that we never, ever, ever attack. We send money overseas in misguided military situations, and we don't complain about that. But it makes good headlines to say that today we stopped the bowling alley from being built at the White House. ''Refurbished'' was the question at hand, and it has been pulled back since July 9. There is no plan whatsoever to do anything with the existing old, decrepit bowling alley at the White House.

So this is not a gutter ball. This is not a strike for anyone. This is just more of their silliness that we will see for the next 24 hours.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill that has been considered under an open rule during this Congress. It is also identical to the amendment I offered to last week's Energy and Water bill, which was passed by voice vote.

My amendment expands the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of the contractors. It is my hope that this amendment will remain uncontroversial, as it has been, and will again be passed unanimously by this House.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I would be pleased to accept the amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman for his offer to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, money market funds are an important tool used by a variety of different organizations, such as businesses, State and local governments, school districts, pension funds, nonprofits, and more. In fact, it is estimated that between 1985 and 2008, people and organizations that invested in money market funds have earned $450 billion more than they otherwise would have earned.

Since the financial crisis, there has been significant discussion about regulating the industry further. In 2010, the Securities and Exchange Commission, or SEC, put in place new rules to prevent future runs by imposing additional disclosure and liquidity standards.

Even after these changes, the Federal Reserve, through the Financial Stability Oversight Council, has attempted to usurp the jurisdiction and expertise of the SEC and proposed additional regulations on money markets. While the FSOC has since backed off their proposal, the SEC is poised to vote soon on a rule to impose a floating net asset value on certain funds.

I share many of the concerns that commenters on the SEC's rule raised about how a floating net asset value would adversely impact money market funds and the people and organizations that rely on them. In fact, it is worth noting that, of the 1,428 comments on the rule, 98 percent were against the floating net asset value.

Before regulators impose any additional changes on money markets, they must be certain that the costs and benefits have been thoroughly weighed. This includes ensuring that the likely tax changes that will need to be considered with a floating NAV are reviewed by the public in an open and transparent manner before moving forward. We should not eliminate money markets as an option for businesses, communities, workers, and retirees to grow and thrive.

In closing, I would like to thank the committee for its positive report language with respect to money market funds and thank the chairman for his time and consideration of this important matter.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, I appreciate the gentleman giving attention to this issue.

As you noted, we have included report language on money market funds within the bill. We are concerned about the issue, and we will work with you as this bill moves forward.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman and look forward to working with him on this important issue.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce final leasing accounting standard rules, regulations, or requirements in FASB Project 2013-270, Accounting Standards Update Topic 842.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1800

Mr. SHERMAN. So much of what we do on this floor is so partisan, going over the same old issues. I bring to you an amendment that I cowrote with the Chamber of Commerce which deals with an issue that has not yet been discussed on this floor.

The Financial Accounting Standards Board is funded by the SEC through a convoluted process designed to claim that they are not a government agency, but they are funded by a mandatory tax, and if you don't follow their prescriptions, you can, indeed, face criminal, as well as civil, penalties.

If it is not broke, don't fix it. For 100 years, we had good rules on how to account for leases. The tenant pays rent, the owner of the building owns the building, and the financial statements disclose in the footnotes all the details any financial analyst would want to see.

Since it is not broke, the folks at the Financial Accounting Standards Board have decided to fix it. They want to list on every balance sheet in America the future amount that will be paid in all lease payments as a liability. The effect of that is to increase the liabilities shown on the balance sheets of American business by $2 trillion. That is right, this is a $2 trillion issue that has not yet been discussed on this floor.

The Financial Accounting Standards Board has done some outreach and taken some testimony. By the standards of the accounting world, they have listened. But by the standards of democracy that we are familiar with, trust me, far more is done before you permit a single three-story apartment building.

Mr. Chairman, almost 70 Members of Congress have urged the Financial Accounting Standards Board to stop. They keep going. They want to act in concert with the European International Accounting Standards Board, and that board is beholden to the European Parliament in Brussels. That is right. Those who, in effect, enact American law are not listening to Congress; they are listening to the only Parliament in the world held in lower esteem than Congress.

What will be the effect on our economy? Well, this will add $2 trillion to the balance sheet liabilities of American businesses. It will put a tremendous disincentive on businesses to sign long-term leases. If your tenant won't sign a long-term lease, you can't fund a new building project, a new shopping center, or a new industrial park. So that is why an economic study funded by the American Association of Realtors, the Economic Roundtable, the Business Owners and Management Association, and others says that the best-case scenario is that this will destroy 190,000 American jobs and reduce our GDP by almost $28 billion a year. The worst-case scenario is over 3 million jobs and nearly half a trillion dollars decline in our GDP.

It is time for us to tell the Financial Accounting Standards Board not to go down this road in an effort to fix something that isn't broken.

It is time, also, to focus on an additional disadvantage of this accounting proposal, and that is it will cause tens of thousands—hundreds of thousands—of businesses in this country to be in violation of their loan covenants, which means that they will have to immediately pay off their liabilities or renegotiate with their bankers, who will insist upon higher personal guaranties and higher interest rates, et cetera.

Thousands and thousands of long-term bonds that have been sold in the public market will be held to be in violation of their loan covenants and will become immediately due—not because the businesses were wrong, but because the accounting standards changed.

Now, I have often thought that accounting principles ought to be written by the Financial Accounting Standards Board and not by Congress. I am clinging to that belief. As I see this disaster unfold in the preliminary—in the discussions of the Financial Accounting Standards Board, it is harder and harder to cling to that belief. But I still retain hope that the accounting standards board will change direction and will not adopt this new policy, which solves no problem and which will add $2 trillion to the liabilities of American business and cost us hundreds and hundreds of thousands of jobs.

Mr. Chairman, because I am hopeful that they will change course, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WENSTRUP). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement guidance FIN-2014-G001 (relating to BSA Expectations Regarding Marijuana-Related Businesses) issued on February 14, 2014.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to stop the implementation of Treasury guidance that is in direct conflict with the Federal anti-money laundering statutes.

On February 14, 2014, the Department of the Treasury Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, FinCEN, issued compliance guidance for ''Bank Secrecy Act, BSA, expectations for financial institutions seeking to provide services to marijuana-related businesses.''

I am concerned that Treasury forgot one detail: the Bank Secrecy Act and Federal anti-money laundering laws are explicitly clear that banks and financial institutions may not engage in marijuana-related transactions.

Despite trending State laws, Federal law remains unchanged. The Controlled Substances Act prohibits the manufacture, possession, and distribution of marijuana. Anything but compliance with the CSA, the law of the land, will trigger criminal anti-money laundering penalties, fines, and possible incarceration for perpetrators.

Instead of issuing guidance to reinforce Federal prohibitions, the FinCEN memo offers banks ways to report suspicion activities as required under Federal law, while blatantly ignoring the fact that banks are not allowed to participate in any marijuana transactions, without exceptions. In other words, instead of enforcing the law, there is just a suspicion alert sent out, which we don't even know if anyone is even going to pay attention to. The very act of depositing drug money runs afoul of Federal law.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to note that the Department of Justice also issued a memo in 2014, ''Guidance Regarding Marijuana Financial Crimes.'' This separate memo reinforces Federal law and outlines possible prosecution and criminal offense for ''transactions involving proceeds generated by marijuana-related conduct.''

My amendment would stop the Department of the Treasury from implementing their February 2014 guidance, which is confusing and is actually creating problems throughout the industry. And it is the government, again, it

is the administration not enforcing its own laws. This is nothing short of tacit approval for money laundering, all the while encouraging banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions to engage in illegal and criminal activities.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield some time to my good friend from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and let me see if I got this straight. Right now, manufacturing, distributing, or dispensing marijuana is still illegal under federal law. Right?

Mr. FLEMING. That is correct, sir.

Mr. CRENSHAW. And the Bank Secrecy Act still prohibits banks from laundering the proceeds of illegal activities. Is that right?

Mr. FLEMING. Right.

Mr. CRENSHAW. But in spite of the Controlled Substances Act and despite the Bank Secrecy Act, Treasury has given banks guidance on how to facilitate the sale of marijuana. That seems wrong, absolutely wrong. This amendment corrects that wrong, so I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of other speakers, so I will be very brief.

This really has very little to do with the substance that we are talking about, or that appears to be marijuana. It is about the fact that, whether we like it or not, there are States that have already legalized either recreational use, in two cases, or medical use in 22 States, and those situations require banking decisions and banking abilities. Jack Lew, Secretary of the Treasury, said at our hearing:

> Without any guidance there will be a proliferation of cash-only businesses, and that would make it impossible to see when there are actions going on that violate both Federal and State law.

So an attack on the use of marijuana may be misleading here because what we are doing is really ignoring the banking aspect of this and the fact that there have to be some regulations and some issues put in place to do the right thing and to uphold the law, the banking laws and other laws.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I say to my friend, Dr. FLEMING, and to the chairman of the committee that the guidance has already been implemented—the guidance from the Justice Department, the guidance from the Treasury Department to banks and to the regulators how to report activity around a marijuana business.

Mr. Chairman, there are now 22 States that allow for medical marijuana. There are two States that have legalized it for all adult purposes. We are at 24 States, and by the end of this year, we will be at about 30 States.

What is happening is because banks may not be following—they are doing what Dr. FLEMING would like to see. They are operating just in cash, which creates its own potential for crime, robbery, assault and battery. You cannot track the money. There is skimming and tax evasion. So the guidance by the Justice Department and the guidance by the Treasury Department is to bring this out into the open.

Mr. Chairman, I will insert in the RECORD yesterday's article in USA Today concerning the security issues dealing with all cash accounts, and the Treasury officials there say:

> Our goal is to promote financial transparency and make sure law enforcement receives the reporting from financial institutions that it needs to police this activity.

[From USA Today, July 13, 2014]

POTS OF MARIJUANA CASH CAUSE SECURITY CONCERNS

(By Trevor Hughes)

DENVER.—The unmarked armored truck rumbles to a stop in a narrow alley, and former U.S. Marine Matthew Karr slides out, one hand holding a folder, the other hovering near the pistol holstered at his hip.

With efficient motions he retrieves a locked, leather-bound satchel from a safe set into the truck's side and presses a buzzer outside the door. It swings open to reveal a cavernous warehouse filled with marijuana and a safe stuffed with cash.

Welcome to the rear guard of Colorado's rapidly expanding legal marijuana industry, where eager users pour millions of dollars—most of it in small bills—into buying pot, hashish, and marijuana-infused foods and drinks. All that cash adds up, and there are few places to put it: Federal regulations, which still classify pot as an illegal drug, make it difficult for marijuana producers to deposit their profits into traditional bank accounts.

And those cash-heavy small businesses make awfully attractive—and vulnerable—targets for criminals.

That's where Karr and the company he works for come in.

Heading through the warehouse where workers tend young marijuana plants, Karr greets a young woman, and the two empty a safe of tens of thousands of dollars in cash neatly packed in plastic envelopes. Like every room in this combined marijuana store and grow house, the smell of pot hangs heavy in the air. Karr double-checks the ledger, locks his satchel and hustles outside, where former cop Phil Baca waits at the wheel of the armored car.

Karr opens the truck's safe, pitches the satchel inside and climbs back into the passenger seat, an AR–15 rifle stashed behind him. It's a scene that plays out six times in three hours. Their take for the day: somewhere close to $100,000 in cash.

''For the first three months, people were just keeping the money everywhere—in the walls, in mattresses, at home,'' says Sean Campbell, CEO of Blue Line Protection Group, which provides marijuana security services, including Karr, Baca and the armored car. ''And banks don't even want to deal with it. You have a quarter-of-a-million dollars in cash show up all at once. The counting time alone is going to take an hour.''

The unusual problem of having too much cash is forcing business owners to hire security firms like Campbell's, especially after Denver police warned in June of a credible threat against marijuana stores and couriers.

Marijuana-store owners have suffered some smash-and-grab robberies over the last several years but surveillance systems and close police attention have solved many of them. Experts say those robberies were largely committed by amateurs, rather than sophisticated crime rings.

Campbell said he believes it will take a serious high-dollar heist to force smaller marijuana stores to take their security more seriously.

State law requires marijuana businesses to have security cameras and systems on the premises, and many have armed guards, but they remain easy targets. The stores and grow operations often are in remote industrial areas, in warehouses that have not been hardened against a determined intruder. Many stores have large amounts of pot sitting around in rooms secured only by flimsy wooden doors.

Options are limited, however. Unlike most other businesses, marijuana-store owners can't easily open bank accounts for fear of running afoul of federal law. Despite Washington state joining Colorado last week in legalizing sales of marijuana for recreational purposes and 23 states plus the District of Columbia permitting medical pot, the federal government still classifies the plant as an illegal drug more dangerous than cocaine or methamphetamine.

By opening a bank account, pot growers and shop owners run the risk of being charged with money laundering, because federal banking laws and regulations are deliberately aimed at tracking large flows of cash like those generated by both legal and illegal drug sales. A single such charge can bring decades in prison, and most banks and pot-shop owners don't want to run that risk.

''When you go into the business, and you know it's federally illegal, you're taking your chances,'' said Tom Gorman, who runs the federally funded Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area task force. ''That's the problem when the state legalizes something that remains illegal at the federal level.''

While declining to be quoted by name, many marijuana store owners interviewed by USA TODAY shared tales of playing cat-and-mouse with banks, managing to keep accounts open for only a few months at a time before getting shut down.

U.S. Treasury officials require banks to file what are known as ''suspicious activity reports'' whenever they suspect someone is trying to launder money. Anyone bringing in a pile of cash sets off internal alarms for bank workers, pot-shop workers say. Federal financial-crimes investigators encourage banks to report suspected marijuana transactions because pot remains illegal at the federal level.

''Our goal is to promote financial transparency and make sure law enforcement receives the reporting from financial institutions that it needs to police this activity and to make it less likely that this financial activity will run underground and be much harder to track,'' said Steve Hudak, a spokesman for the Treasury Department's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.

Tax-and-marijuana attorney Rachel Gillette said she's seen banks' concerns firsthand—several banks she deals with said they wouldn't let her open an account, even though both the federal and state government are allowed to deposit tax payments from pot sellers. Gillette said federally regulated banks say it's just easier for them not to risk getting their hands tainted by pot.

''They literally told me they would not take my account because I do business with

the marijuana industry,'' Gillette said. ''That seems fundamentally unfair—the state is taking that money and putting it in the bank; the IRS is taking that money and putting it in the bank.''

Gillette is suing the IRS on behalf of one of her clients who has been paying federal payroll tax bills with cash. The IRS calls for electronic payments and adds a 10% surcharge for cash payments, she said. With some marijuana businesses paying payroll taxes of $100,000 a quarter, those penalties are substantial.

Colorado has tried to solve the problem with a new state law permitting creation of marijuana banking cooperatives, which would have the power to accept deposits, lend money and make electronic payments. But that system likely won't begin operating for at least another year, said Gov. John Hickenlooper, and even then federal officials would need to bless the plan.

The amount of cash already flowing through the fast-growing system has forced state tax officials to change how they accommodate payments. While Colorado allows businesses to pay their taxes in cash, most pay electronically. Marijuana businesses, however, must trek to a central Denver office, cash in hand, where they're met at the curb by armed guards and escorted inside. ''Some people walk in with shoe boxes. Some people have it in locked briefcases. We've had people bring it in buckets,'' said Natriece Bryant, a spokeswoman for the Colorado Department of Revenue.

Campbell, who runs the armored-car company, said the vast cash flows are a clear come-on for criminals. He said he's working with banks to offer alternatives for marijuana businesses, including vault services. For many in the marijuana industry, the scene from the Emmy-winning television series Breaking Bad of a storage unit filled with drug cash hits uncomfortably close to reality.

Says Campbell, ''You're effectively creating a magnet for crime.''

Mr. PERLMUTTER. So I would urge a big ''no'' vote on this amendment. It is going backwards.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. So many have spoken on this floor in favor of states' rights. A majority of Americans live in States in which medical marijuana is legal, and yet we have this bizarre circumstance where these have to be all cash businesses. The result, as the gentleman from Colorado points out, is tax evasion—or potentiality for tax evasion—and also an invitation to crime—violent street crime—as people figure out how they can invade with guns a store that is licensed by my State or his State and try to steal huge quantities of cash.

It is absolutely absurd to tell people that they cannot use medical marijuana when they are in physical pain and they live in a State where that is allowed, and it is even more absurd to have to keep millions of dollars of cash there for the possible criminal taking because we have businesses that are actually operating that are outside the banking system.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, first of all, it is absolutely a fact that marijuana, the use of marijuana and the sale of marijuana, is against federal law. Now, you may want to change that law, but that is the law.

Also, our banking system, even those that are State banks, State charter banks, fall under a Federal banking system.

You are talking about money laundering. Well, what about other drugs? What about heroin? What about methamphetamines? Should we also have exemptions and carve-outs for those as well? Why even have a system that detects money laundering and actually enforces that if we are going to begin to create exemptions and carve-outs for that as well?

Also, I would remind folks that with regard to medical marijuana, that is still very controversial. The reason why marijuana is still a Schedule I drug, illegal, is that it is neither known nor accepted by authorities that raw marijuana has an acceptable medical use.

□ 1815

Now, yes, extracts of marijuana, even Marinol—which is synthetic THC—is a schedule III, like hydrocodone, and that can be prescribed and monitored by a physician. There is no problem with that, and the money can go into any banking system.

So if there are beneficial parts of the marijuana, we can extract that and create medication from it, whether it is liquid or tablet, injection or whatever, and then that will certainly be delivered, prescribed by physicians.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay a performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to any employee of the Internal Revenue Service.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer one final amendment to the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2015.

Let me first say that I am especially grateful to Chairman CRENSHAW and Ranking Member SERRANO for working with me on my variety of amendments to this bill. They have been exceptionally cooperative and congenial. I would also like to thank the staff of the Financial Services Subcommittee. They have also been very courteous and cooperative with my staff.

My final amendment to the bill seeks to effectuate a policy of accountability in government. Historically, the IRS has never been liked by the American people. The agency takes our hard-earned wages and enforces the Internal Revenue Code.

I would argue that the power wielded by this agency is matched only by the Department of Defense because, as we all know, the power to tax is the power to destroy, and although no one ever liked the IRS, most Americans quietly trusted them.

They trusted that the agency was enforcing the law with fairness and impartiality and were beyond reproach in terms of political pressure. That trust has not only been questioned, it has been annihilated.

This year, House Republicans have gone above and beyond to hold this President and his lawless administration accountable for their actions and inactions, and this is another opportunity to act rather than to speak.

My final amendment to the bill follows in the footsteps of another that I cosponsored and supported in the MilCon-VA Appropriations Act just a few weeks ago. This amendment would prohibit bonuses or performance awards to be paid to senior executive employees at the IRS.

The saying goes with great power comes great responsibility. The IRS is responsible for administering tax laws fairly and justly. They have failed at that responsibility, and they now must be held accountable. Senior management should never have let this happen.

Moreover, they should not be given performance awards in the wake of one of the largest scandals in recent history. Giving out bonuses is ludicrous and amounts to a slap in the face to the American public.

I would also like to quickly note that I appreciate the committee's inclusion of a provision, section 112, in the bill. That section prescribes that, before a bonus may be awarded to an IRS employee, an assessment of the employee's conduct, in addition to a mandatory check for back taxes or delinquent taxes, must be performed and taken into account.

As a duly-elected Member of Congress representing hundreds of thousands of Arizonans, I cannot, in good

conscience, allow any sort of bonus to be awarded to senior management at this rogue agency.

As long as I remain a Member of this body, I will seek to ensure that this policy becomes law each and every fiscal year. It is my hope that this amendment will ultimately be signed into law and that no bonuses at all will be awarded in the next fiscal year.

None should have been given this last year, but Commissioner John Koskinen decided to dole out bonuses anyway, despite the anger he knew it would cause. Overall, my hope is that this amendment will incentivize one of these senior executives at the IRS to come forth with copies of Lois Lerner's magically vanishing emails.

Should that day come and should the Congress and the American people receive closure to this scandal, I will cease my efforts to prohibit these awards, and the IRS may begin the process of rebuilding the trust it has so blatantly violated.

This agency has shown contempt for the American taxpayer, and the ensuing outrage at the IRS has been bipartisan. When the House voted on House Resolution 565 to demand that Attorney General Eric Holder appoint a special counsel to look into the scandal, 26 Democrats voted to support that measure.

As I mentioned with my last IRS amendment, if you disapprove of the IRS leaking tax information about the President's political opponents, then support my amendment.

If you disapprove of the IRS targeting conservative groups for their political beliefs, then support my amendment. If you disapprove of the IRS ignoring congressional subpoenas, then support my amendment.

If you disapprove of this agency stonewalling Congress, destroying evidence, and lying to the American people, then support my amendment. Finally, if you disapprove of IRS senior executives receiving bonuses for their failures, then support my amendment.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their continued work on the committee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I will certainly yield to the chairman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. The gentleman has made a couple of interesting points that I think bear emphasis. Some of the actions of the IRS have been outrageous, and we have talked about that from time to time. As the gentleman pointed out, this year, $63 million in bonuses were paid to IRS employees.

It is interesting they were paid by the new Commissioner when the prior Commissioner had decided that it was not appropriate to pay those bonuses, and then the new Commissioner testified before our subcommittee how he was outraged that he didn't have enough money to answer more than 61 percent of his phone calls.

I said: Sir, what is outrageous to me is you don't have enough money to answer the phone calls, which is the first thing you ought to do, yet you paid $63 million in bonuses, and then we find out that some of the people who received the bonuses were delinquent on their taxes.

I urge adoption of the amendment

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I get tired of saying this, but it has to be said. I realize that the other side's desire is to bring the IRS down to nothing. It is a constitutional question. We have the power to collect taxes. One would argue that we must have a department that collects taxes.

They may not always be the department—the agency—we want them to be. Both sides, whether one believes it or not, were outraged that something wrong might have been done, but to suggest and paint with a broad brush the whole IRS and say that everyone there at the senior level is not worthy of a bonus or not worthy of our respect is really to do a disservice to public service employees. These folks do a job. They do a job on a daily basis.

Are there problems with the IRS? There have always been problems at the IRS. Has the IRS been an agency that is loved by the American public? No, because we as Americans would love somehow to do everything we need to do, but have taxes that are either very low or nonexistent.

That is not a knock on us. We would all rather pay less taxes than we pay, but we continuously just spend time knocking and knocking. If you measure the time that we have spent on this bill so far and you measure how much of that time has been allocated to the IRS and to bringing it down, not to helping it in any way, not to coming up with any solutions—the whole argument has been they did something wrong, we are going to punish them.

We are not talking about children. We are not talking about a foreign government that attacked us. We are talking about an agency that might not have done everything the way we want them to do it, and therefore, we have to use our resources, our power, and our legislative ability to make them do a better job, to help them along the way, not to destroy them.

So here we are saying if you have executives at the higher level that are doing a good job, you can't help them in any way. You have to ignore that.

Now, we talk about morale. We talk about morale with our staff. We talk about morale with our Membership. Why do we have so many Members who are retiring?

If you asked them, a lot of them are retiring because we don't get along the way we used to or maybe because we spend so much time on wasteful issues.

So we can't paint with a brush the whole IRS. We have to find a way to help, to make them a better agency—yes, to use tough love.

Absolutely, I will be the first one to agree to that and to join the majority in doing that, but this whole word of punishing of a worthless institution, of a corrupt institution, of an institution that does not follow the law, that is not true, that is not fair, and that is not correct.

That is why this amendment is misguided, and it may do just the opposite, like so many of these amendments. By punishing, you bring down morale, and you bring down the support of those who could help us do a better job at the IRS like we all would like.

I hoped that we would get Mr. GOSAR to withdraw his amendment, but his facial expression tells me that I am crazy in asking that question. You don't have to agree that I am crazy in asking that question, but I think we should defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used, with respect to the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, or Wisconsin or the District of Columbia, to prohibit or penalize a financial institution from providing financial services to an entity solely because the entity is a manufacturer, producer, or person that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling marijuana or marijuana products and engages in such activity pursuant to a law established by a State or a unit of local government.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer this bipartisan amendment to carry forth an important issue of public safety to provide legally-constituted marijuana businesses access to banking services. To do otherwise is to render them an all-cash sector of the economy, which is fraught with peril.

If you supported the Rohrabacher amendment to the Commerce-Justice and Science Appropriations which passed clearly, then you will support this as well. It brings forth the terms and conditions of the Department of Justice and Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.

Yesterday morning, on the very front page of USA Today was an article setting forth the dangers of all-cash businesses in our States that have approved legally marijuana-related businesses. In the words of the Attorney General:

> You don't want just huge amounts of cash in these places. They want to be able to use the banking system. It is a public safety component. Huge amounts of cash, substantial amounts of cash just kind of lying around with no place for it to be appropriately deposited is something that worries me, just from a law enforcement perspective.

□ 1830

If you support public safety, if you supported the Rohrabacher amendment to the Commerce, Justice, and Science bill, you will support this amendment as well. In the interest of public safety, you will do this. Because in the words of the Department of Justice, the two most important terms and conditions: keep marijuana out of the hands of children and keep cash out of the hands of gangs and the cartels. To oppose this amendment is to support that, and I know you don't want that.

So, I urge you in the strongest terms to support this amendment, this bipartisan amendment, as was adopted earlier on the Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations bill.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment requires a new determination.

Therefore, I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Yes, I do.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I would just urge the Chair, in ruling, that this does not change the law in any respect. It respects the guidance that has been promulgated by the Justice Department and the Treasury Department and does not make a change and is not outside of the rules.

I would say to my friend from Florida that his point of order is incorrect, and would ask the Chair to rule that the gentleman's amendment is in order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination as to the reason a financial institution provides financial services to an entity.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
>
> SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of chapter 29, 31, or 33 of title 44, United States Code.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which builds off the good work accomplished by Chairman CRENSHAW and Ranking Member SERRANO in the underlying bill.

At a recent Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing, we had the opportunity to hear testimony from David Ferriero, the Archivist of the United States and head of the National Archives and Records Administration, which oversees the Federal Records Act.

In his testimony before Congress, Mr. Ferriero gave an account of how the IRS failed to notify him about the unauthorized disposal of Lois Lerner's hard drive, a hard drive which contained key emails and information about her actions in the targeting of conservative groups. In fact, during my questioning of Mr. Ferriero, he stated that the IRS ''did not follow the law.''

It is clear the IRS has not made it a priority to comply with the intent of the law, whether in the form of intimidating taxpayers, ignoring congressional requests for documents, or ignoring requirements to document valuable records that are in the public interest. My amendment would address one of these failures and prohibit any funds in this bill to be used by the IRS to act in contravention of the Federal Records Act.

It is a commonsense check on the IRS's recent behavior, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I just want you to know that in the bill we have a provision that applies to the IRS. This is a little bit broader, but I think it is a good amendment, so I encourage folks to support it.

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is primarily concerned with records management at the IRS, which does not surprise us—the IRS again. However, this bill already contains a provision preventing the use of funds by the IRS to violate these very same sections of the code. In other words, the bill that we are debating today, the full bill, already accomplishes what the gentleman seeks to do. Every agency is already required to follow Federal records management law, so this amendment seems particularly unnecessary.

I realize Members on the other side want to continue to issue press releases stating how tough they are on the IRS, but there is no need to restate current law. I think that this one is different in the sense that while other amendments that I may not approve of or support speak to an issue that hasn't been spoken to before or repeat something we have dealt with before, this one speaks to an issue that Mr. CRENSHAW already took care of in the bill.

That is my opposition to it, and that is why I think the amendment is unnecessary.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New York for his concern about this. I am concerned as well.

I appreciate the fact what the chairman has said, that this expands the reach; it expands the authority. If, indeed, all of our agencies had a requirement under the Federal Records Act and they followed it, I wouldn't be here. But under significant questioning of the Archivist of our Nation, he indicated to me under significant questioning that the IRS ''did not follow the law.''

That is the purpose of this amendment: to make sure there are more teeth available even than what is put in this good bill to make sure that the IRS follows the law.

I ask my colleagues for support for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARENTHOLD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the Office of Management and Budget to process or approve an apportionment request that does not include the following phrase: ''Apportioned amounts are not available for any position that is held by an employee with respect to whom the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives has certified a statement of facts to a United States attorney under section 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 194).''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment that would prohibit funding to any Federal employee who has been found in contempt of Congress.

As a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I have had serious concerns about the nonresponsiveness of certain Federal officials to legitimate congressional oversight activities. In some of these situations, the actions have been taken by this House to hold these officials in contempt of Congress.

Specifically, my amendment prevents funds from being made available for the Office of Management and Budget to process or approve an apportionment request from an executive agency that does not include the following language:

Apportioned amounts are not available for any position that is held by an employee with respect to whom the President of the Senate or Speaker of the House of Representatives have certified a statement of facts to a United States attorney under section 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 194).

What the experts and lawyers tell me this means is we won't pay folks who have been held in contempt of Congress. The taxpayers don't need to be funding somebody who is not cooperating with their elected representative, and it has gotten so bad that this entire body has held them in contempt.

If somebody has failed to do his or her job in the private sector or in any other environment, they wouldn't get paid, and I think the Federal Government needs to follow this.

Let me give you a little bit of background on the process so you understand how this is going to work.

Funds apportioned to executive agencies are apportioned or handed out by the OMB. Executive agencies must submit a request to the OMB 40 days before the start of the fiscal year or within 15 days of the enactment of the appropriations act. The OMB then determines how the executive agency's fund will be apportioned.

This amendment would require an executive agency to include the quoted language in their apportionment request to the OMB, which would prevent the OMB from allocating funds to an agency for the salaries of Federal employees who have been found in contempt of Congress.

To me, this is just common sense. We don't pay employees who don't cooperate with their boss. We are the elected representatives of the people. We are the boss, and we need to enact this legislation to ensure those in contempt of Congress do not continue to receive taxpayer funds.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay any individual at an annual rate of Grade 1, Steps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6; or Grade 2 Step 1 or 2 as defined in the ''Salary Table 2014–GS'' published by the Office of Personnel Management. Further, none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay any individual at an hourly basic rate of Grade 1, Steps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6; or Grade 2, Step 1 or 2.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would end the Federal Government's practice of paying poverty wages to its workers and hopefully set an example for the private sector to stop paying poverty wages to its workers.

My metropolitan area of Florida has the lowest average wages of any of the 50 biggest cities in America. It is time to end this and to pay people fairly. A fair day's work should result in a fair day's pay.

The reason why we have to end poverty wages in America is simple. It is just too expensive to be poor in America. If you are poor, it is difficult to buy or rent a place to live, to buy or lease a car to drive, even to get electricity from a utility company, to save any money at all, or even open a bank account. It is just too expensive to be poor in America.

Journalist Barbara Ehrenreich put it best:

If you can't afford the first month's rent and security deposit you need in order to rent an apartment, you may get stuck in an overpriced residential motel.

If you don't have a kitchen or even a refrigerator and microwave, you will find yourself falling back on convenience store food, which—in addition to its nutritional deficits—is also alarmingly overpriced.

If you need a loan, as most poor people eventually do, you will end up paying an interest rate many times more than what a more affluent borrower would be charged.

To be poor—especially with children to support and care for—is a perpetual highwire act.

□ 1845

Mr. Chairman, when I say ''it's too expensive to be poor in America,'' I am not just quoting a poverty advocate. I am quoting Noah Wintroub, an official for JPMorgan Chase. Yes, even the bankers are telling us that it is too expensive to be poor in America.

Right now, the Federal Government can pay as little as $8.62 an hour for a grade 1, step 1 worker. That is not enough. You get what you pay for. That is the capitalist way. If a government worker has to take another job just to get by, then that worker can't focus on doing a good job serving the public. If a Federal worker is working 80 hours a week instead of 40 just to survive, he is not going to do a good job at either job.

My amendment simply would not allow the government to pay anyone less than $10.10 an hour—still a very modest amount. According to CBO, it doesn't cost the government a single dime extra. It is supported by the American Federation of Government Employees. Paying Federal workers $10.10 an hour is still not enough, but at least it is a start.

Right now, the minimum wage gives you $1,200 a month to live on if you work a full-time job for 40 hours a week. From that $1,200 a month, you must pay your Social Security taxes, your Medicare taxes, pay for your food, your clothing, your housing, your transportation. You must also pay, by the way, for the food and clothing of your children.

That is not possible. It is simply not possible to live that way, and we can't expect people to do that. In fact, the taxpayers end up subsidizing them through food stamps, Medicaid, the earned income credit, and a dozen other ways that we make up for the shortfall when their employers are not paying them enough to keep them alive.

I think it is time that we take a stand. I hope this body sees the wisdom of paying at least Federal workers, to start, above poverty wages. I urge this body to accept this amendment and set a proper standard for labor in this country. Let's have $10.10, not $7.25. You can't survive on $7.25.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I just got this amendment a little bit ago. I don't quite understand what the gentleman is trying to do.

As I read the amendment, it basically says you just can't pay Federal employees. If I am a Federal employee and somebody says you can't pay me this wage, I guess I can either come to work and not get paid or I can just decide that you decided not to pay me so I don't think I will come to work anymore.

I don't know how many people are affected by this, but I have got to believe

a lot of people would look at this and say: Gee, the gentleman from Florida says we are just not going to pay you.

I guess on behalf of the Federal employees, I have to oppose that, because I think all Federal employees ought to be paid. I don't think we should pass legislation saying they can't be paid.

So I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the creativity of my colleague from Florida's argument, but no one is suggesting Federal employees have to work for free. All this amendment does is simply eliminate the poverty rates set forth in the General Schedule and replaces them with the existing higher rates.

All we are saying here is that grade 1, steps 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are below poverty level; grade 2, steps 1 and 2 are below poverty level.

I don't see how this amendment could possibly lead to the scenario that the gentleman from Florida, the chairman, is describing. It simply would mean that these workers would no longer be paid poverty wages. They would be paid under the existing GSA schedule a proper day's pay for a proper day's work.

Therefore, and given the fact that the AFGE, which is responsible for representing these workers, supports this amendment and rejects the nightmare scenario described by the gentleman from Florida, I would hope to have the gentleman from Florida's consent and support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I just want to read this again. It says that none of the funds made available by this act may be used to pay any individual at an annual rate of grade 1, step 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6.

So if you are grade 1, step 6, it says you can't be paid at that rate. It doesn't say anything about raising your salary or lowering your salary. It just says you can't be paid.

I really think that this is something we ought to reject. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act, including amounts made available under titles IV or VIII, may be used by any authority of the government of the District of Columbia to prohibit the ability of any person to possess, acquire, use, sell, or transport a firearm except to the extent such activity is prohibited by Federal law.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Despite the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in District of Columbia v. Heller that struck down the unconstitutional D.C. handgun ban, it is still difficult for D.C. residents to exercise their God-given right to bear arms. Congress has the authority to legislate in this area pursuant to article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution, which gives Congress the authority ''to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever'' over the District of Columbia.

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

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

Why would the D.C. government want to punish and harass law-abiding citizens who simply want to defend themselves from criminals? As everyone with even the smallest bit of common sense knows, criminals, by definition, don't care about the laws. They will get the guns any way they can.

Does anyone actually believe that strict gun control laws will prevent criminals from getting guns? Strict gun control laws do nothing but prevent good people from being able to protect themselves and their families in the event of a robbery, home invasion, or other crime.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

It also adds a requirement on D.C. that it doesn't add anywhere else. It imposes additional duties by requiring law enforcement or the D.C. Council to determine what is prohibited by Federal law before they are allowed to legislate.

We know that folks like to sound good on certain issues by legislating from here, but the city council should not be asked to incur these extra duties that they don't have now.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I certainly disagree with the gentleman's points there.

First of all, Congress has the constitutional authority to legislate and exercise over all matters in the District of Columbia. Furthermore, if a law enforcement officer in the District of Columbia is not already familiar with Federal laws, then I question whether he should be a law enforcement officer.

But most of all, I would make the point that the underlying bill already contains language that is virtually identical in form to the amendment that I have offered. For instance, section 809 states that ''none of the Federal funds contained in this Act may be used to enact or carry out any law, rule, or regulation to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of any schedule I substance under the Controlled Substance Act.''

There are multiple examples in the underlying bill where the structure of those portions of the bill are identical to my amendment and require knowledge of law.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination by the District of Columbia as to the state of Federal firearms law. The gentleman has not shown that this determination is already required.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee?

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes had it.

So the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Committee.

□ 1900

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARINO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to collect any underpayment of any tax imposed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to the extent such underpayment is attributable to the taxpayer's loss of records (except in the case of fraud).

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARINO. I thank the chair and the ranking member for their hard work and dedication during the appropriations process, and I look forward to working with them on a number of important issues surrounding the treatment of taxpayers by the IRS.

Mr. Chairman, I will be withdrawing this amendment at the conclusion of my allotted time. However, I wish to make a point.

I agree with the steps the committee has taken within this legislation, but feel more must be done to ensure equal treatment for all taxpayers. My amendment would prohibit the IRS from pursuing claims against taxpayers for underpayment where the issue is lost records, except in the case of fraud.

According to its own publications, the IRS recommends that taxpayers keep records up to 7 years—and more in some cases—to respond to potential audits. This is often necessary for individuals and corporations to retain records for years and potentially longer for businesses depending upon the circumstances and types of records.

The loss of records can have significant repercussions for the taxpayer and can result in penalty fees and payments of back taxes with interest. Should these taxpayers be audited, the burden is on them—yes, the burden is on them—to produce proper records, not the IRS. While these regulations make sense, as we do not want taxpayers improperly withholding taxes they properly owe under the current tax system, it is unfortunate that the one agency promulgating the regulations does not follow these strict standards.

We now know the IRS, through its employee Ms. Lois Lerner, Director of Exempt Organizations, unfairly targeted and scrutinized conservative groups in their applications for tax-exempt status. Under the IRS' rules, Ms. Lerner was required to retain her records discussing policy decisions and discussions in paper form, including those related to the decision to probe conservative organizations. However, Ms. Lerner refused to follow protocol, and to make matters worse, her email copies were lost due to a so-called computer crash.

Given Ms. Lerner's blatant disregard to keep records properly in accordance with IRS rules, it is patently unfair to require taxpayers to follow such burdensome standards. In addition, the IRS Commissioner testified on the topic of Ms. Lerner's emails multiple times before the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, suggesting that there would be no issue in producing the emails. However, the Commissioner knew there was an issue with Ms. Lerner's computer in February and that the emails were certainly lost in March. Despite this knowledge, he failed to notify Congress until June.

This is outrageous. While the IRS is trying to evade explaining the loss of records, we should prohibit the IRS from mercilessly pursuing taxpayers for the exact same fault.

With that, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), my colleague and the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment even though I reserved a point of order.

I would just inquire if the gentleman intends to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MARINO. I do. I am going to do that in my closing, sir.

I thank the chairman for his support of the principle of my amendment. While I recognize this would be legislative language in an appropriations bill, I welcome the opportunity to work with the chair and my other colleagues to properly investigate this situation and ensure that similar situations of government abuse do not arise in the future.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have a new and improved amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used, with respect to the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington or Wisconsin or the District of Columbia, to penalize a financial institution solely because the institution provides financial services to an entity that is a manufacturer, producer, or a person that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling marijuana or marijuana products and engages in such activity pursuant to a law established by a State or a unit of local government.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a referendum on public safety. It follows the exact intent—but is technically perfected—of the earlier amendment that was offered, and I thank the gentleman from the majority for pointing out its technical flaws. They have been corrected.

It is a referendum on public safety. If you want to render an all-cash sector of the economy in the 23 States that allow for medical marijuana and in the two States that allow for the adult recreational use of marijuana, you will make them unsafe. That is for certain.

I entreat you to pick up yesterday's USA Today and read the excellent article, including the citation of several security experts, about what will happen with a certainty, inevitably, if we do not take this measure.

If you want to keep marijuana out of the hands of children and if you want to keep cash out of the hands of gangs and cartels, you will support this amendment.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the State of Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

The medical marijuana industry is rapidly taking root in Nevada. Our local governments are developing regulations and are issuing licenses as we speak. Yet representatives of this exciting industry continue to raise the same concern—a lack of access to banks, which is critical for the safe operation of any small business.

This commonsense measure would respect states' rights, add more transparency, facilitate regulations, protect the public, and foster the growth of small business. I urge a vote in favor.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the State of California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I thank Congressman HECK for yielding and for his really bold and tremendous leadership on this.

I am proud to join you, Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. ROHRABACHER, in cosponsoring this bipartisan, commonsense amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would provide important certainty to business owners, employees, government agencies, and financial institutions in 34 States and jurisdictions that have passed marijuana reform laws.

By prohibiting Federal agencies from unduly penalizing financial institutions for providing basic banking services, like opening a checking account, this amendment would ensure that legitimate business owners can comply

with State regulations and that regulators and law enforcement can hold businesses accountable.

□ 1915

I recently had a chance to visit one of these small businesses in my home district of Oakland, California, and know how big an impact the access to financial services can have.

When these businesses are unable to access financial services, they are forced to use unsatisfactory cash-based transactions that lack transparency, accountability, and create a threat to public safety.

I was proud to cosponsor a similar amendment to the Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations bill that passed the House. I want to thank Mr. HECK again for his leadership and hope this passes.

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, a little earlier, we had a discussion about this, and I pointed out that it is very clear that, right now, it is still illegal under Federal law to manufacture, to distribute, or to dispense marijuana. That is the Federal law.

There is also a Federal law that says banks can't launder the proceeds of illegal activities, and as we talked about earlier, we have got the fact that the Treasury has given guidance on how to facilitate the sale of marijuana.

The point is the law is the law. The Federal law, I just stated, and I don't think we can go around picking and choosing which States the Federal law applies to. The Federal law is the Federal law, and that is the way it ought to be.

I think that the fact that we have those two laws, when somebody violates those laws, that is wrong. Earlier this evening, we adopted an amendment that corrected that. This seeks to go back the other way.

I would just urge people to vote ''no'' on this because we have a Federal law that controls, and we can't pick and choose who gets to comply and who doesn't.

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, to my friend from Florida, I agree, except that the world has moved, and businesses that are legal in these vast array of States should be able to operate in a businesslike fashion.

They should be able to have checking accounts and credit cards and payroll accounts, instead of operating solely in cash that invites robberies, invites assault and batteries, invites tax evasion.

The system—the banking system should be able to provide for that, instead of just operating in a cash setting. So we need to limit and avoid the crime that the cash invites, and we need to allow these businesses to operate in a businesslike fashion.

The States and the people of those States have chosen to move forward. We should not, through the banking system, try to stop that and then create crime in its wake.

Mr. HECK of Washington. First, let's correct the RECORD. The earlier vote did not approve the opposite amendment. In fact, the decision, as announced by the Chair, was to affirm the amendment, and then the rollcall was provided and is yet pending.

Secondly, the will of this body has, in fact, been manifested on one occasion, and that was an amendment highly similar to this one, to the Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations, and it passed by a clear bipartisan majority in this Chamber.

Lastly—and again, this is about public safety. This is about keeping marijuana out of the hands of children and cash out of the hands of the gangs and the cartels. That is what this amendment is about.

I am frankly stunned to learn that the party whose heritage was in support of states' rights now no longer sees fit to uphold those States who have gone in this direction who, through votes of people and votes of their duly-elected legislatures, have created tightly-controlled markets for this particular substance.

This is not about being in favor or against marijuana consumption. This is about public safety. This is about providing access to banking services for safe environments, safe communities, and I entreat you to support it as you once did before.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order by the rule at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to confidentiality and disclosure of returns and return information).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I want to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the work that he has done on this. This has been yeoman's work, a difficult task.

We haven't done a Financial Services appropriations bill in a number of years, and so I want to commend the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

My amendment deals with the Internal Revenue Service, and I know a lot of these amendments have addressed the issue.

The Internal Revenue Service, Mr. Chairman, as you and the American people know, by law—by law—may not release any personal taxpayer information. It must be protected, and it is clear that what we have had over the past year or so is the revelation of a huge violation of the public trust that has occurred as it pertains to the IRS' lawful requirement to protect taxpayer information.

Internal Revenue Code section 6103 is what this amendment deals with. It is a portion of the Code that is a taxpayer protection provision written to prevent unlawful disclosure of confidential taxpayer information.

The recent actions of the IRS, whether it is the targeting of conservative social welfare groups or the unlawful disclosure of an organization's confidential tax return and donor list, are nothing less than chilling, Mr. Chairman.

What the IRS has done is targeted conservative groups, allegedly to determine whether or not they ought to be granted tax-exempt status. In so doing, they have asked for those organizations' donor lists, the lists of hardworking Americans who have taken some of their resources and provided support for these organizations.

Then the IRS took that donor list information, not only kept the organization from getting tax-exempt status, as would be appropriate, took that donor list information and released it to political enemies or political opponents of the organization, apparently for political purposes.

This is outrageous activity, Mr. Chairman. This amendment is a very simple amendment that reminds the Internal Revenue Service that their primary responsibility is to serve the American taxpayer.

Given the information that has come to light over the last year or so, I would suspect that every Member of this Congress should support holding the IRS accountable to the rule of law.

The IRS has violated the trust of the American people, and it is imperative that this body hold the IRS accountable for their egregious actions.

It is a simple amendment. It is a commonsense amendment. It is an amendment that is supported and responsive to our constituents, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), the chairman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think every American taxpayer needs to be assured that their personal information is going to be held in strict confidence, and that is what this amendment does.

I think, particularly at a time when the IRS has demonstrated a lack of ability to either self-police or self-correct, when each week we read about a new revelation of some sort of bureaucratic incompetence or maybe willful disregard for the law, I think it is more important than ever to make sure that every taxpayer knows that personal information is going to be held in strict confidence.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the chairman for his support, and I urge support of this amendment by all colleagues in the House.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any Internal Revenue Service instant message or other electronic communications system that is not operationally searchable and archivable at all times.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, it was really troubling to be reviewing emails that the IRS finally produced to us after we asked for these emails for over a year. Of course, they gave them to us on the afternoon of July 3, so as to minimize the press damage.

Basically, the emails showed Lois Lerner sending an email to a technician saying, you know, Congress will ask for our emails, and I have told people in the IRS they need to be careful about what they say; question, if we do an instant message in the system that is called OCS, will those be immune to congressional oversight?

The technician basically said, well, that is the default setting, you can make it so that it would be archivable and searchable.

That was very troubling because it was almost like Lerner, as a matter of course, is conducting herself in a way to obstruct the proper oversight, and that is very troubling with an agency that is this powerful.

So I think what this amendment will do will be to simply prevent that. This is saying exactly what Lois Lerner was asking about, the settings. If you are going to use funds, the settings have got to be turned on, and if you don't, then you can't use funds to operate it.

So I think it is a commonsense amendment, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. Chairman, given that the point of order has been lodged, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw amendment No. 52.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chair, as an alternative to the prior amendment, I offer amendment No. 54.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Internal Revenue Service to create machine-readable materials that are not subject to the safeguards established pursuant to section 3105 of title 44, United States Code.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment accomplishes the similar objective that I articulated just a moment ago, and I would just add that it is very troubling, if you were called into court to defend yourself against the IRS and they asked you to produce certain documents in discovery and your defense was, well, the documents have been destroyed, you would be presumed essentially guilty. They would have an adverse inference lodged against you.

I think that is what this amendment is getting to. The IRS has to practice what they preach. They should be held to the exact same standards as the American people are held to with their taxes, and they should follow the record retention requirements under Federal law.

So I think it is a commonsense amendment, and I urge that my colleagues adopt the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to my colleague from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to applaud him for correcting any procedural flaws. He makes an excellent point, and I accept the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1930

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of funds made available by this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be obligated or expended on conferences.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chair, last year, the House Oversight Committee conducted a hearing to review an IG report documenting a lavish conference that was put on by the IRS—over $4 million for one conference. Expenses included $135,000 on outside speakers, including $17,000 for a speaker who created paintings on stage to make his point that one must free ''the thought process to find creative solutions to challenges.''

The troubling thing about the report was that the bulk of that money, $3.2 million, came from unused funds that were allocated for hiring. Now, this is at the exact same time that the IRS began to single out conservative groups that sought tax-exempt status, in part, they said, because the agency simply did not have the manpower to handle the number of applications pouring in.

Now, we have debunked that idea that somehow there was a torrent of applications, but golly gee, if that is really true, why are you spending $3.2 million on these conferences? So I think the IRS has abused the trust of the American taxpayer with respect to conferences, and I think it should be held accountable.

Now, some say in response to this amendment that taxpayers need to be forced to fund these conferences because it helps with IRS employee morale. I have just got to tell you, I am more concerned with the morale of the American people. When taxpayers see an arrogant agency flout the law, refuse to produce evidence, and waste tax dollars, they become demoralized, and rightfully so.

So at a time when military officers are receiving pink slips, there is no way we should allow the IRS to persist with these conferences.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I think the mistake we are making here is the one we have been making all day. Not only is it targeted only at the IRS, which seems to be the desire to continue to do this for the next 24 hours or for so long as this bill lasts, but secondly, it paints it with a wide brush. If you say no conferences of this type or if you limit the number of conferences, okay, we could discuss that; but to say that one agency in the Federal Government cannot have any kind of conferences, none at all—zero, nada—that really speaks to just a continuous desire to destroy the IRS.

Now, there were issues concerning the conferences. There were issues concerning the conferences for other agencies. We have dealt with that. We can deal with this. But to say no conferences at all is to suggest that an agency cannot operate the way it needs to at times.

So I think that this is just another attack on the IRS. It makes for good headlines, even at this time of night. I think it is the wrong thing to do, and I would hope that we could oppose it or that the gentleman will withdraw the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. (a) Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the following accounts and programs:

(1) Payment of Government losses in shipment under ''Department of the Treasury—Bureau of the Fiscal Service''.

(2) ''Supreme Court of the United States—Salaries and Expenses''.

(3) ''United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit—Salaries and Expenses''.

(4) ''United States Court of International Trade—Salaries and Expenses''.

(5) ''Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Salaries and Expenses''.

(6) Payment to judiciary trust funds for Judiciary Retirement Funds under section 624.

(7) Payments to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the Office of Personnel Management under section 624.

Mrs. BLACKBURN (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), who has done a wonderful job bringing this bill to the floor.

As I do with all of the appropriations bills, it is a focus of mine to come in and ask for an additional 1 percent cut on top of the great work that has already been done.

I think it is important to give credit to our Appropriations Committee. This is a $21 billion bill, and it is appropriating $566 million less than what was appropriated in fiscal year 2014, and it is $2.2 billion less than what the President requested. That is to be commended. Our appropriations team has done a terrific job on beginning to rein in what the Federal Government spends. The Republican House leadership is to be commended for making their focus to get our fiscal house in order.

I think we have to go a step further, and that is the purpose of my 1 percent across-the-board spending cut amendment. What we need to do now is to engage the bureaucracy, engage these Federal agencies, rank-and-file employees, to come to the table with their recommendations of how we continue to cut.

We are $17 trillion in debt. We cannot continue to borrow 30 cents of every dollar that we spend. We have to think about the future for our children, our grandchildren. This is an amendment that we should all support because we do this for our children, for the sovereignty of our Nation, and for the fiscal health of our Nation for years to come.

I think it is important to note that through the years, Governors have used across-the-board spending cuts, Democrat Governors—a former Democrat Governor from my home State of Tennessee. You have got the Democrat Governor in New York. You have got the Governor over in Missouri. They have all used across-the-board cuts.

The American people like this idea. They like having the bureaucracy engaged in saving money. A Washington Post/ABC News poll from March 6, 2013, revealed that 61 percent of all Americans even supported a 5 percent across-the-board cut in Federal spending.

It is time for us to rein this in and get our fiscal house in order. This is a way to save an additional $228 million.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend from Tennessee. She makes an excellent point, and I think everyone agrees that we ought to try to rein in this culture of spending and put in place a culture of savings. I have been working my entire congressional career to do that.

One of the things that we do in the appropriations process is we have hearings. We listen to people. They try to justify their request. Sometimes when programs work well, they might receive an increase. When people are not doing very well, like the IRS, they have their request denied and are actually funded at lower levels.

What is interesting, last night on this floor, we added about $1 billion to our debt reduction by taking that billion dollars out of the IRS. So when we set our priorities, we do that day to day. In this case, we had 12 hearings.

If you look at our bill, there are actually nine programs that are just flat out eliminated. They are gone. It wasn't a 1 percent or an X percent cut. It was just, that is not a program that is vital to the functioning of the Federal Government so it is gone. It has been eliminated. There are several agencies where we have reduced their funding because we figured out that they could do with a little bit less.

But when you take an additional 1 percent across the board after you have had a lot of time and energy put into place to set the right priorities, I don't think you take into consideration that some programs are better than others.

I know my friend from Tennessee cares a lot about Women's Business Centers, and they received an increase under our appropriations bill because we think they are doing a great job. The Small Business Administration does great work at creating private sector jobs. The Women's Business Centers, because we thought they were doing well, they received an increase. Now, I don't know that she really wants to cut them.

She says she is not going to apply these cuts to the Federal judiciary, and I think that is appropriate. Actually, the Federal courts are pretty happy. Last night, several millions of dollars were added to the Federal courts.

I guess the simple point is that you have to take into consideration the merit of every program. If we didn't do anything and we just showed up one day and said how should we fund these people, then I think it is appropriate to say, well, let's just cut them across the board. But when you spend time and energy in setting the priorities and making hard choices, that is what we have done, and we are proud of the work we have done. I appreciate her compliment that we have done great work.

The fact that she would like to cut 1 more percent across the board I don't

think is the right way to observe the situation. I appreciate what she is trying to do, but I don't think in this case it is the right approach.

I would also like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to this amendment. The only difference here, Mr. Chairman, is that we are not attacking the IRS. Now we are attacking the Financial Services Subcommittee. The fact of life is that this committee took the biggest hit of any subcommittee in the House.

And while I may disagree with how some of the bill came out, I have made it clear to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) that what I disagree with the most are the riders and the allocation. With a different allocation, we would have had a different bill. So to now cut 1 percent from the committee that took the biggest hit is really to just to try to cripple the bill completely, and it serves no purpose other than to be able to say that you cut it.

Now, it would be nice to see if these kinds of things were mean, what happened on the military budget every so often, but we are not going to see that. We are only going to see it on bills like this one, which really services a lot of people. I think that the chairman is right. I join him in opposing this amendment, and I hope that it will be defeated.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the work that the chairman has done on this bill, and our Appropriations Committee is to be commended.

I think we do have to recognize Washington has a spending problem. They don't have a revenue problem. They have got a spending and a priority problem. We see it every single day.

What I am asking is to engage those rank-and-file employees, have them find 1 penny on the dollar out of their appropriations that they could save in order to get this burden of debt off the backs of our children and grandchildren—one penny on the dollar. It has worked in the States. It works in our county and city governments. People like that and appreciate that you push for better stewardship, and it is the right thing for us to do as we watch the debt totals climb, skyrocket, and explode.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide funds from the Hardest Hit Fund program established by the Secretary of the Treasury under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5211 et seq.) to any State or local government for the purpose of funding pension obligations of such State or local government.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

□ 1945

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that would prevent the Federal Government from bailing out public pensioners in cities such as Detroit and Chicago.

We have been reading for the past several months that the Obama administration has been in talks with the city of Detroit to transfer $100 million to the city.

According to an April 16, 2014, article from the Detroit Free Press, the administration has looked to transfer $100 million from the Hardest Hit Fund to shore up Detroit's unfunded pension liability. The Hardest Hit Fund was created by the Obama administration in 2010 with money from the 2008 stimulus package. The money is meant to help States that have been adversely affected by the housing downturn, and that is according, again, to the Detroit Free Press.

The article adds that:

The $100 million in Federal money was discussed Tuesday night in breakneck negotiations that resulted in a tentative deal to reduce pension cuts for the city's retired general workforce.

Mr. Chairman, I refuse to let Federal taxpayers be on the hook for unfunded pension liabilities made by Big Labor organizations. Cities such as Detroit, Chicago, and others where Big Labor has created extremely generous retirement benefits for public service workers are going to have to find their way out of the mess that they have created.

Now, it is my understanding that the city of Detroit has reached an agreement with the State of Michigan to shore up Detroit's unfunded pension liability for the time being. However, it does not foreclose this as a possibility to occur in the future for Detroit or any other city where Big Labor agreements have caused financial destruction.

According to an April 7, 2014, article from chicagobusiness.com, Chicago's unfunded pension liability stands at $19.5 billion. A February 20, 2013, article in Forbes notes that Federal bailouts of State pension funds ''would implicitly encourage States to keep spending and doling out entitlements, as doing so is popular for politicians, even if unsustainable.'' The article adds that this is especially true in liberal-leaning areas where public-sector labor unions have a lot of control.

Mr. Chairman, we must foreclose the administration's bailout of Big Labor as a possibility. I refuse to stand by and watch hardworking taxpayers be on the hook for the irresponsible decisions of liberal, Big Labor groups.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I just want to agree with you that I don't think that taxpayers should bail out Detroit's pension shortfall or any other city's shortfall. So I want you to know that I support your amendment.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I appreciate that. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this is really a mean amendment to single out one city, one city that is hurting; to single out labor when, in fact, it is not labor, but it is the people that have those pension plans and now may not have a pension plan, to single them out.

With all due respect to the gentlewoman, I am sure there have been many instances throughout history and in recent years when your area, your State, has been helped by Federal dollars when it was hurting, and we all got together and did that, be it a flood, be it a fire, be it a natural disaster. Whatever it may be, we came together to help. Detroit has its problems, and Detroit might have made some mistakes. But to single it out in an amendment and to say that we cannot help in any way, shape, or form is really mean, mean-spirited and wrong.

It may look good to single an urban center out. It may look good to single out a place that is hurting. But that is not the American way. The American way, I can tell you, as a New Yorker, when New York was hurting, people came to its aid. When we were attacked, we came to its aid.

Sure, this is different, but Detroit, it's hurting right now. And to single it out on this House floor at 10 minutes to 8, at this time, to single it out as not being worthy of Federal help, is really just wrong. And then to take the opportunity to attack organized labor by suggesting that somehow they are to blame and therefore they should not get any help is also mean-spirited.

So I have seen, in the time that I have been here, difficult amendments. But this one is one that really takes the cake. Mr. Chairman, Republicans

have supported bailing out banks and financial institutions that were deemed too large to fail. We were all for saving the auto industry, and I was for it, too. We were all for making sure that big institutions did not fail. And while I questioned it, many of us went along with it. And here to single out Detroit at its worst moment when it is hurting like no city has hurt in a long time is just the wrong thing to do.

If this is what the gentlewoman wants to do, I guess there is no way to stop her, but I would really wish that she would take a moment to think about this before she goes any further with this.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I find the gentleman's choice of words so interesting. I think he used ''mean'' and ''mean-spirited'' several times.

Let me tell you what is mean-spirited. Mean-spirited is looking at future generations and saying, you didn't want this, you didn't ask for it, but guess what? You have got a $17 trillion bill on your head. Right now, the birth tax for every child born in this country is $54,000. Is that good? Of course not. Is that mean-spirited? You bet it is. You are saying you owe this money like it or not because Washington can't get its spending habits under control. Washington is spending money it does not have to pay for programs that my grandkids do not want.

You are saying it is not the American way. Let me tell you something. Using borrowed money to pay for debts that have not been created by this government is not the way we do business.

I would remind you of a Congressman from Tennessee who stood on this floor at one point in history, and he reminded the body that this was not their money to give. It is the taxpayers' money. That Member of Congress was Davy Crockett.

This is the taxpayers' money. They expect us to be good stewards. Bailing out cities that have not been good stewards of their money is not what this body should be doing with Federal tax dollars that come into our coffers.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. It is amendment 080.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Federal Communications Commission may be used, with respect to the States of Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin, to prevent such States from implementing their own State laws with respect to the provision of broadband Internet access service (as defined in section 8.11 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) by the State or a municipality or other political subdivision of the State.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve a point of order mainly because we haven't seen this text or the amendment until this very moment. In fact, we still haven't seen it.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to prohibit any taxpayer funds from being used by the Federal Communications Commission, the FCC, to preempt State municipal broadband laws.

In other words, we don't need unelected Federal agency bureaucrats in Washington telling our States what they can and can't do with respect to protecting their limited taxpayer dollars in private enterprises.

As a former State senator from Tennessee, I strongly believe in states' rights. I know that is an issue that is important to many of my colleagues in this Chamber. And that is why I found it deeply troubling that FCC Chairman Tom Wheeler has repeatedly stated this past year that he intends to preempt states' rights when it comes to the role of state policy over municipal broadband.

Chairman Wheeler's statements posed a direct challenge on the constitutionality of States' sovereign functions. It wrongly assumes Washington knows what is best and forgets that the right answer doesn't always come from the top down.

Mr. Chairman, 20 States across our country have held public debates and enacted laws that limit municipal broadband to varying degrees. These State legislatures and Governors have not only listened but have responded to the voices of their constituents. They are closer to the people than the chairman of the FCC. They are accountable to their voters.

Mr. Chairman, States have spoken and said that we should be careful and deliberate in how we allow public entry into our vibrant communications marketplace, a sector of our economy that invests tens of billions of dollars each year, accounts for tens of thousands of jobs, and serves millions of consumers.

Municipal broadband projects have had a mixed bag of results. There have been some successes and also some spectacular failures that have left taxpayers on the hook. For example, look at the failed UTOPIA project that has created massive disruption and is challenging taxpayers. In fact, it was recently reported that the ''residents of 11 Utah cities would be billed as much as $20 a month as part of a plan to salvage the State's once-heralded UTOPIA fiber optic network.''

That doesn't sound like a model the Federal Government needs to force against the wishes of State-elected officials. That doesn't sound like competition, and it sounds like another Federal bailout waiting to happen.

State governments across the country understand and are more attentive to the needs of the American people than unelected Federal bureaucrats in Washington. That is why this past June I was joined by 59 of our colleagues in sending a letter to Chairman Wheeler stating our concerns and requesting a response to a list of questions, questions that we are still waiting for him to respond to. The U.S. Senate also sent a letter to the FCC on this issue, and they are, likewise, waiting for a response. It seems the FCC is content to tell our States how they will manage their sovereign economic affairs, but they won't answer to the Congress who is responsible for exercising oversight of the agency.

Inserting the FCC into our State's economic and fiscal affairs sets a dangerous precedent and violates State sovereignty in a manner that warrants deeper examination. This Congress cannot sit idly by and let an independent agency trample on our states' rights. This is an issue that should be left to our States, and if it comes to a point where we need a national standard, then that debate should be held by Congress, not the FCC, and should be done with the participation of the American people. I urge adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. First, I wish to withdraw my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is withdrawn.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. I do have, and I know it comes at a different time, but I do have letters from different groups opposing the amendment from the National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors, including the gentleman who gets credit for inventing the Internet, and I am not talking about Vice President Gore, I am speaking about someone else.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS

JULY 15, 2014.

U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National League of Cities (NLC), the National Association of Counties (NACo), and the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors (NATOA) strongly urges you to oppose any amendment to HR 5016 that would hamstring the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) from taking any action on—indeed, even discussing—the issue of state laws that prohibit or restrict public and public/private broadband projects. It is clear that such laws harm both the public and private sectors, stifle economic growth, prevent the creation or retention of thousands of jobs, and hamper work force development.

The United States must compete in a global economy in which affordable access to advanced communications networks is playing an increasingly significant role. As the FCC noted in challenging broadband providers and state and municipal community leaders to come together to develop at least one gigabit community in all 50 states by 2015: ''The U.S. needs a critical mass of gigabit communities nationwide so that innovators can develop next-generation applications and services that will drive economic growth and global competitiveness.'' This is especially true in rural America.

The private sector alone cannot enable the United States to take full advantage of the opportunities that advanced communications networks can create in virtually every area of life. As a result, federal, state, and local efforts are taking place across the Nation to deploy both private and public broadband infrastructure to stimulate and support economic development and job creation, especially in economically distressed areas. But such efforts are being thwarted in some areas by State laws that prohibit or restrict municipalities from working with private broadband providers, or developing themselves, if necessary, the advanced broadband infrastructure that will stimulate local businesses development, foster work force retraining, and boost employment in economically underachieving areas.

Consistent with these expressions of national unity, public entities across America are ready, willing, and able to do their share to bring affordable high-capacity broadband connectivity to all Americans. State barriers to public broadband are counterproductive to the achievement of these goals. Efforts to strip funding from the FCC to even discuss this issue, let alone take action, are misplaced and wrong. Please oppose any amendment to HR 5016 or any other measure that could significantly impair community broadband deployments or public/private partnerships.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS.

PRESERVING A FREE AND OPEN INTERNET

Whereas, since its inception, the Internet has existed based on principles of freedom and openness, core values that have made it the most powerful communication medium ever known; and

Whereas, the FCC is currently debating how to enshrine these Open Internet Principles into 21st century regulation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. in 2010 determined that the long-observed Open Internet Principles of nondiscrimination, nonblocking, and transparency, described below, should not be declared in an FCC Policy Statement, but instead should be enshrined in a formal rulemaking seeking to reinstate those principles; and

Whereas, the FCC issued its Open Internet Order, reinstating these rules for preserving a free and open internet, on December 23, 2010, formalizing the three basic protections: transparency, no blocking of lawful content and no unreasonable discrimination of network traffic; and these rules were made effective November 20, 2011; and

Whereas, these rules enshrine the values of what is commonly referred to as net neutrality; and

Whereas, the first principle of the Open Internet Order states that fixed and mobile broadband providers must publicly disclose accurate information regarding network management practices, performance characteristics, and commercial terms of their broadband services; and

Whereas, the second principle states that fixed broadband providers may not block lawful content, applications, services, or non-harmful devices; mobile broadband providers may not block lawful websites, or block applications that compete with their voice or video telephony services; and

Whereas, the third principle states that unreasonable discrimination shall not be permitted, that fixed broadband providers may not unreasonably discriminate in transmitting lawful network traffic; and

Whereas, these principles, applied with the complementary principle of reasonable network management, guarantee that the freedom and openness that previously enabled the internet to flourish as an engine for creativity and commerce under the protection of the original policy statement will continue, providing greater certainty and predictability to citizens, consumers, innovators, investors, and broadband providers, while retaining the flexibility providers need to effectively manage their networks; and

Whereas, since the beginning of the internet, broadband Internet access services have continued to invest in a single infrastructure which has increased average speeds for all users across our nation, without resorting to the practice of prioritization for users who can afford to pay the most; and

Whereas, online companies, or edge providers, have also invested in new innovative products and services that have driven economic growth and consumer demand for improved internet services and faster speeds from broadband internet access providers; and

Whereas, the dual investment of broadband Internet access service providers and edge providers has fostered a virtuous cycle of investment and innovation online; and

Whereas, two key rules of the three rules comprising the Open Internet Order, one pertaining to no blocking and another pertaining to no unreasonable discrimination, were again vacated on January 14, 2014 by the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. in the Verizon Communications Inc. v. Federal Communications Commission (2014), ruling that the FCC has no authority to enforce these rules; and

Whereas, the FCC on May 15, 2014, voted 3–2 to open the process of public comment on their proposed net neutrality rules that could in some circumstances allow paid prioritization of internet traffic based on a commercially reasonable standard; and

Whereas, paid prioritization under a commercially reasonable standard allows paid prioritization that has heretofore been understood to be unjust and unreasonable; and

Whereas, unreasonable paid prioritization is antithetical to a neutral Internet, and nondiscrimination is an inherent and indivisible characteristic of net neutrality; and

Whereas, all data on the Internet should be treated equally, not discriminating or charging differentially by user, content, site, platform, application, type of attached equipment, and modes of communication; and

Whereas, innovation relies on a free and open Internet that does not allow individual arrangements for priority treatment over broadband Internet access service; and

Whereas, preventing access to any lawful websites, slowing speeds for services, or redirecting users from one website to a competing website creates asymmetrical access which is antithetical to an Open Internet; and

Whereas, startups are the engine of an innovation economy, yet may not have the cash flow to pay for paid prioritization, and will therefore be unable to compete with large companies to deliver content to customers, impeding startup growth, thus limiting economic development and the creation of jobs: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the US Conference of Mayors supports a free and open internet as outlined in the FCC's original Open Internet Order; and be it further

Resolved, That the US Conference of Mayors supports comprehensive nondiscrimination as a key principle for any FCC rulemaking; and be it further

Resolved, That the US Conference of Mayors supports securing a commitment to transparency and the free flow of information over the internet, including no blocking of lawful websites and no unreasonable discrimination of lawful network traffic; and be it further

Resolved, That the US Conference of Mayors calls on the White House to offer their support of these principles; and be it further

Resolved, That the US Conference of Mayors calls on Congress to offer their support of these principles and if necessary use their lawmaking power to enshrine access to a free and open Internet and give the FCC a clear mandate; and be it further

Resolved, That the US Conference of Mayors recommends that the FCC preempt state barriers to municipal broadband service as a significant limitation to competition in the provision of Internet access.

COALITION FOR LOCAL INTERNET CHOICE

Washington, DC, July 15, 2014.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Coalition for Local Internet Choice has heard that Rep. Marsha Blackburn is planning to propose an amendment to House Appropriation bill H.R. 5016. The amendment would preclude the Federal Communications Commission from using its appropriated funds to take any action that would preempt a State law governing whether or to what extent the State or a municipality or other political sub-division of the State may provide broadband Internet access service. The Coalition urges you to oppose any such amendment.

As Congress and the Commission have often recognized, ensuring that all Americans have reasonable and timely access to advanced telecommunications capabilities, particularly in rural and other high-cost areas, is ''the great infrastructure challenge of our time.'' Toward this end, Congress has assigned the Commission a central role in defining the relevant terms and standards and in identifying and removing barriers to broadband investment and competition. While preemption of State barriers to

broadband investment and competition should be used rarely, in only the clearest of cases, it should not be ruled out categorically in all cases, as the Blackburn amendment would do.

Our Coalition was established to support local choice in acquiring advanced communications capabilities. Our members believe that communities should be free to decide to work with willing incumbents, enter into public-private partnerships, develop their own networks, if necessary, or do whatever else may work for their citizens, businesses, and institutions. Where communities have been free to do this, we have seen robust economic development enhanced educational and occupational opportunity, access to more affordable modern health care, improved public safety, greater energy efficiency and environmental protection, and much more that has contributed to a high quality of life. In contrast, where state barriers to community broadband initiatives and public-private partnerships exist, both the public and private sectors, particularly high-technology companies, are failing to meet their potential.

At this critical time in our country's history, we should not preclude or inhibit any potentially successful strategy that will enable our communities and America as a whole to thrive in the emerging knowledge-based global economy. Nor can we afford to take off the table any approach that may be necessary in certain cases to remove barriers to broadband investment and competition.

Sincerely,

JOANNE HOVIS,
Chief Executive Officer, CLIC.

Mr. SERRANO. Whatever happened to localism or local control? This amendment means the Federal Government will tell every local citizen, mayor, and county council member that they may not act in their own best interests.

Any such amendment is an attack on the rights of individual citizens speaking through their local leaders to determine if their broadband needs are being met.

Congresswoman BLACKBURN only has to drive an hour and a half down Interstate 24 to Chattanooga to see where the city-owned electric utility owns a broadband network. It charges $70 per month, enough to cover expenses but affordable enough to attract businesses.

□ 2000

Her State passed a bill to prevent nearby towns from joining Chattanooga and to block other communities from doing themselves. Companies have moved jobs or expanded in Chattanooga after learning that the minimum connection speed on the city-owned network was faster than the maximum they had available at headquarters.

Preemption will not force anyone to do anything that the municipalities alone don't want to do. This is not about forcing States to do anything, but instead stopping States from choking grassroots competition and stopping States from blocking faster networks or new networks where none exist.

It may sound one way, but it is a total different interpretation that we have, and this amendment could really hurt—in fact, may even hurt the efforts that she claims she wants to put forth.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to note that what this amendment does is to allow those citizens in those cities, in those States that have made this decision—this is how they want to handle broadband—to do it.

It gives the power to them. It keeps bureaucrats, sitting at the FCC, from making these decisions and overriding the wishes of our States and of those cities that are located therein. I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that Chairman UPTON has legislation and has spoken out on this issue, and the whole issue here is to allow cities to do what they need to do without having the major cable companies and so on lobby the States and stop them from doing so.

Broadband is something that we need to expand—that may sound like a pun—to make it broader, not to make it limited. It should be available everywhere, and it should be available in every possible place—rural, suburban, inner city, in homes, in schools.

We have to build the infrastructure to make that happen. Again, I repeat, I really think that her intent is not being met by her amendment, and that is why I oppose it and hope we would all oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have one final amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Consumer Product Safety Commission to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled ''Voluntary Remedial Actions and Guidelines for Voluntary Recall Notices'' (CPSC Docket No. CPSC–2013–0040).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds for the voluntary recall proposed rule at the Consumer Product Safety Commission and would prevent them from moving forward with a rule that would cripple the highly successful voluntary recall program that is currently in place.

For nearly 40 years, the CPSC and manufacturers and retailers, big and small, have partnered to ensure that the system of voluntary recalls is effectively reducing the safety risks that are posed to the public.

In fact, the CPSC recently highlighted the success of the program, noting that 90 percent of the recalls through the award-winning Fast Track program are implemented within 20 days. The Fast Track program was created by former CPSC Chairman Ann Brown to greatly reduce the amount of time it takes recalls to be implemented.

Instead of working to increase the efficiency of its programs, the CPSC's proposed rule change effectively kills its most successful program. On May 30, Ann Brown, a Democratic former Chairman appointed by President Clinton, sent a letter to the Energy and Commerce Committee expressing deep concerns over the impacts of the Commission's proposed rule.

Concerning the substantive provisions of the proposal, former Chairman Brown stated:

A Fast Track procedure would be rendered impossible under these circumstances.

The success of this Fast Track program is based on the shared commitment of the Commission and the private sector to remove harmful products from the marketplace.

The Commission, however, now seeks to transform the voluntary recall process into a legal negotiation equivalent to a settlement agreement. The proposed substantive changes would require companies seeking to implement a recall to hire an attorney to negotiate binding and enforceable terms with the CPSC staff.

This places significant burdens on small businesses that use the Fast Track program because the program allows them to work with the Commission staff without having to pay expensive legal fees. The CPSC should not discourage companies from working closely, efficiently, and effectively with the CPSC when potential hazards or defects are identified.

As the letter from former CPSC Chairman Brown shows, this is not a political issue. Senators from Pennsylvania—CASEY and TOOMEY, a Democrat and Republican, respectively—submitted a letter in January for the docket, raising concerns about the proposed changes.

Senator KING sent the Commission a letter in March expressing similar concerns, and I include these letters, Mr. Chairman, from former Chairman Brown and from the Senators into the RECORD.

ANN BROWN,
Palm Beach Gardens, FL, May 30, 2014.

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

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBER WAXMAN, I had the privilege of serving as Chairman of the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission from March 1994 until November 1, 2001. During my time as Chairman, we prevented numerous deaths and injuries through enforcement actions, product recalls and working with consumers, consumer groups and firms regulated by the Commission. Product safety is best accomplished when government, Industry and consumers work together.

Under the Consumer Product Safety Act (CPSA), manufacturers, distributors, and retailers of consumer products must report certain potential product hazards to the Commission. They must report immediately if they obtain information which reasonably supports the conclusion that a product (1) fails to comply with certain mandatory or voluntary standards, (2) contains a defect which could create a substantial product hazard, or (3) creates an unreasonable risk of serious injury or death.

If the Commission believes that a product presents a substantial product hazard to the public, it may pursue corrective action. Early in my Chairmanship, I learned that some number of companies were offering to conduct product recalls but because of entrenched procedures, those firms were not allowed to proceed with a recall until the CPSC staff performed a technical evaluation of the product involved, agreed that there was a product safety problem by making a ''Preliminary Determination'' (PD) of hazard, and then sent a letter to the firm advising it of the preliminary determination of hazard and requesting a product recall.

This process could and often did take many months-months without a recall, months where consumers were at risk, even though the firm was ready, willing and able to proceed with a recall at the time of its report. We changed this bureaucratic process early in my tenure as Chairman by creating the Fast Track Product Recall program in August 1995.

Originally called the ''No PD'' program, firms who reported to CPSC, identified a product safety problem, agreed to and initiated a recall within 20 working days of their report, no longer required a staff technical evaluation of the problem reported. Rather than performing a technical evaluation to confirm the product problem reported upon, the CPSC staff evaluated the remedy proposed to assure that it adequately addressed the problem identified and spent time working with the firm on conducting the product recall.

The Commission made this Fast Track program permanent on March 27, 1997, and it has been hugely successful. More than one-half of all CPSC recalls are now conducted through the Fast Track Program. Recalls conducted through this program benefit consumers, the recalling firm and the CPSC. Recalls are announced faster better protecting consumers from injury. Recalling firms do not receive a letter stating that the CPSC staff has preliminarily determined their product is a substantial product hazard. And the government spend less resources investigating a product that a company has already agreed should be recalled.

The CPSC staff received a ''Hammer'' Award from Vice President Albert Gore's National Partnership for Reinventing Government for the Fast Track Product Recall Program. This award honored federal employees for significant improvements to customer service and for making the government work more efficiently. Also in 1998, the Fast Track Program was named a winner of the prestigious Innovations in American Government award, an awards program of the Ford Foundation and Harvard University, administered by Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government in partnership with the Council for Excellence in Government.

Now this award winning program appears to face the risk of being unintentionally undermined by a rule proposed by the CPSC in November 2013 that is Intended to enhance voluntary recalls by setting forth principles and guidelines for the content and form of voluntary recall notices that firms provide as part of corrective action plans. One of the CPSC's proposals is to prohibit firms desiring to conduct a voluntary recall from disclaiming that there is a hazard presented by their product unless the Commission agrees to the disclaimer. I am concerned that this proposal if adopted could undermine the efficacy of the Fast Track program. Another proposal would classify a voluntary Corrective Action Plan (CAP) as ''legally binding'' thus transforming a CAP into a Consent Decree, potentially delaying an otherwise effective recall weeks or even months due to haggling over legalities. A Fast Track procedure would be rendered impossible under these circumstances.

CPSC urges firms to err on the side of caution by reporting potential product safety problems and conducting recalls. It is my understanding that virtually every firm that reports under the CPSC mandatory reporting requirement and requests to participate in a Fast Track recall, asserts that their product does not present a substantial product hazard, but nonetheless they wish to conduct a recall. If reporting firms are not allowed to make this disclaimer, they have no incentive to participate in the Fast Track Program.

Not making the disclaimer may be perceived in product liability litigation as akin to admitting that the product reported on is a substantial product hazard. If so, reporting firms might just as well report to CPSC, not offer to conduct a recall, and take the chance that the CPSC staff might conclude their product is not a substantial product hazard and that no recall is necessary.

If this occurs, recalls would be delayed, CPSC would be required to use substantial technical resources to evaluate products so that the staff can determine whether to make a preliminary determination of hazard, and consumers are left unprotected potentially for many months.

I respectfully request that the Committee urge the Commission to consider its proposed rule carefully and to assure that it does not adversely affect CPSC's Fast Track Product Recall Program.

Sincerely,

ANN BROWN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC, January 30, 2014.

Re Proposed Rulemaking on Voluntary Product Recalls

ROBERT S. ADLER,
Acting Chairman, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, Bethesda, MD.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ADLER: We have recently become aware of a proposed rule by the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) that could greatly increase the cost and complexity of recalling harmful consumer products.

As you know, the agency currently operates a ''Fast Track'' program that is well regarded and has a history of success. Since its inception in 1997, the program has allowed companies to recall products when they have reason to believe their products will harm consumers. The vast majority of companies across the nation comply with the program, and companies in Pennsylvania often initiate product recalls as a precautionary measure, even where there is no evidence of injury to consumers. As the CPSC itself points out, the advantage of its award-winning program is that it permits companies to remove potentially hazardous products from the marketplace as quickly and efficiently as possible, without requiring CPSC staff to make a preliminary determination that the product is hazardous. Because the program makes recalls voluntary and utilizes standard-form documents that can be expeditiously reviewed and executed, product recalls occur rapidly and efficiently.

Unfortunately, the proposed changes seem to jeopardize the efficacy of the existing process, which could increase the risk of harm to consumers. The proposed rule makes ''voluntary'' product recall Action Plans legally binding and requires companies to state with specificity each instance in which a product causes harm. We worry that these changes may discourage companies from initiating precautionary recalls and increase compliance and administrative costs. Companies that recall products will have to utilize lawyers to negotiate their ''legally binding'' documents and will involve upper corporate management to approve forward-looking obligations. Similarly, the CPSC will have to devote more time and personnel to negotiating recall documents and may be subject to litigation to determine whether a particular product is hazardous. Given these issues, we are concerned that the proposed change could ultimately keep harmful products on store shelves for longer periods of time, and thus increase the risk of harm to consumers.

Given the longstanding success of the Fast Track program, and the paramount importance of maintaining effective procedures for recalling dangerous products, we encourage the Commission to very carefully consider any changes it seeks to make to its Fast Track recall program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. CASEY, JR.,
United States Senator.

PATRICK J. TOOMEY,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 21, 2014.

Hon. ROBERT S. ADLER,
Acting Chairman, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, Bethesda, MD.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ADLER: I write today to communicate serious reservations about the rulemaking being conducted by the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) regarding remedial actions and guidelines for voluntary recall notices. While framed as ''interpretive'' guidance, the CPSC's proposed rule makes substantial changes to current practice surrounding voluntary recalls—changes that could result in significant compliance burdens for businesses wishing to voluntarily recall a product.

The CPSC currently has in place a highly successful ''Fast Track'' process that enables a company to make use of an expedited process, in consultation with the CPSC, to recall a defective product. This innovative program eases regulatory requirements and enables businesses to work with the CPSC to get defective products off store shelves within days, rather than the weeks and months a normal recall process might take. The ''Fast Track'' program demonstrates a smart blend of strong consumer protections and ease of business compliance, creating an environment that encourages businesses to report

defective products and quickly remove them from circulation.

The proposed rule under consideration would make substantial changes to the ''Fast Track'' program and could threaten the incentives for businesses to undertake voluntary recalls, as well as substantially increase the cost of completing the process. Most significantly, the proposed rule makes the corrective action plans in voluntary recall agreements legally binding, which could dramatically shift the incentive structure for businesses to report incidences of defective products. Making a plan legally binding will slow down the voluntary recall process, leaving consumers at risk for a longer period of time as the plans will first need to be subject to detailed review by legal counsel.

The proposed rule would also allow the CPSC to require the adoption of a compliance program as a component of corrective action plans. This requirement—if not properly calibrated—could introduce further delays in the voluntary recall process, even when a business has no history of recalls or violations. Thus, in the midst of working with the CPSC on the parameters of a voluntary recall agreement, a business might also have to negotiate the parameters of a compliance program and provide description of said program in the recall announcement.

While Section 214 of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 required the CPSC to establish requirements for mandatory recall notices, the statute bears no mention of establishing similar requirements for voluntary recalls. I understand that the CPSC bases its authority to establish guidelines from language in a House committee report, but I am not convinced that the proposed rule's sweeping changes to the existing voluntary recall process is congruent with either the intent of the statute or the language in the committee report.

Existing regulations require companies initiating a voluntary recall to propose and implement a formal corrective action plan, but these plans were never intended to be legally binding. Part 1115.20 of title 16 of the Code of Federal Regulations describes a corrective action plan as ''[a] document, signed by a subject firm, which sets forth the remedial action which the firm will voluntarily undertake to protect the public, but which has no legally binding effect.'' In effect, the regulations expressly prohibited the Commission from making these agreements legally binding in order to encourage—not deter—businesses to recall defective products. The CPSC's proposed rules may have the opposite of the intended effect—and, at the very least, could substantially delay the timely distribution of product safety information to the public.

Make no mistake: I have long been an advocate for strong regulations that protect public health, safety, and the environment. However, I also believe that we must regulate in a manner that is sensitive to the burdens placed on individuals and businesses. My opinion is that the CPSC's proposed rule may go too far—and may have the unintended consequence of delaying the recall process and extending the period of time in which defective items remain in circulation.

I urge the Commission to take my comments into consideration. The proposed rule could have a widespread and indiscriminate effect on voluntary recalls, and I ask the Commission to do its due diligence in fully vetting the impacts on businesses across the country, particularly for those wishing to initiate a voluntary recall as a precautionary measure. For large businesses, who already employ legal counsel and compliance officers, these new requirements will be substantial; for small businesses, they could be crippling.

Sincerely,

ANGUS S. KING, JR.,
United States Senator.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I also ask that Members of this Chamber recognize that the proposed rule change would slow a process meant to be conducted with speed and without red tape and would harm a system that ensures that consumer products sold in the U.S. are the safest in the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, there is a contradiction with what the gentlewoman says because, on one hand, she doesn't want government involved in localities, and on the other hand, she wants to tell localities how to act.

On the other hand, she doesn't want us to tell the Consumer Product Safety Commission how to act, so it becomes very confusing. This is an issue we should leave to the discretion of the Consumer Product Safety Commission. This is not something we should be micromanaging the CPSC on.

Furthermore, it is a proposed rule, and the CPSC is simply reviewing comments at this stage, and that is important to note. They are simply reviewing comments at this stage. We in this body should let the process of issuing rules play out, as is required in law, instead of cherry-picking where and when we want to interfere.

This is simply not an area of overregulation, since no regulation is yet in effect, so this amendment is unnecessary. I oppose the amendment, and I hope my colleagues will as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I think the gentlewoman has very well explained the amendment. We have a system that has been working well for 40 years, and so I don't think we need to make any unnecessary changes, and so I urge Members to support her amendment.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman.

I urge support of this amendment. The program in place at the CPSC has worked well. It is supported by both Republicans and Democrats. The process they are going through at CPSC is expending a tremendous amount of time and money.

Looking at setting up a system that would force these retailers into legal negotiations and settlements is not the way to address this.

The Fast Track program has been enormously successful. Former Chairman Brown worked during the Clinton administration—was appointed by President Clinton. They did a great job putting this program together. We should leave it in place. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this agency is one of the better agencies. Every so often, we read about baby seats and blankets and all kinds of issues that affect our communities and our daily lives.

We should stop trying to attack it, as some people do. I just think that this is not a good amendment and that it should be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

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

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the further consideration of H.R. 5016, and that I may include tabular materials on the same.

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

There was no objection.

INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS OF AMERICA

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back here on the floor once again. Tonight, we want to carry on our long-running discussion about how to improve the American economy, how to create jobs here in this Nation and move us all forward, how to rebuild the middle class, how to make sure that every family has the opportunity

to earn a good living, buy a home if they want to, educate their kids, get health care, and enjoy the fruits of this great Nation.

We often talk about this in the context of Make It In America. This is our jobs agenda. This is the agenda about how to rebuild this Nation, and there are seven different parts to it: trade policy, which we are not talking about tonight; we will talk a little bit about taxes; energy, that is another day; labor; education; and research.

We are going to spend tonight talking about this issue, the infrastructure issue of this Nation.

Let's see, in California, it is right smack in the middle of commute time, 5:15. I am from California, and I know that my constituents in the Sacramento area on that great Interstate 80 are sitting there in a traffic jam.

□ 2015

What a surprise. Or maybe they are on the Caltrain returning from the San Francisco area and held up behind a freight train that is probably carrying bulk and crude oil to the refineries in the Bay Area. They are waiting and waiting and waiting, whether they are on the road or on the train or on the bus, waiting and waiting and waiting.

Folks, in case you didn't know it—and I know you did—we have got a transportation problem in America. We have got a very serious problem.

So as we talk about jobs, as we talk about our Make it in America agenda, we need to talk about infrastructure, we need to talk about transportation, because this is a big, big issue for America. It is an issue that affects every single one of us.

My district also has about, I don't know, 150 miles of Interstate 5. So as you travel from California and you head north, last winter or last year, you would get on Interstate 5, you would get past Seattle, and then you would come to a screeching halt. Why? Because the Interstate 5 bridge in Washington State, just as you got to the Canadian border, collapsed. Wow.

How could that happen in America? How could it be that our bridges on a major interstate connecting Canada, United States, and Mexico would collapse? Well, it is because we did not maintain that. It is because our transportation policies are the previous century's policies and they don't fit in this century.

So, all across America, you are going to see more of this. In a moment, I am going to turn to my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO), and he will undoubtedly talk about the problem on that side.

It was a big day here in the Congress, because today we did what we do so very well: we kicked the can down the road. We have a major transportation crisis. This isn't the ''bridge to nowhere,'' but this is where we are headed right now. We are headed for a transportation crisis, because in about 3 weeks, maybe 4 weeks, the transportation funds are going to run out of money.

So, in an effort to deal with this problem. The United States Congress, led by our Republican leadership, did what it has done for the last 3½ years, and that is taken their can and kicked it down the road. We passed a stopgap temporary transportation funding bill that will provide us with another 10 months of funding so that the rest of the Nation's transportation systems—the State governments, the local governments, the cities, and even the Federal Government—will be perfectly unsure what the game plan is for the future years.

How they will plan, nobody knows, because they don't know what to expect from the Federal Government in terms of funding beyond the next 10 months, which is precisely where we are today. So, doing our very best, the repeated process of kicking the can down the road, we did it once again. Now, I will admit, I voted for it. We had no options, unless we wanted to lose several tens of thousands of jobs.

This is what my State government gave to me. If we fall off the bridge and don't fund transportation, here is what will happen to California: 73,572 jobs will be jeopardized; 5,692 active highway and transit projects will come to a screeching stop, which is pretty much what the commuters are doing right now on Interstate 80 between Sacramento and Davis, where it is my district; and California has 172,201 miles of public roads that will continue to be in very, very poor condition.

So, given the options that our Republican leadership has presented to us—and, by the way, we don't do anything that they don't allow us to do—they gave us the opportunity to kick the can down the road. Okay, better than nothing, but not the solution.

I would like to now turn to my colleague from the State of New York to talk about this system from your area, and then I would like to go back to what we should be doing, what we must be doing, which is to put in place a 4-year transportation program that actually solves our transportation and infrastructure problems, the Grow America Act.

What is the view from the east coast? Any better than the west coast?

PAUL TONKO, my colleague, I yield to you.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for half the remaining time until 10 p.m. as the designee of the minority leader.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. TONKO. I believe that is 53 minutes, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you.

Representative GARAMENDI, let me, once again, thank you for leading us in this hour of discussion, 53 minutes worth of discussion, that focuses on the value added, the importance of investment in transportation projects.

Back to our humble beginnings as a Nation, we were able to cite the relevance of having investments made in transportation. Whether it was to address public safety, whether it was to address the needs of commerce, or to grow our Nation, transportation investments have always provided that lucrative dividend that enables us to be just that much stronger as a Nation, and certainly to build our competitiveness to the ultimate.

That is the wisdom here that comes with an associated investment in transportation. Now, we have throughout our history tremendously sound ideas of how we work together as a Nation with a vision, with a sense of purpose, that enabled us to move forward, whether that was investing in an Erie Canal that gave birth to a necklace of communities called ''mill towns'' that enabled people to tether their American Dream in those given locations, as they were to find life anew here in their new country, or whether it was the Transcontinental Railroad.

There was an investment, there was a plan, there was a vision shared by this Nation where we chose to go forward and invest those dollars so as to enable us to connect as a Nation, enable us to, again, sharpen the edge, the competitive edge of this country. Or perhaps it was an interstate highway system that found President Eisenhower working with Democrats and Republicans in Congress to put together this strategy, to have a better way to allow us as States, individual States, to, again, connect as a Nation.

So, we have been, or should be at least, inspired by these chapters of our history that showed that when we had this vision, when we executed this plan, when we dug deep to make the investment, and when we were bold in our initiative, great things happened. There were tremendous responses that came to build commerce, to provide for public safety, and to, again, connect the Nation.

Today, the saga is no different. We should respond again in robust fashion, and understand that in this new century it is important for us as we compete in a global economy to offer our business community the best sets of infrastructure investment so that we can move forward with that sound down payment that enables them to function and function well.

What we have seen here in the House, as my colleague from California just indicated, was a delay tactic, a kicking the can down the road, if you will. And as it was the only game in town, that was a ''take it or leave it'' situation, where we did not want a trust fund to be emptied, and we moved forward with this effort.

However, the leadership bringing their bill to this floor didn't even have enough Members of their majority to support this measure. So, they needed to reach to Democrats to say: okay, we will move forward with this short-term solution, it is not the optimum, it is not near what is needed, and so now the work should continue to put together a legitimate opportunity for us to avoid insolvency in the near future.

What do we need to do? We need to have a long-term strategy, we need to go forward to avoid what could have been without action today 700,000 jobs lost nationally and some 100,000-plus projects either delayed or coming to a grinding halt. We need to provide the predictability, the stability, for those groups that want to invest in our infrastructure.

No corporation, no group out there, no business which involves itself in improving our highways and bridges will take this method seriously unless they feel that, they sense that stability. So, let's go forward and be sound about the investments we will make in our infrastructure, and let's put together that long-term strategy, because as we have witnessed in the past, and understand it to be today, that investment in infrastructure is the rock-solid cornerstone of a stronger tomorrow.

Representative GARAMENDI, there is much work to be done. There is work to be done that will require investments into infrastructure, transportation and infrastructure, in every region of this country. We know that. Let's get serious about the business, and let's avoid these short-term strategies that, again, get into areas where we smooth pensions, which can create another crisis of another kind.

We need to do better than what was done today, and we need to go forward. There were attempts to improve this, but this was the measure that was put before us, and, again, people saw it as the only opportunity to avoid insolvency of that highway trust fund. So, here we are again challenged in this moment to go forward with much better vision, with bolder initiatives, and with deep-rooted commitment to the transportation needs of this Nation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much. It is always good to be on the floor with you. Thank you so very much for bringing to our attention once again the history of this Nation, how it was built, the great infrastructure.

There is a report card out on how our infrastructure is today. This was put together by the engineers and others who do this kind of work. I am just going to read through this: aviation—these are our airports—D; bridges, C-plus; dams, D; drinking water, D; energy, D; hazardous waste, D; inland waterways, D; levees, D; ports, C—whoa, that is good; public parks and recreation, C-minus; rails, C-plus; roads, D; schools, D; solid waste, B—I guess we can get rid of our trash, that is good—transit, D; and wastewater, D. So, the entire infrastructure is D.

Do you want to know why? Well, here is the reason why. Short-term we run out of money.

Let's take a look here.

In 2002, we spent $325 billion on nondefense structures, all of these things I just talked about, and that was 2002, at the beginning of the Bush Presidency. And then every year after that—we are now down to about $225 billion.

So $100 billion of investment, annual investment, disappeared, and so now we are running all of these D scores. It is fortunate that we are not asking for—well, I guess we are asking for reelection. We are in trouble.

Just by the way, I got a phone call from my wife, and she said: You know, about the pickup truck, John. I said: What about it? She said: I've got to take it in, the mechanic says the wheels are out of alignment. I said: How much is that going to cost? She said: Somewhere over $100. On average, in San Francisco, $782 is spent on every car every year to repair for the damages of the poor highways in California. I don't think I have New York, Mr. TONKO, but I suspect it is no better there.

Let's talk about the future. Excuse me, I am just stuck. I don't want to get stuck on the past, but it is pretty bad. Let's talk about the future.

Mr. TONKO. Before you go there, let me just share this, because even though it is 27 years old as a memory, it is still vividly captured by so many of us that lived in upstate New York. When I served in the New York State Assembly, Montgomery County, New York, is my home area. We are a donor county to the New York State Thruway system. Twenty-seven years ago, ten lives were lost when a Thruway bridge collapsed. It, obviously, was a terrible price for those ten individuals to pay. Their family members and friends would remind us that there is no pricetag that we can put on that loss.

□ 2030

I can tell you the economic impact on many counties in that region was severe. Interestingly, no one from that home county, my home county, was lost in that tragedy. Some in New York State paid dearly for that tragedy, but people whose home States were far away from New York were lost in that tragedy.

So that reminds all of us that we are all at risk, no matter where that deficiency may be, no matter where that lack of investment may fall. We are all at risk because we are interconnected, incredibly so, which is an undisputed fact. Any failure out there, any deficiency, challenges each and every one of us.

And so when we talk about the future, that past history of lack of investment needs to remind all of us that there is a worthiness here that this should be a high priority.

You talk about the delays that trip has measured. The impact on people within the capital region that I represent in New York is some $1,600 annually in terms of idle time, in terms of repairs required to their vehicles, in terms of accidents that might be caused by less than acceptable conditions on those roadways. So this is costing us, as you just indicated, annually.

We need to understand that it is about public safety and it is about avoiding accidents and tragedies. It is about connecting the Nation. It is about investing in commerce. That is what this is telling us. It is the requirement of this Chamber and the United States Senate and the White House to come together and get things done.

This President has urged us to accept his plans to close loopholes that will provide revenues in a long-term strategy, that will provide for work for millions of people in the trades industry, to put their skilled labor abilities to work for us as a nation and to make certain that future consequences like those that were faced in Montgomery County with the bridge collapse aren't repeated time and time again.

Before we go to the future, I just wanted to set that tone for some very tragic situations that we as a nation have endured. I am speaking of one assembly district in one State, but I know across the country there have been these terrible situations where the infrastructure weakness gripped us with pain and consequence.

Mr. GARAMENDI. No doubt about that. I am thinking about the Twin Cities. That was another bridge that collapsed more recently. These are real reminders of the necessity of dealing with the reality of transportation.

Fortunately, there is a way to solve the transportation and the infrastructure challenges of this Nation. It has been proposed by President Obama. It is called the GROW AMERICA Act. It specifically is designed to rebuild our crumbling transportation system.

It is a comprehensive plan. It deals with all of the various parts of the transportation and infrastructure system. There is a major piece for our rail. There is a major piece for inner city transit buses and transit within the cities. There is a piece for the ports, bridges, and highways. All of this is encompassed in the GROW AMERICA Act, which the President and Secretary Foxx of the Department of Transportation proposed a few months ago.

The legislation was presented to the House of Representatives, introduced here in the House by Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON about a month and a half ago, and it has simply sat there. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee of this House has not taken it up, although it should.

We should be holding hearings on this issue, because this is what we need to address: the rail system, the buses, the ports, the bridges, the highways, the freight systems; the movement of men, women, materials, and freight all across this country.

The program is a very robust program, and over 4 years it will bring us almost back to what we were doing in 2002. Because in 4 years, we would be spending at the level of $325 billion a year over that 4-year period of time.

But here is what it means for next year. If we were to pass the GROW AMERICA Act now rather than kicking the can down the road, beginning October 1, 2014, we would have $7.6 billion to fix our highway system. We would have $6.8 billion to improve public transportation: buses, light rail, and intracity rail. We would have $3.4 billion for our rail systems, like what you have here in the Northeast Corridor. Out in California, we have the Capital Corridor, the train system between San Diego and Los Angeles, and so forth. And we would have $1 billion for our freight transportation system, or a total of $18.6 billion more in 2015 to fix our crumbling infrastructure.

This is a very robust investment and it covers all of these programs. Each of these programs are necessary in and of themselves, like the highway system, to fill the potholes so that men and women across the country don't have to, as I must do, take my pickup in for a front wheel realignment. And all of these other systems, like transit, rail, port and freight systems, we would be able to grow those. We would be able to begin to fix our infrastructure system, and we would put people back to work.

Mr. TONKO. Right.

What I like about the plan, Representative GARAMENDI, is that it is all-inclusive in terms of an umbrella approach that encompasses several policy areas. It is not just transportation, which is very valid and certainly urgent, but we also address environmental policy, energy policy, economic development policy, and urban policy.

There are a number of strategies that come together into this one initiative that allow us to be smart about our investments and to be efficient. And isn't that what people seem to call for when they go to vote each and every time for Congress?

People interpreted the 2010 election that the voters were saying government is the enemy, government is the problem, government is too big. I think the people said, no, we want efficient government, effective government.

That is what a strategy like this provides. It incorporates planning. It incorporates investing on a routine scale so that we are not doing these catch-up games that require down payments of interest before we even get some investments made in infrastructure. So I like this.

With the rail portion, we are talking about the most energy-efficient form of travel. In order for us to provide a benefit to the public or to commerce, a transportation quotient is an important factor in the household budget and planning that all of us do as households and in budgeting for business so that they can cut that factor and be competitive in landing the contracts for the work that they do. So rail is an important component for that vision of providing a sounder outcome. It is better for the environment, and there is less pollution as we become more energy-efficient in our travel.

The next order of business is the connection with urban cores. Multimodal concepts enable us to again provide for the recovery of our inner urban cores. We have been lacking for sound urban policy in this Nation. It is time for us to have a heart for these urban cores and to put together smart growth strategies, which this sort of planning, this sort of vision enables us to do.

And the list goes on and on.

To your point, Representative GARAMENDI, we are going to put people to work, too. That is not a bad thing.

Instead of coming up with dollars to sue a President, why don't we invest in our infrastructure? We are going to rush around this week and come up with ways to make certain that we can go forward with a lawsuit against the President. We are going to invest hard-earned taxpayer dollars to prove a point, to stage some sort of political theater and not do the sort of priorities that the American public is calling on us to do.

They don't want this acrimony to be driven by additional digging into the pocket of the taxpayers. They want soundness and effectiveness of programs. They want to know that what we do will grow jobs, create a climate that fosters private sector job growth, enable us to be more competitive, enable our public to be more safe as we travel, and enable us to put people to work.

That is what people deserve. They are calling for that sort of vision and initiative. We owe it to the American public to put into play this long-term strategy that we know deep in our hearts is the best thing to do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative TONKO, what is happening tomorrow? The Speaker and the leadership of this House are going to do a press conference to talk about suing the President?

Mr. TONKO. And there is talk of how we will provide the dollars to make that happen.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And we haven't taken up a transportation bill, have we?

Mr. TONKO. Right. I think the approvals we are looking for here ought to come for sound investments that will bear benefits for generations to come—and in a multiple order of effectiveness for various purposes, from jobs to safety to connecting for commerce and the like.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let's put aside that lawsuit tomorrow and all the foolishness that it is and at least let you and me and whoever cares to join in this talk about substantive issues the American people really want, which is to do our work to put together programs that actually meet the needs of the people.

This is the President's proposal. I know the President has said if it has his name on it, it isn't going anywhere. So take his name off of it and let's just call it an American act.

What is it?

It is a 4-year program. It is 4 years of transportation infrastructure funding. As you said, it is holistic. It includes many different elements, including planning and research, as you just described. It is $302 billion over the 4 years, which is a substantial increase over what we are presently doing. It is fully paid for and does not increase the deficit.

I love my charts. I hope the rest of you like them as much as I do. If you don't, I am going to show them anyway.

What happens when we invest a dollar in infrastructure is we actually grow the economy by $1.57. So for every dollar we invest, we get economic growth. We increase the economy in this case by another 57 cents beyond the dollar that we have already spent. And as you just said, you are laying in place the foundation. You have made the capital investment that will endure for years to come.

Anyway, in 4 years, this GROW AMERICA Act is $302 billion over the 4-year period. For transportation, the highway system has $199 billion. That is a 22 percent increase over what we are currently spending. In the area of transit systems, it is $72 billion over the 4-year period. That also is an increase. There is research, which we have talked about.

The multimodal, this I really like. You talked about the transit hubs, and that is an important piece, but the multimodal freight system is the ports, the trains, and the highways all coming together.

I know you have major projects in New York. You may want to talk about those.

These are the hubs for which our economy grows because it is the export as well as the import from overseas. It is the rail system that then takes those containers of that cargo and puts it on the rails to go across the country—whether it is BNSF, or UP on the west coast, or the CSX rail system on the east coast—and the trucks, and they all come together in a hub. So there is actually $10 billion for those rail hubs. For the rail system itself to improve the Nation's rails, it is $19 billion over the 4 years.

Then there are the special innovative programs that local governments want to do like the TIGER grants. These are local programs. That is $5 billion.

□ 2045

It is a substantial growth in what we have been spending over the previous years, and you will remember the chart that shows the decline in spending. It is an opportunity for us to pick it up and push it forward at a much higher level, employing people, growing the economy in the process, and laying

down the foundation—the concrete, the steel, the bridges, the rails—upon which the economy will grow.

I know you have examples of this. Please, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. What I would add to your support of statements would be that, as we delay, as we do these gimmicks, as we do these kicking the can down the road scenarios, there are projects lining up. They are building up.

We are not resolving the overall core of concern out there. In a way, projects are piling up. In New York, the American Society of Civil Engineers has given this country, as you stated earlier, a poor report card on our infrastructure.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me. Are you like California, with D ratings?

Mr. TONKO. Yes. I mean, we have some tough, tough issues to deal with, and this report card from professionals is telling the story as it is.

Today, nearly 13 percent of New York's bridges are deemed structurally deficient. Some 27 percent of the State's bridges are considered functionally obsolete. Now, that is piling up. It is not going to get better until we invest. As it piles up, these concerns or these benefits from this investment are not being shared with the country.

Now, people don't want to hear about climate change and global warming, but at least see it as a way to be more resourceful with the energy supplies that we do have. If you can't buy into the notion of cleaning up the air to avoid carbon emission and methane emission, at least see it as a way to pull cars off the highway and allow for mass transit, public transit, to enable us to better address the capacity situation of our roads and bridges throughout all of our States, then see it as a way to bring under control the transportation cost factor for commerce.

When you build this port system, when you connect with rail and highways and bridges and when you have the ultimate investment made in today's state-of-the-art infrastructure, you are providing this golden benefit to commerce, so that they can compete and can compete effectively in a global marketplace. It is driven by commerce, as is our public safety, as is our connectedness as a Nation.

So there are many benefits here. The multiple facets of all of this vision that the President has shared with this Congress should not be kicked aside. You don't kick this away, like you did the strategies and the solutions for our infrastructure needs. You sit down at a table together and perform, as this Nation expects us to on behalf of issues as critical as infrastructure.

We know what has to be done. Let's do it. Let's be the professionals as we come together in a bipartisan fashion and bicameral fashion—the legislative branch working with the executive branch—and get it done. We have been inspired throughout our history with those concepts of the Erie Canal, the Transcontinental Railroad, the interstate highway system.

Here is our moment. Do we let it pass us by, or do we move forward and get it done in grand fashion, where we are pulling cars off the road, enabling people to enjoy the public and mass transit opportunities as a Nation and where we have state-of-the-art port facilities so that we can ship our goods and so that we can enable commerce to be given that muscle it needs, which is the American way?

Our grandparents knew about this. They handed us a better Nation. Where are we in this moment? As stewards of today's given strategy and policy, are we going to fail for the next generations? Or will they look at us someday and say: they got it, they did it, they did it well, and they did it with a sense of vision and planning and passion and commitment, and they scored for us as a generation, and now, we will build upon that success?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Si se pueda. Yes, we can.

Mr. TONKO. Yes, we can.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We can do it.

It is interesting that we spend a lot of time talking on the floor here in the Chamber about government regulation and red tape and all of that. In the GROW AMERICA Act, there are major reforms to speed up projects, to move projects faster—to get the concrete poured, to get the bridge built, to get the airport up and running.

Those reforms are very, very important. They, along with the overall bill, are languishing for lack of a hearing, for lack of action. We really have the opportunity to not only put the projects in place, but to put them in place faster with the reforms that are called for in the GROW AMERICA Act.

I was starting to talk about the TIGER programs. This is an opportunity for our local county, city, State to put forward innovative projects. For example, the systems that you were talking about, the transit hubs, those can be proposed. They can be graded based upon their utility, on their usefulness.

Those are then grant programs—public, local, State, together with the Federal Government. This is a substantial increase. I know these are very popular in California. We keep lining them up, but there hasn't been sufficient money. In the GROW AMERICA Act, there is a significant increase. Some $5 billion would be available for these innovative transportation projects.

What is there not to like in this? It is fully paid for—interesting. It is fully paid for in two ways—one, on the existing excise tax on gasoline and diesel. It is not increased, but is still the same. Then the balance—that is, the increase—is to be paid for by closing tax loopholes on corporations.

It is interesting that today, as the President was talking about this and also talking about closing tax loopholes on corporations that are offshoring American jobs, The Wall Street Journal—that rather famous and quite good newspaper—carried on its front page, ''The Race to Cut Taxes Fuels Urge to Merge,'' a cute headline.

Then, in The New York Times, another headline on the very same subject reads, ''Drug Firms Make Haste to Elude Taxes.''

So right here in these two national newspapers are examples of the kinds of tax avoidance games that are being played by American corporations to avoid paying their fair share of the American taxes.

The President, in the GROW AMERICA Act said stop it, stop these kinds of tax loopholes, tax breaks, that American companies are taking to avoid paying their share of the burden of transportation. He wants to close these loopholes, and here are two that clearly ought to be closed immediately.

Mr. TONKO. When you look at that strategy, Representative GARAMENDI, you sense the fundamental fairness.

I look at projects like the efforts in New York where Governor Cuomo is leading this effort to make certain that we invest in the rebuild of the Tappan Zee Bridge. That takes traffic from the greater Metro New York area, the New York City area, and moves it along into upstate New York and into the Northeast area of our country—a major thoroughfare with a huge price tag.

Now, if we partner with our States, that is helping those individual States to endure, to provide for the resources needed to build these major projects and to do them well. Otherwise, it falls upon the local taxpayer and on State income taxes and what have you—or whatever the State revenue supplies are—so that there is this partnership that is strengthened when the Federal Government leads with a strong commitment to infrastructure improvements.

Now, in looking at the safety, the stretch is miles long as we travel from that metro area on the Tappan Zee Bridge into upstate New York. It was in need of improvement for quite some time, and I applaud the Governor for leading the effort now in putting it together, but, again, the Federal partnership here is important.

For us to continue to ask middle-income America to pay the bill—they are already saturated with these efforts. They know that they have been stressed out.

What this measure does is provide fundamental fairness again. It is not just about the projects done, the vision shared, the implementation of a plan. It is about a revenue side that comes together in a progressive fashion, in socially and economically just fashions, to make certain that there is an equal sense of responsibility to bear in terms of providing for the infrastructure improvements that we as a Nation, as an American society, require.

Let's go forward and be the bold pioneers, if you will, of this generation

and show people that we didn't miss the opportunity to invest in America. This Nation, as great as she is, with this economy as strong as it can be, requires assistance through our wonderful history, and this is not a surprise. It should not be a surprise. We need to constantly upgrade and improve and maintain our infrastructure.

Tonight, we have spent a lot of time, Representative GARAMENDI, talking about projects and initiatives that can move us forward, but there is also a commitment that needs to be made to the maintenance and operational costs of these systems.

If we don't commit to that, it sooner or later catches up with us, and then there are requirements for huge bond acts, or there are various ways to come up with strategies, and when you come into moments like this, you will have resistance from certain thinking, philosophical approaches in government, and it makes the job all the more difficult.

We know what needs to be done. We have been bolstered by our rich history. We were at our best when we invested in America. Let's learn from that. Let's seize the moment.

Let's go forward and commit to commerce, to safety, to the general public—to the needs of the general public. Let's provide for that strength of America, for that pioneer spirit that has always driven us.

I know I have talked about this so many times when I have been with you on the floor, but the pioneer spirit was on display when we built that Erie Canal. It was on display when those manufacturing towns built their factories.

It was on display when so many of our ancestors as immigrants came here and tethered their American Dream. They climbed that economic ladder. They ascended with those opportunities to provide for their families, for their children and grandchildren to go forward.

That is us. That is the synergy of this Nation. That is the passion of the American public. We deny that when we deny the vision, the plan, the investment, the policy, the initiative driven right on this floor that ought to be bipartisan in nature. Make no mistake about it—bipartisan in nature.

Let's move forward. Let's have that plan. Let's have that vision, and let's commit to this future.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We certainly can do it. We certainly ought to do it. Our predecessors have done it. There are 435 of us here in the House of Representatives, and the question is: Are we willing to do it?

It can be done. This plan, GROW AMERICA, is fully paid for. Yes, some corporations that are skipping out on their taxes would have to participate, and they should. They ought not be tax dodgers.

This is a very interesting plan put forward by our colleague JOHN DELANEY, a Representative from Maryland, that would take those profits that these corporations have stored overseas—profits that they have not paid taxes on in America—to repatriate, to bring that money back to America.

His program would generate, over a period of 10 years, $720 billion to be used in public-private partnerships to build our infrastructure. There are many, many ideas about how this could be paid for. The President has laid out a plan not to raise the gasoline and the diesel tax, but rather to bring about some tax fairness, and corporations would be required to pay their fair share—all of it good.

I suspect we have maybe another 5 minutes or so, but I want to bring up one of our favorite subjects. I am going to put this up.

Here we are with the GROW AMERICA Act and all of the things that could be done. This is back to Make It In America. I love this photo. It is one of my favorites.

I know, often, you travel on the train from New York down to Washington, D.C.—or back—right about now. This locomotive, which is the most advanced electric locomotive in America, made in America, was paid for by a Make It In America strategy.

Part of the transportation program—the American Recovery Act—back in 2008 said that they put aside about $700-plus billion for Amtrak all across the Nation to be used for improving the Amtrak system.

They said that that money would be used to build locomotives, and they said 100 percent American-made. Siemens, a German company, said, oh, $700 billion for locomotives made in America, we are a German company, we can build those in America.

So in Sacramento, California, in the infrastructure program, Siemens has built a 100 percent American-made locomotive, and it is going to be operating very soon on the Northeast corridor.

This is a good thing. This is how we can rebuild the American middle class. This is how we can create jobs, using our infrastructure investments to build jobs in America.

It is a fundamental piece of our Make It In America strategy of rebuilding our manufacturing sector where you do have good, solid middle class jobs, where a family can earn a living without both husband and wife having to work all the time or maybe two or three jobs.

We are talking about the American Dream being restored, and the infrastructure is a fundamental piece of that—not just because it moves the economy, not just because it is foundational to economic growth, but because it is American middle class jobs.

□ 2000

It is the hardhats. It is the welder putting together the new locomotive. It is the engineer designing the system. It is the accountant. It is the secretary handling the paperwork. It is America building each future.

The President has laid out a good plan. Is there some way better to do it? Put your ideas on the table, my colleagues, put your ideas on the table.

How can you do better than this GROW AMERICA Act? Let's get about doing it. This is our future. This is America's opportunity, and it is fully paid for, doesn't increase the deficit. In fact, it will grow the economy and provide us with those middle class jobs.

I know, Mr. TONKO, you have been at this for your entire career, as have I, and to be here in Congress, at this moment, when we had an opportunity, we missed it today. We missed the opportunity today to grow the American economy, and instead, we kicked the can down the road. Better than nothing, but not good enough—nothing to be proud of.

Mr. TONKO, a few seconds—I don't know how much time we have.

Mr. TONKO. I believe we probably have about 5 minutes now. I think we go to about 7 minutes after.

Look, I think what you point to—the gentleman from California is absolutely right on. It is a ripple effect. It is not just the rail tracks that are developed, the railways that are developed. It is not just the highways and bridges. It is incorporating rail cars.

Now, here is a ripple effect. As we have grown the efficiency of the system, now we are building, manufacturing rail cars, putting people to work, alternatively-fueled vehicles that can enable us to continue in that effort to reduce carbon emission and methane emission, making certain that, again, we go through this whole process, coming out more environmentally sound.

So, yes, today's vote was a big disappointment, in terms of what we could have accomplished. It was that short term, get out of this immediate challenge, and let's go forward.

There is not that vision. There is not that full indepth plan that is required of us, and certainly, we fell short—far short of the mark that should have brought us across the finish line and enabled us to say, hey, we scored really well here, we put together a sound package.

This is about putting a strategy together that enables us to advance all of these cutting-edge technologies that enable us to strengthen the manufacturing base of America where these ripple effects reach us into our communities.

You talk about the locomotives of today and the future that are driven by the intellectual capacity of workers and researchers in this country. I think back on the industrial heritage of Schenectady, New York, that I represent here in the House.

The American Locomotive Company, ALCO, was producing tremendous cars that enabled us to again have that richness of rail history.

Well, you know, all through our history, there have been those decades and chapters that have inspired us because we met the task, we came ready to deliver, and we were not going to let any force stop us.

That is the greatness of America. That is how we achieved. That is how we climbed to our mountains, where people noticed America, where we were that beacon of hope, where the best things came from this Nation.

Are we ready to settle for second best? Fifth best? I don't think so. So let us move forward.

Other nations are investing in their infrastructure. You hear it all the time, about rail systems in Europe and Asia. You hear about the improvements that people have made with subway systems and the like.

We know that we have got the smarts to do it. We have got the intellectual capacity to lead not only this Nation, but the world, and as we go forward, let us be proud of the fact that we can come together, make things happen, and have that long-term strategy, which was just not here today for that vote. It was not here today for that vote.

I will repeat myself. The Republican majority didn't have their votes enough to pass the measure, so they obviously didn't believe in what they were doing, and it is unfortunate. It was the only game in town. It was the only plan placed on the table.

We need to do better than this, and we can. So our bright days of tomorrow lie ahead of us, only if we are ready to muster up the boldness to make it happen.

Representative GARAMENDI, to you to close.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It is time to close. We can build America. We can build our infrastructure. The President has laid out a worthy plan, comprehensive, and all of the elements of the infrastructure that we must do. It is fully paid for. It is a good starting point.

Maybe there is a better way of doing it, but we cannot get it done with short-term, kick the can down the road bills, such as was passed today, but that is better than not doing anything.

This is the American future, and the question for all of us, 435: Why did we come here? Did we come here just to pass the time, or did we come here to really build America?

We are going to Make It In America. We are Americans, and we will make it.

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

THE VIOLENCE IN ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate that recognition.

First of all, I would like to direct attention to the Middle East, to our dear friend and ally, Israel, and the fact that I pointed out to Prime Minister Netanyahu twice, a few years apart, that going back to the very inception of Israel as a nation more than 3,000 years ago, there has never been a time when Israel gave away land trying to buy peace, that that land was not ultimately used as a staging area from which to attack it.

It has been true all those years, the original founding of Israel, the promised land, going through the division of Israel into two kingdoms, northern and southern, and then the rejuvenation really of that nation in the late 1940s.

No matter which President, no matter which party the President was from, no matter which Secretary of State was pushing to get a Nobel Peace Prize by trying to bring people together, anyone that pushed and forced Israel to give away land ended up bringing about attacks on Israel because they gave away land that should have been Israel's.

Southern Lebanon has been the source of so many attacks and kidnappings, intrusions into Israel. The Gaza Strip had so many Israeli families living peacefully, greenhouses, methods of taking care of themselves.

In an act—a unilateral act by Israel to attempt to secure a bit of peace, Israel gave away the Gaza Strip, now governed by Hamas, a terrorist organization that the United States through this administration is funding because we are funding the Palestinians and they have the relationship now with Hamas.

So we are taking American tax dollars from many people in the United States who do not believe it is a good idea to curse Israel and to supply money to its enemy, so Israel can be attacked, and yet, that money is being taken and given to them.

They can say because money is fungible, where we are not actually using the money you give us to attack Israel, and they can also claim they are not actually using the money that we give them to teach hatred in textbooks and all kinds of ways actually, including the naming of holidays after barbarians who have committed attacks on innocent people and killed innocent people. They name holidays after them. They name streets after them.

Here in the United States, we tend to name holidays or streets after people like Martin Luther King, Jr., who subscribed to peaceful means of protest, who would never encourage killing or attacks to achieve what Hamas and the PLO have utilized.

It is time to cut off the money. Until they quit teaching hatred, they quit utilizing funds to attack Israel, you cut off their funds. You cut off the teaching of hatred, and you have got a shot at some semblance of peace in the Middle East.

In the meantime, Israel is being attacked—every day, the rockets flying, hoping—the Palestinians hoping that maybe they will kill some innocent Israeli people.

Wouldn't that be great, they are thinking, if we could just kill maybe some children, maybe blow off some legs and arms? What a great accomplishment Hamas and the PLO can be thrilled about.

Of course, Hamas took over from the PLO in governing, but the area is no more peaceable, and it is time to cut off all American funding to any area that subscribes to the shooting of rockets to kill innocent people, as is going on in the Middle East, enemies of Israel attempting to kill innocent Israelis.

There was an attempt by Israel to enter into an Egyptian-brokered ceasefire with Hamas, but according to The Jerusalem Post story, by Yaakov Lappin, that collapsed Tuesday when Gazan terrorists continued to fire rocket barrages on the south, center, and north of Israel.

A fragment from a mortar shell killed an Israeli man, Dor Chanin, 37. Chanin had come as a civilian volunteer to distribute food to soldiers at Erez.

□ 2115

It is time to quit aiding and abetting the attacks on our friend Israel. It is time to start helping them.

And when it comes to the disastrous effort to negotiate with terrorist leaders in Iran—they are developing nuclear weapons. They are developing the ability to develop nuclear weapons because they have their centrifuges spinning. And I think those who say they want enough nuclear material to produce several nuclear weapons at the same time, they are not going to just do one. They are going to wait until they have enough to do several so that they can spread out, be difficult to track and be difficult to stop before they utilize them to destroy Israel, as the Little Satan, as they see it, and the United States, as the Great Satan.

It has been described in one of Joel Rosenberg's novels far too accurately: Even though Iran is developing intercontinental ballistic missiles that could carry nuclear warheads to the United States—''the Great Satan'' they call us—they really don't even need those. They could put them on a cargo ship, a yacht, whatever, and bring them over—have one in New York, have one in Chicago, have one up the Potomac. And they could pretty well devastate American economic powerhouse cities. If they put one in New Orleans, the Houston ship channel, there goes most of our refined gasoline.

It is time for America to wake up. This administration is not adequately protecting us, and that is why our Attorney General has now finally admitted this month, in an ABC interview, that, in effect, he is extremely concerned and in fear more now of a terrorist attack than he has been at most any time in his time as Attorney General. And this is a guy that knows terrorism. I mean, he has helped terrorists in his role prior to working for this administration. He is quite familiar with

what they are capable of doing. So for him to say that, people ought to take notice.

Of course we have our Secretary of State, John Kerry, in an article of July 15 from The Weekly Standard by Jeryl Bier. The headline, ''Kerry: I Get 'A Little Uptight When I Hear Politicians Say How Exceptional We Are.'''

Heaven forbid that we should realize the capability of America and that there is no other nation in the history of the world that has fought, has lost lives of our military, has spent tremendous amounts of our treasure not to create an empire, but simply to bring liberty and freedom to people we don't even share languages with, we don't share religions so much with. Nations haven't done that. America is an exceptional nation, and we are losing that exceptional status.

So perhaps I will make our Secretary of State feel much better and be much prouder as I say that under this administration—as has been pointed out to me by Africans in Nigeria, by Africans in Togo—the United States has gotten much weaker in world opinion under this President. So that should make our Secretary of State feel very, very pleased because a Member of Congress is not claiming to be exceptional. We are. But really, I am claiming that Nigerians and others who were so pleased, as they told me, that you elected your first Black President have now grown scared as they have watched America, under this President, get weaker and weaker and become far less exceptional in the eyes of the world as we once were.

One of the problems has been that this country has been under assault, has been under an invasion through our southern border. As border patrolmen will attest, the Tucson sector of our 2,000-or-so-mile border on the south had traditionally been where there were more people coming into this country illegally.

We have an area in Arizona where there is a national park on the American side, where the sign has been seen—and I have had a picture of it here on the floor—during the Obama Presidency that simply directs American citizens, warns them not to use this area because there are criminals and drug activity in the national park. So American citizens are encouraged to use an area north of the interstate because this administration has just pretty well relegated that area to criminals from outside of this country. That would mean that is a failure to adequately provide for our common defense, and it might be support for Andrew McCarthy's book title, ''Faithless Execution.''

Now, I feel like the appropriate thing to do is to pass the resolution that I filed a year ago here in this House that goes through explaining how the President has failed to secure our country, has failed to secure our borders. We don't want our borders closed. I certainly don't. Immigration is a wonderful thing. There is no country in the world where they have five times our population, or less—no country allows 1 million people or more to come into their country legally. We do.

We love immigration. It is a great thing. ''E pluribus unum,'' the Latin phrase meaning, out of many, one, has been a part of the Great Seal since the 1770s. It is on the ribbon that runs through the beak in the eagle's mouth on one side of the Great Seal.

I was taught, growing up, that our melting pot is one of the many things that has made us so great. People come here, assimilate, speak the same language, love the same country, and become Americans.

Well, we have seen hyphenated Americans become the order of the day in recent years. And I so look forward to the day, if it ever arrives—and I hope and pray it does—when, once again, we are Americans.

I know on 9/12/2001, as I looked around our courthouse square, the hundreds of people there—all races, both genders, lots of national origins—but that day, we were all Americans. There were no hyphenated Americans, not on 9/12. Through the tragedy and the hate and the death and the sorrow of 9/11/2001, on 9/12, we saw our Nation shine, a compassionate nation, a caring nation, but also a nation committed that we would not be struck again.

And now—I mean right now—our Attorney General, under this administration, refused to prosecute what a Federal district court said were the named coconspirators of those convicted of supporting terrorism, which was echoed by the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. These were front organizations for the Muslim Brotherhood. There was plenty of evidence to support that they were coconspirators with the convicted defendants in supporting terrorism, and this administration, this Attorney General, refused to prosecute them.

Under this administration, they even got a heads-up from Russia, you have a Muslim coming back in named Tsarnaev who has been to a terrorist area. He has been radicalized. And Russia warned not once, but twice. And this administration that has removed information about radical Islam from its training materials for the different departments—and I have reviewed some of it that they have removed.

We were told that most of it that they removed from the FBI training materials. Well, people who have not been allowed to fully see and be trained on what radical Islam is were sent out to the mosque where Tsarnaev went regularly, not to ask questions about has Tsarnaev talked about Qutb that wrote ''Milestones'' that Osama bin Laden credits with having brought him along the road to terrorism, to violence. They didn't know the questions to ask. So the only reason we had the FBI sent out under this administration was for the outreach program.

They were so ignorant that while the outreach program was going on, what was really happening and what had happened at that mosque and who had been radicalized and who had not, that the Director of the FBI did not even know that the founder of the two Muslim mosques there in the Boston area were founded by a man named al-Amoudi, who had helped the Clinton administration and then helped the Bush administration until he was found to be supporting terrorist activity. He was arrested just right out here at Dulles International Airport, and he is now doing over 20 years in Federal prison for supporting terrorism. He was the founder of the Islamic Society of Boston, which founded those mosques.

The FBI Director didn't even know. They didn't go out there and talk to anybody about whether or not Tsarnaev had been radicalized. But lo and behold, they said, hey, we talked to Tsarnaev himself, and he didn't admit that he was radicalized. And we talked to his mom, and she didn't admit that he was radicalized. So apparently they thought he was good. And people died and lost limbs in Boston.

Instead, we have seen spying on American citizens to an extent that it is hard to believe we have reached here in America, where you have the NSA getting everybody's phone logs of all calls they make—and this is all reported in public formats, in the public media—where you have the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that was established to protect us from unscrupulous banks and banking habits and practices. That was done when we had a majority of Democrats in the House and Senate. They set it up where that Bureau would never have to be responsible to Congress at all. We could never have oversight. They would get their money from the Federal Reserve so they could run independently. And what have they done? Well, they have been gathering debit and credit card purchase and use information on Americans.

Some of us think that if they really want to protect us from unscrupulous bank practices, they ought to wait until we tell them that we have been treated unfairly and then go after the criminal. That is really what the Constitution Bill of Rights anticipates. You don't go gathering everybody's personal information, except on probable cause. You get a warrant.

□ 2130

But not now. This administration has the CFPB that is gathering information in the name of protecting us. I don't want that kind of protection. I want them to leave us alone and quit drawing and gathering all the personal data on people in America. It is none of your business unless there has been a crime, and then, and only then, your gathering should be based on probable cause.

We have got the ability of the United States Government to use drones, thermal imaging, and all kinds of technology to spy on American citizens

like never before. We have the ability, as this administration has shown, to be concerned about an American citizen in Yemen who was radicalized, who was a terrorist, even though he had met with people in this administration, met with people in the prior administration, and had led prayers here on Capitol Hill of Muslim staff members. Wouldn't it have been interesting if this administration had decided to capture him during one of his numerous trips into the United States instead of blowing him up in Yemen? It might have been interesting to find out what he had to say about the people he worked with in this administration and the prior administration on Capitol Hill.

Well, how, one might wonder, could an American citizen be radicalized to hate Americans so well? If you go look at his life, his parents were not American citizens. They came into the United States on a visa for college. That is when he was born and taken back to Yemen. In Yemen growing up he learned to hate America.

How many people has this happened to? We know the Muslim Brother who was leading Egypt and weaponizing the Sinai, which is still an area of devastation because of all the weapons Morsi made sure were there. Morsi's wife had a daughter here in the United States, an American citizen, and obviously he didn't care a whole lot for America.

So I had a resolution a year ago that just went through all the whereases explaining that there is no need to pass any bill through the House and Senate to secure our border or to do immigration reform until the President actually goes through the effort of securing our borders. He has got the money. Some people have already forgotten that Secretary of Homeland Security Napolitano just announced one day that even though Congress had appropriated $4 billion to provide a virtual fence in areas that a fence would be difficult, she just decided that was not practical, too expensive. So she would not do a virtual fence. And so what happened to the $4 billion? What happened to our security? Well, we didn't get secured, and we didn't get the virtual fence. There was clearly some wasted money in that area. But we still have got to get control of our border.

But when you have a President who has not done anything significant to secure our border but has, in fact, pronounced a new law, the initials of which are DACA, he just pronounced a new law that had not been passed by Congress but had simply passed the lips of our President. Here is the new law. Here is what you can do to get amnesty. And he pronounced amnesty in what USCIS has announced has been over 550,000 cases. Our President pronounced an amnesty law into effect that provided amnesty already to over 550,000 people who had come in illegally.

The New York Times and others have said that just in very recent months, we have had an additional 300,000 people come into our country illegally. And, this week, we get the report that 38 people have been deported. Well, if you do the math, that means that those 850,000 who came in illegally who had a 100 percent chance of getting to stay here because of this administration not enforcing our law and not enforcing our border, that 100 percent chance of getting to stay here got dramatically reduced. Because of this administration's wonderful efforts, it has now been reduced from a 100 percent chance of staying here to a 99.9955 percent chance of staying here. And that should certainly scare anyone who had started planning a trip into this country illegally, that their odds of staying here had dropped from 100 percent clear down to a 99.995 percent chance of getting to stay here.

I still come back to the resolution I filed a year ago. Until the President shows he is going to secure the border, we shouldn't pass anything. As our own Speaker has said, we can't trust this President. When the Secretary of Homeland Security can just say, I don't want to spend $4 billion you guys appropriated for a fence, I am going to do something else. Really? Well, I guess you can do that if you are a bit lawless.

But if we are going to be a nation of laws, then laws that have been duly passed by Congress and signed by other Presidents should be enforced, otherwise we become like the countries that people are fleeing.

It was rather emotional Saturday night to be down right near the river where children and adults were being processed—processed meaning they have to ask each one of them numerous questions, normally in Spanish. And there are some articles of clothing they are not allowed to take in to the detention area. And when she was asked, were you glad to leave home, she began to cry. She didn't mention she was so glad to get away from all the violence. She didn't mention that things were so terrible at home she couldn't stand to stay, she looked so forward to coming to America. She cried. She missed her home. She missed her relatives that were there. Break your heart. One of the most beautiful little girls I have ever seen. It is a wonder she didn't get drawn into sex trafficking. She was a gorgeous little girl. And I know beautiful girls. My wife and I have had three.

Border Patrolmen have talked about, and it has been reported, dead children. Their bodies have been found, one washed up. As this administration continues to lure people into America, that has now been admitted by this administration, that the President's own amnesty bill that he pronounced into law has been luring people up here. Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson admitted that in an op-ed that he wrote for Spanish-language newspapers. It is time to stop luring young children and adults into the United States into the arms of human traffickers. It is time to stop.

Of course, I mention there is one way that we could stop very quickly the massive invasion that is going on because the ability to stop an invasion like we are seeing now was even anticipated by our Founders, and they put it in the third clause of section 10 of article I of our Constitution. That says:

> No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact which another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded.

Not by a foreign army, it doesn't say that; not by a military, it doesn't say that; just invaded. And there is a great law review article from a Michigan law journal that discusses this provision. It has not been utilized before. There are no cases that we can find that have utilized this. But perhaps it is time to use it now.

But it says, unless actually invaded or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

The Attorney General himself has said the threat of another terrorist attack is scarier now than it has been. And we know that there is an increased number of what are called SIAs, those who would be special interest aliens that come from countries like Syria, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. They are coming in from nations where there are leaders who want to destroy us.

It is worth trying to make sure we don't have terrorists coming through our southern border because we know there are lots of people coming through that don't get caught. Even though, as one of the border patrolmen said here when I was down there: It is interesting—we used to chase them, and now they chase us. Talking about people coming in illegally.

But not all of them chase the Border Patrol. If someone is paid megabucks to be brought into the United States, it can be done, while Border Patrol is spending an hour, hour and a half processing a massive number of groups coming in, 10, 12, 16, 18, 27, and they are having to process all those, and we have such a limited number of border patrolmen, plenty of opportunities to bring in anybody the drug cartels have been paid to bring in with whatever they are bringing.

So we have a resolution. It hasn't been filed yet, but it says:

> Whereas this provision in the Constitution, therefore, recognizes the continued right of individual States to use force in self-defense if ''actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay'';

And whereas an unprecedented, organized, mass invasion of the United States is occurring along our southern border;

Whereas before this invasion Marine Corps General John Kelly, commander of the U.S. Southern Command, or SOUTHCOM, in testimony before committees in each House of Congress, the House Armed Services Committee in

February, and the Senate Armed Services Committee in March, warned of the security threats to the United States from criminal networks and terrorist organizations penetrating the United States through our southern border and since the invasion he has warned that the situation poses ''an existential threat to the United States'';

□ 2145

This general who has been overseeing our military in our southern area says that the threat to our country is a threat to our very existence. Our continued existence is at risk with what is going on at the southern border. This resolution goes on:

Whereas, credible sources have reported plans for an even larger invasion;

Whereas, between June of 2012, when the Obama administration unilaterally implemented the Deferred Action For Childhood Arrivals (DACA) through March of 2014, approximately 550,000 illegal aliens received temporary deferred action, according to USCIS;

Whereas, Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson admitted that DACA was in fact luring people to cross the U.S. border, whether they were eligible for the deferred action or not, in an opinion editorial he wrote for Spanish-language newspapers;

Whereas, a court order signed on December 13, 2013, by U.S. District Judge Andrew S. Hanen of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas found as factual that ''The DHS, instead of enforcing our border security laws, actually assisted the criminal conspiracy in achieving its illegal goals.'' The U.S. Court also found that a private citizen doing the exact things that DHS is doing ''would, and should, be prosecuted for this conduct.'' Additionally, the Court found that ''The DHS has simply chosen not to enforce the United States' borders laws,'' and that the ''DHS is rewarding criminal conduct,'' and that ''these illegal activities help fund the illegal drug cartels which are a very real danger for both citizens of this country and Mexico'';

Whereas the State of Texas reported it has identified, between October of 2008 and April of 2014, a total of 177,588 unique criminal alien defendants booked into Texas county jails who are responsible for at least 611,234 individual criminal charges over their criminal careers, including 2,993 homicides and 7,695 sexual assaults;

Think about that, Mr. Speaker: 177,588 criminal aliens booked for crimes in Texas. People are being killed in America and specifically, according to these figures, 2,993 that we know of by criminal aliens in this country. And they have committed at least 7,695 sexual assaults.

You want to talk about a war on women, this administration will not defend the women of America from criminal aliens by the thousands and hundreds of thousands. Well, we know thousands, and we know people are coming in by the hundreds of thousands illegally, and this administration wants to talk about other people having a war on women when they will not defend the women that are being sexually assaulted by illegal aliens in this country. In Texas alone, we know of 7,695 such assaults:

Whereas the Department of Homeland Security, through the General Services Administration, issued a solicitation in January, 2014, which proves the falsity of statements by officials in that Department, that they had no knowledge that this mass invasion would occur;

Whereas in 2014 there has occurred a sharp increase in the number of Special Interest Aliens apprehended illegally crossing the United States border, being from terrorist-sponsored or affiliated countries such as Syria, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nigeria, and Somalia;

Whereas Attorney General Eric Holder acknowledged in an ABC news story in July of 2014 that there exists a clear and present danger of imminent terrorist attack from ''a situation that we can see developing'' and ''more frightening than anything I think I have seen as Attorney General'';

Whereas the Commander in Chief of the United States appears to be either unwilling or unable to exercise his constitutional responsibility to defend this country from imminent danger or invasion;

Resolved, it is the sense of the House of Representatives that all Governors of the States along the southern border, and other States willing to assist them, are urged to exercise the right of self-defense against invasion or imminent danger as will not admit of delay as provided for in article I, section 10 of the United States Constitution.

Some would say, How would you pay for that?

Well, how about for one thing we eliminate the child tax credit for people who are here illegally that are getting back much more, many thousands more dollars, than they actually pay in?

How about—and we are told a hundred billion or so is sent by people who are illegally in this country to their home country—how about, for allowing people to be here illegally, we put a 5 percent tax on that $100 billion going out of this country? We could pay for whatever we need very quickly.

Well, we have a bill that has been filed. It has gotten a lot of acclaim, and in the remaining minutes I would just like to look at some of this bill that my good friend, Senator JOHN CORNYN, and my good friend, HENRY CUELLAR, a fellow House Member, have filed. We have a copy of what is being proposed. It has been sent to different folks on Capitol Hill. And it does, at page 2, take a shot at changing the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008. It makes a shot at fixing that. How ironic that Wilberforce, the champion of ending slavery in all of the British Empire, had this bill named for him that was supposed to help stop sexual trafficking, but as a result of this bill and the President's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, as a result of that bill countless children have been lured into sexual slavery.

We can't even be told a number, but we are told that it is definitely happening. As the drug cartels are paid to humanly traffic people up, they find people who would make attractive sex slaves, and so an effort to stop sexual trafficking has actually helped create more. But anyway, the first few pages deal with that.

It does say on page 4 that such person may not be placed, talking about unaccompanied children—which, by the way, having been to the border a number of times, it is clear to me there is no child coming across the border unaccompanied unless they are teenagers. The children you see are accompanied by somebody. And even if the coyote leaves them right before they go into the custody of Border Patrol, they were accompanied right up until that time. But unaccompanied minors under this proposed new bill may not be placed in the custody of a nongovernmental sponsor or otherwise released from the custody of the United States Government until the child is repatriated unless the child is the subject of an order under section 235(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

It goes on, the next section, 102, defines the term ''asylum officer,'' which means an immigration officer, and it puts some pretty tough conditions, including has had substantial experience adjudicating asylum applications. So that means we are going to have to have people who have been doing this a lot. You couldn't have fair judges sent there if they haven't had substantial experience adjudicating asylum applications. That seems a little unnecessary.

Anyway, then it sets deadlines, 7 days and 72 hours shall issue an order, but then it does indicate if it is impractical by reason of an alien's mental incompetency for the alien to be present, the Attorney General shall prescribe safeguards to protect the rights and privileges of the alien. The alien shall be given the privilege of being represented at no expense to the government, shall have a reasonable opportunity to examine evidence, present evidence, and cross-examine witnesses.

On page 8 is Withdrawal of Application for Admission. In the discretion of the Attorney General—and that is the guy that hasn't been enforcing the law as it is, who is currently in contempt of Congress, who has been obfuscating on Fast and Furious and on other serious crises in our government, has at least been complicit in failing to bring forth evidence and to prosecute people timely, including the IRS scandal, and now we are going to give him a lot of discretion here, that is a matter of concern.

Anyway, it says based on a preponderance of the evidence, the judge has got to find that the alien is likely to be eligible for any form of relief of removal. Anyway, basically what it is saying is that in general, an applicant for admission must establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the alien is likely to be eligible for any form of relief from removal. So if they just say, well, there is a good chance we are likely to be eligible, not that we are going to prevail, but it is just likely we are going to be eligible, then they get to go around that requirement.

If an immigration judge determines that the unaccompanied alien child has

not met the burden of proof required under the subsection, the judge shall order the alien removed unless the alien claims an intention to apply for asylum or that the alien has a fear of persecution. So we have some rigorous steps in here in this bill, and they will be ordered to be removed, unless, of course, if the alien claims an intention to apply for asylum or a fear of persecution. Well, that lets him sidestep some of those requirements.

Page 11, if the officer determines credible fear of persecution, the alien shall be held in the custody of the Secretary for Health and Human Services. Really, I thought that had been one of the problems created by prior law, of giving custody to Health and Human Services. For heaven's sake, let's leave custody with the people dealing with the immigration issues. Let's leave it in Homeland Security. Let's not be transferring people to another department because we have seen what HHS does. They transfer them all over the country, and there are consequences there because now we find out that under a HUD requirement, those people may be eligible for housing which will allow the government to rezone your neighborhood.

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

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 15, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 1813. To redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, as the ''Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin, Jr., Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1376. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the ''Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building''.

H.R. 255. To amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 272. To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the ''Major General William H. Gourley VA–DOD Outpatient Clinic''

H.R. 291. To provide for the conveyance of certain cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota.

H.R. 330. To designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

H.R. 507. To provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes.

H.R. 876. To authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1158. To direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

H.R. 1216. To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Vet Center in Prescott, Arizona, as the ''Dr. Cameron McKinley Department of Veterans Affairs Veterans Center''.

H.R. 2337. To provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado.

H.R. 3110. To allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska.

H.R. 803. 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.

H.R. 356. To clarify authority granted under the Act entitled 'An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes'.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 16, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6399. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael R. Moeller, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6400. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter notifying that the Department intends to assign women to previously closed positions in the United States Army Special Operations Command; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6401. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting Annual Report on the Activities of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC) for 2013 to the Committee on Armed Services.

6402. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Limitation on Allowable Government Contractor Compensation Costs [FAC 2005-75; FAR Case 2014-012; Item III; Docket 2014-0012, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM75) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6403. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; EPEAT Items [FAC 2005-75; FAR Case 2013-016; Item I; Docket 2013-0016, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM71) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6404. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contracting with Women-Owned Small Business Concerns [FAC 2005-75; FAR Case 2013-010; Item II; Docket 2013-0010, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM59) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6405. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-75; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAC 2014-0052, Sequence 3] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6406. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-75; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR Case 2014-0051, Sequence No. 3] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6407. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report on the operations of the Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) for Fiscal Year 2013, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 5302(c)(2); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6408. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Anti-Doping Agency, transmitting the Agency's 2013 Annual Report and Financial Audit; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6409. 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; Illinois; Revision to the Chicago 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0274; FRL-9912-57-Region 5] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6410. 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; Maine and New Hampshire; Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0733; EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0935; A-1-FRL-9911-51-Region-1] June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6411. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for North Carolina: State Implementation Plan Miscellaneous Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-0602; FRL-9912-83-Region 4] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6412. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Nitrogen Oxide Combustion Turbine Alternative Control Requirements for the Milwaukee-Racine Former Nonattainment Area [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0206; FRL-9912-56-Region 5] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6413. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; Listing of Trustee Designations [FRL-9739-9-OW] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6414. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oklahoma: Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0461; FRL-9911-76-Region 6] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6415. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0336; FRL-9912-64-Region 9] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6416. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania Portable Fuel Container Amendment of Pennsylvania State Implementation Plan [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0298; FRL-9912-21-Region 3] received June 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6417. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Nevada; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [NV 126-NBK; FRL-9908-86-Region 9] received June 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6418. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval and Partial Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Dakota; Revisions to South Dakota Administrative Code; Permit: New and Modified Sources [EPA-R08-OAR-2014-0241; FRL-9912-24-Region 8] received June 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6419. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Exemption of Certain Chemical Substances from Reporting Additional Chemical Data [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2012-0221; FRL-9910-84] (RIN: 2070-AK01) received June 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6420. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Modification of Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances; Update of Chemical Identities [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0276; FRL-9910-51] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6421. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 14-21, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6422. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 14-30, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6423. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6424. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor that was declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6425. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6426. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6427. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6428. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, transmitting the 2013 Statements on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6429. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled ''District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2014 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals thorough the 2nd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6430. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification that the Department issued payments to eligible local governments under the Payments In Lieu of Taxes (PILT) Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6431. A letter from the Chief, FWS Endangered Species Listing Branch, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for Ivesia webberi [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2013-0079] (RIN: 1018-AZ12) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6432. A letter from the Chief, FWS Endangered Species Listing Branch, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Ivesia webberi [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2013-0080] (RIN: 1018-AZ57) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6433. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery Off the Atlantic States; Amendment 5 [Docket No.: 130403322-4454-02] (RIN: 0648-BD08) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6434. A letter from the President, National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, transmitting the 2013 Annual Report of an independent auditor who has audited the records of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4514; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6435. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of action taken to extend the ''Memorandum of Understanding Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Archaeological Material from Cambodia from the Bronze Age Through the Khmer Era''; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6436. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ''Part D Plans Generally Include Drugs Commonly Used by Dual Eligibles: 2014''; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

6437. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-502, ''Transfer of Jurisdiction Over Lot 802, Square 4325 within Fort Lincoln New Town Emergency Approval Resolution of 2014''; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Oversight and Government Reform.

6438. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests be enacted during the second session of the 113th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, Science, Space, and Technology, the Judiciary, Rules, Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 670. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions for food inventory (Rept. 113–522). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. COLE, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 5107. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reduce the fuel economy obligations of automobile manufacturers whose fleets contain at least 50 percent fuel choice enabling vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 5108. A bill to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. CHU, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. HAHN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. NUNES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BASS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 5109. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1048 West Robinhood Drive in Stockton, California, as the ''W. Ronald Coale Memorial Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GARDNER):

H.R. 5110. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal rebasing of payments for home health services, as required under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and to replace such rebasing with a Medicare home health value-based purchasing program, and for other purposes; 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 Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 5111. A bill to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 5112. A bill to provide eligibility for veterans benefits for individuals who served in the United States merchant marine in the Southeast Asia theater of operations during the Vietnam Era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 5113. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to end the increased Federal funding for Medicaid expansion with respect to inmates' hospital care under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, to apply the savings towards a 2015 Medicare Advantage stabilization program to help protect seniors' choices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 5114. A bill to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, Armed Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCALLISTER:

H.R. 5115. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 5116. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 5117. A bill to make competitive awards to national estuary programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LONG, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 5118. A bill to direct the Attorney General to report to Congress on the numbers of aliens unlawfully present in the United States who appear and fail to appear before immigration judges for proceedings under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 2014 AT PAGE H5597 MEMORIALS

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 106 urging the President and the Secretary of State to use every opportunity and resource at their disposal to end the unjust imprisonment of Saeed Abedini; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 5107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 5108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 5110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the commerce clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The SAVE Medicare Home Health Act repeals the rebasing cuts to home health services contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. These cuts restrict patient access to home health services and reduce patient-centered control of health care decisions. By removing these cuts, the bill removes government intrusion into the doctor-patient relationship, which is protected by the 9th and 10th Amendments to the Constitution.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 5111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP OF GEORGIA:

H.R. 5112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce clause

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution

This states that ''Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 5114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. MCALLISTER:

H.R. 5115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIII

Section 1, ''Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.''

Section 2, ''Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.''

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 5118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 4, (authorizing Congress "To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization . . .").

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 303: Mr. FORBES, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 333: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 543: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 690: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 795: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 800: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 842: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 988: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 996: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 997: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1179: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1250: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1328: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1354: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1462: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 1515: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1518: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KIND, and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1555: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1556: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1563: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1573: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1696: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1795: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 1878: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1893: Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2013: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 2116: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2355: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2398: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2453: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2457: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2468: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2482: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2529: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2673: Mr. HARPER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2780: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2902: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2959: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 2990: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3097: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3116: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3322: Ms. WATERS and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3461: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3482: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3486: Mr. MESSER and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 3494: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3665: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3680: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MENG, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3722: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3732: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 3742: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3867: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 3899: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3970: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3991: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 3994: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 4103: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4143: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4156: Ms. Frankel of Florida, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4158: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 4250: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 4252: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 4271: Mr. CLAY and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4305: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4325: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 4351: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 4365: Mr. UPTON and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4385: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4389: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 4426: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4449: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 4450: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 4456: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4466: Mr. MCALLISTER.
H.R. 4510: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4515: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 4521: Mr. JONES, Mr. HARPER, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 4546: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 4566: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 4567: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 4578: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4582: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 4594: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4612: Mr. MESSER and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 4651: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 4698: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 4709: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 4741: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 4761: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4808: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4836: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 4837: Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 4841: Mr. POLIS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4854: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4857: Mr. SCHOCK
H.R. 4867: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 4871: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 4886: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 4906: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 4930: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4960: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 4961: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 4969: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4979: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4980: Mr. WAGNER, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. BASS, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 4985: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4986: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4989: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. HARTZLER.
H.R. 4991: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 5005: Mr. POLIS, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5007: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ENYART, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 5009: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5010: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 5024: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 5026: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 5034: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 5051: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 5053: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 5059: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ENYART, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. COOK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 5060: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 5077: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BARR, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 5083: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 5084: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5089: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MICA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.J. Res. 118: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Ms. JENKINS.
H.J. Res. 119: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BEATTY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BUSTOS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. LOWEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. LYNCH.
H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ESCHOO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. HONDA.
H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. LUCAS.
H. Res. 477: Mr. HIMES.
H. Res. 612: Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 620: Mr. BARROW of Georgia and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H. Res. 622: Mr. JORDAN.
H. Res. 623: Mr. CLAY.
H. Res. 644: Mr. KLINE, Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 665: Mr. COLE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LONG and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H. Res. 667: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. LEE of California.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

H.R. 5021 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 or rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:.

SEC. ____. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide funds from the Hardest Hit Fund program established by the Secretary of the Treasury under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5211 et seq.) to any State or local government for the purpose of funding pension obligations of such State or local government.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 12: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

AMENDMENT NO. 13: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''National Security Council and Homeland Security Council—Salaries and Expenses'' for the National Security Council is hereby reduced by $4,200,000.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MR. MARINO

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to collect any underpayment of any tax imposed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to the extent such underpayment is attributable to the taxpayer's loss of records (except in the case of fraud).

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MR. MASSIE

AMENDMENT NO. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act, including amounts made available under titles IV or VIII, may be used by any authority of the government of the District of Columbia to prohibit the ability of any person to possess, acquire, use, sell, or transport a firearm except to the extent such activity is prohibited by Federal law.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 16: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce final leasing accounting standard rules, regulations, or requirements in FASB Project 2013-270, Accounting Standards Update Topic 842.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MS. SCHAKOWSKY

AMENDMENT NO. 17: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: S6201

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term ''Fair Labor Standards Act.''.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT NO. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Office of Personnel Management may be used to process or pay any annuity payment under chapter 83 or 84 of title 5, United States Code, to a former Federal employee with respect to whom the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives has certified a statement of facts to a United States attorney under section 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 194).

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 15, 2014 No. 110

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we wait expectantly for You to bring order from our world's chaos. Empower our lawmakers today to contribute harmony to our Nation and world by living with purity. Make their thoughts and desires so pure that they can bear Your scrutiny. Make their words so pure that You delight to hear them. Make their deeds so pure that You find joy in seeing them. And because of their pure thoughts, desires, words, and deeds, may our Senators possess such pure hearts that they will see You.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH FROM CORPORATE INTERFERENCE ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 459, S. 2578, the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 459, S. 2578, a bill to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, there will be a period of morning business until 12 noon today, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. The majority will control the first half, the Republicans the final half.

At 12 noon today the Senate will proceed to executive session and to a series of two rollcall votes on the following nominations: cloture on Norman C. Bay to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and cloture on Cheryl A. LaFleur to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Following the second vote, the Senate will recess until 2:15 p.m. to allow for our weekly caucus meetings. If cloture is invoked on either of the nominations, the time from 2:15 p.m. until 3 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. At 3 p.m., the Senate will proceed to vote on confirmation of the two nominations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2599 AND H.R. 4718

Mr. President, it is my understanding that there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2599) to stop exploitation through trafficking.

A bill (H.R. 4718) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to both of these bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will be placed on the calendar.

FERC NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, later today, as I have just mentioned, the Senate will hold two rollcall votes to confirm nominations to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission—Norman Bay and Cheryl LaFleur.

I am aware of the important nature of these two nominations, and I realize that their confirmations have significant consequences.

Upon her confirmation, Cheryl LaFleur will remain at the FERC as chair for 9 months. Following that period of time, Norman Bay will then assume the position of FERC chair.

I appreciate very much the work done by a number of Senators to get us to the point where we are. The chair of the energy committee, Senator MARY LANDRIEU, has done really hard work, and it has been a bipartisan effort to move these nominations forward.

I have been assured by both nominees that the issue which the Wall Street Journal editorialized about yesterday—and they called it ''the federal takeover of New York's electric grid''—will be addressed. I have spoken to both nominees, and they will take a hard look at that. When it came out yesterday, I directed attention to that, and that will be addressed by both of them, and they have said so.

HOBBY LOBBY DECISION

Mr. President, last week my friend, the Republican leader, essentially declared victory for American women in their struggle for equality by saying:

We've come a long way in pay equity and there are a ton of women CEO's now running major companies. . . . I could be wrong, but I think most of the barriers [for American women] have been lowered.

The Republican leader seems to be suggesting the obstacles preventing women from receiving equal treatment under the law have been conquered—the struggle for equality for women is over.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

The only things missing from the Republican leader's declaration would be an aircraft carrier and a large ''MISSION ACCOMPLISHED'' sign hanging in the background. We all remember that. Remember, that was President Bush declaring the war in Iraq was basically over. Well, it was not. And the war regarding women is not over.

The Republican leader suggested that the notion of ensuring equal rights for American women is tantamount to ''preferential treatment.'' That was his opinion. That is as shocking as it is troubling.

The truth is, regardless of what Republicans in Congress may say, the barriers of inequality for American women are very real and very substantial. Take this as an example. There are many examples, but let's try this one: The Republican leader mentioned pay equity. American women are paid an average of 77 cents for every $1 their male colleagues make for doing the exact same work. It is not fair. But instead of working with Senate Democrats to give working women a fair shot at equal pay for equal work, Republicans refuse to even let the legislation be debated. This was one of their multitude of filibusters.

The Republican leader also spoke of the growing number of women CEOs at major companies. Now try this one on: Currently, among Fortune Magazine's listing of the 500 top companies in the world, there are 24 chief executives who are women. That is 4.8 percent of all the CEOs in the Fortune 500. If anyone believes—including my friend, the Republican leader—that fewer than 1 in 20 is good enough, this perfectly illustrates the Republicans' antiquated beliefs concerning working women and American women in general.

But perhaps the most disturbing reminder of the inequality barriers that women face is the Supreme Court's recent Hobby Lobby decision. Just a few weeks ago, five men on the U.S. Supreme Court gave corporate bosses the right to interfere with their employees' decisions about birth control.

In its Hobby Lobby decision, those five Justices ruled that for-profit companies can assert religious objections to deny their employees—who may not share their same religious views—the contraceptive coverage required by law. That is what the Court said.

The Court's decision was stunningly wrong. The Court's misguided decision effectively takes away the right of American women to decide their own health care, instead empowering boardrooms to make final decisions on their employees' access to birth control.

How is it possible that in the 21st century we are debating whether or not bosses should be able to dictate their employees' family planning? It is 2014. It is not 1906 or 1907 or 1915.

Health coverage is a form of payment or compensation for employees.

There is a strike going on in New York—they are going to start Monday, I am told—for the largest short-haul railroad. Mr. President, 300,000 people ride that every day. What is the big sticking point? It is health care. Health care is a big deal to everybody. Health care is a form of payment or compensation for employees. Should employers' religious beliefs be able to dictate how you spend your paycheck and your days off? Of course not. So why would we let bosses decide something so personal and so private as the use of contraceptives?

Last week Senators PATTY MURRAY and MARK UDALL introduced the Not My Boss's Business Act to fix the Hobby Lobby decision. This legislation would make it illegal for any company to deny their workers specific health benefits, including birth control, as required by Federal law.

The Murray-Udall bill preserves the exemption for houses of worship and the accommodation for religious nonprofits that have religious objections to contraceptive coverage.

The decision to use birth control is private—and it should be—and it should not be subject to the personal or religious beliefs of some corporate boss; otherwise, where is it going to end? As Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg stated in her dissenting opinion:

> Would the exemption . . . extend to employers with religiously grounded objections to blood transfusions; antidepressants; medications derived from pigs—

And there are medications derived from swine that help people get well—

> including anesthesia, intravenous fluids, and pills coated with gelatin; and vaccinations?

That is what Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said.

As Justice Ginsburg points out, the Court's decision is a very, very slippery slope. It opens the door to endless possibilities in which corporate boardrooms trump employees' health coverage.

That is why I support this bill, which clearly establishes a woman's right to quality health care. By passing the Not My Boss's Business Act, the U.S. Senate can knock down a significant barrier to women's equality. Regardless of what Republicans in Congress will tell you, we have a long, long way to go before American women are equal in all aspects of the law, as they should be.

The bill before us is a step in the right direction. It will help undo the damage done by the Supreme Court. But, more importantly, the Not My Boss's Business Act will help ensure American women have access to the health coverage they need and deserve and should be entitled to by law.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we hear the President is planning to spend the week calling for Congress to pass highway funding legislation that Congress is already planning to pass. It seems odd for the President to be focusing so intently on something that is inevitable while ignoring other issues that really should be addressed—issues such as ObamaCare.

So many middle-class families in my State and across the country continue to suffer from the impact of this law. One thing that becomes increasingly clear with each passing day is the extent—the extent—to which ObamaCare is particularly hard on women.

Research shows that women make about 80 percent of the health care decisions for their families in our country. Yet ObamaCare has caused countless women to lose the health care plans they had and liked. When these women first spoke out about the betrayal they felt when they lost their plans, many of the law's supporters simply waved their concerns away or said they were making it up. They said they were lying or that their plans were ''junk''—because, of course, the critics knew better. It is a pattern that seems to have continued ever since.

American women also now have fewer choices of doctors and hospitals under ObamaCare. The bill's supporters have continually waived those concerns aside too.

Millions of Americans use flexible spending accounts to pay for out-of-pocket health care expenses. But ObamaCare imposes arbitrary limits on how much of a family's own hard-earned money can be set aside, and the law also prevents people who have come to depend on FSAs from using them to pay for common expenses such as allergy medicine or cold medication.

ObamaCare's cuts to Medicare Advantage and other regulatory actions could reduce the average benefit for women and men who rely on this program by more than $1,500 a year. Concerns such as these are all simply brushed aside by ObamaCare's supporters.

Washington should also be looking for ways to grow economic opportunities for women, but ObamaCare, of course, does just the opposite. I have heard from businesses large and small in Kentucky that fear they will not be able to cope with the higher costs of coverage under ObamaCare. They do not want to cut hours for their staffs or eliminate jobs, but many may no longer really have a choice.

Many of them are worried about new mandates that place millions of Americans—nearly two-thirds of them women—at risk of having their hours and wages reduced. One of my constituents from Somerset recently wrote to tell me what this new ObamaCare mandate has meant for her.

> I'm employed at a major chain putting these rules into effect now. This is causing us to lose up to eleven hours per week averaging $440.00 . . . [less] per month less in wages. Obamacare [is] causing us to lose hours [and] lose wages, yet expecting us to spend more.

Let me repeat that. She says ObamaCare is causing her to lose hundreds of dollars a month in lost wages and at the same time causing health

care costs to skyrocket. This is simply not right.

Yet despite these terrible stories that keep pouring into our offices, the people who supported this law when it passed continue to defend it now. We kept warning them that ObamaCare would hurt jobs and increase costs. They had to know ObamaCare was going to reduce choices for women and limit their access to certain doctors and hospitals. But Washington Democrats voted for ObamaCare anyway. They created these problems. That is why they should be working with Republicans now to start over with real, patient-centered reform that lowers costs and that women and men in this country actually want, but of course they refuse. They are just doubling down on ObamaCare.

Now they are trying to convince people of another untruth—that somehow it is not possible to preserve our Nation's long tradition of tolerance and respect for people of faith while at the same time preserving a woman's ability to make her own decisions about contraception. Washington Democrats are doing this based on a claim that, in the words of the Washington Post's nonpartisan Fact Checker, is ''simply wrong''

I realize Democrats may think the best way to keep people from focusing on the impact of ObamaCare on middle-class families is to just make things up and to attempt to divide us. Well, I think that is a shame. It takes a pretty dim view of what we are capable of as a country. The goal here should not be to protect the freedoms of some while denying the freedoms of others; the goal here and always should be to preserve everybody's freedoms. We can do both. That is just what a number of us on this side are proposing to do this week. Instead of restricting Americans' religious freedoms, we should preserve a woman's ability to make contraceptive decisions for herself. That is why we plan to introduce legislation this week that says no employer can block any employee from legal access to her FDA-approved contraceptives. There is no disagreement on that fundamental point. The American people know that. They know Democrats are just attempting to offer another false choice. What we are saying is that of course you can support both religious freedom and access to contraception.

Look, if Washington Democrats really wanted to help women, they would work with us to do so. We have been imploring them to work with us to deliver relief to middle-class women for years now, to work with us on a new approach to the health care law that is hurting millions of American women. It is not too late. Work with us to increase jobs, wages, and opportunity at a time when American women are experiencing so much hardship as a result of this administration's policies—especially ObamaCare.

BAY NOMINATION

I would like to voice my opposition to the nomination of Norman Bay to be a Commissioner of and eventually lead the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC. I fail to see what qualifies Mr. Bay to be Chairman of the Commission, especially when the Acting Chair of FERC, whom he would displace, is much more qualified to hold the position. Unlike most FERC Commissioners in the last decade, he has never served as a State utility regulator, he has never served on the Commission and does not possess the background in policy areas that FERC is charged with overseeing.

In contrast to Mr. Bay, the current Acting Chair of FERC, Cheryl LaFleur, is much more qualified to hold the Chair position. Ms. LaFleur came to FERC with more than two decades of experience in the electric and natural gas industries, including roles as chief operating officer, general counsel, and acting CEO of National Grid USA and its predecessor. I find it shameful that this administration would seek to displace a well-qualified woman in favor of a male nominee with less experience.

More importantly and of utmost concern to my home State, there are factors that lead us to believe Mr. Bay would reliably serve as a rubberstamp for this administration's extreme anticoal agenda. This agenda harms the people of Kentucky and is one I most strenuously oppose.

As the current head of FERC's enforcement office, he has shown a history of targeting carbon-intensive businesses. Who is to say that if installed as the next head of FERC, he will not come after Kentucky businesses relying on the coal industry for electricity, which is 90 percent of my State.

Moreover, during his testimony before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee this past May, Bay cited his home State of New Mexico as an example of a real-life ''all of the above'' approach to energy. He mentioned his State's reliance on solar, wind, oil, and gas for its energy mix. Notably left out of this supposed ''all of the above'' approach, however, was any mention of coal—which, by the way, provides 70 percent of the electricity in New Mexico.

For all of these reasons—because he is not qualified, because he holds an anticoal agenda, and because he will be only too willing to implement this administration's anticoal policy—I will be opposing Norman Bay's nomination to FERC. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12 noon, with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

NOT MY BOSS'S BUSINESS ACT

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the repercussions of the Supreme Court's misguided Hobby Lobby decision which allows employers to refuse to cover contraception as a part of their employees' health plans under the false pretense that corporations can not only have religious beliefs but they can impose those beliefs on their employees.

Several days ago I was home in the great State of Colorado. I stood shoulder to shoulder with experts in women's health care who joined me to highlight how the Hobby Lobby decision is already negatively affecting women in our State.

One Denver-based OB–GYN explained how physicians might now have to consider an employer's religious beliefs when making medical recommendations. She said the Court's decision fundamentally interferes with health care decisions that should be based solely on a patient's well-being.

Because of the Supreme Court's 5-to-4 decision, women across America are now facing the uncertainty that their bosses may restrict the health care benefits Federal law currently secures for them.

Birth control has been deemed an essential preventive health service by a nonpartisan independent group of doctors and other medical experts. Ninety-nine percent of American women have used birth control at some point in their lives. They use it for a variety of health reasons. In fact, just hours after Senator MURRAY and I introduced legislation in response to the Hobby Lobby decision, a Colorado mother called my office to share the story of how her college-age daughter was suffering from a health condition that was so debilitating that it kept her from attending class or really participating in any activities at school. As a result, her doctor prescribed a form of birth control that ended up managing her symptoms and getting her back on track. This Colorado mother wanted to make sure I knew that access to contraception is not just about birth control and that if her employer took away the contraception coverage in her family's health plan, her daughter would not have coverage for a medically necessary treatment.

Regardless of why women take birth control, none of those reasons have any connection to how they do their jobs. Their bosses have no business interfering in those decisions. But with the Court's ruling in Hobby Lobby, corporations and CEOs have been handed

the right to play the role of gatekeeper for what kind of health care employees and their families can access as a part of their health insurance plan. That is not acceptable to Coloradans.

I have heard the arguments from those who say the Supreme Court's decision narrowly protects religious freedom. I think we can all agree that where religious freedoms are being threatened, we as Americans have a duty to act swiftly to address it. But the fact is that actual religious institutions are already exempt from requirements that run contrary to their beliefs. Remember, the men and women who went to work for Hobby Lobby signed up to work at a craft store, not a religious organization.

This decision, in the words of Justice Ginsburg, is one of startling breadth. In the Hobby Lobby majority opinion, the Supreme Court said its decision only applied to ''closely held'' corporations, but up to 90 percent of American companies are considered closely held and over half of Americans work for a closely held company. To call this decision ''narrow'' is as wrong as the reasoning behind it.

Contrary to what supporters of the decision are saying, this is just not about contraceptives. We have been warned by legal experts, including Justice Ginsburg and the other three Justices who joined in her dissent, that this decision could lead to employers discriminating against women, minority groups, and others because a company's owner may object to any number of medications or procedures, such as vaccines or HIV treatment.

Just over 2 short weeks ago, before the Hobby Lobby decision, workers knew exactly what health services they had access to under their health plans. They did not need to be labor lawyers to figure out which benefits they would receive, which benefits they might be at risk of losing, or how much more they would have to pay out of pocket for prescription drugs or other critical health treatments. However, with the Hobby Lobby case, that has all changed.

Supporters of the Hobby Lobby decision want women to believe this is not a big deal. But let me be clear. This has the potential to change health coverage for millions of women. I am not—along with millions of Americans—going to stand for this kind of discrimination. I trust women to make their own health care decisions. I do not believe their employers should have a say in that. Through their hard work and insurance premiums, women have earned and already paid for coverage that includes copay-free contraception under Federal law. Health insurance is a part of their compensation packages. There is nothing free about it; they have earned it.

Not only does this case wedge bosses into private health care decisions, it unfairly burdens hard-working women, ignoring the fact that contraception can be crucial to women and families' economic success. The ability to decide when, how, and with whom to have a family is critical to the health and economic security of women and their families.

The Supreme Court even stated this in its opinion in Planned Parenthood v. Casey in 1992. I wish to quote the Supreme Court from 1992:

> The ability of women to participate equally in the economic and social life of the Nation has been facilitated by their ability to control their reproductive lives.

That is what the Court said in 1992.

Today many employees are left wondering if that economic freedom is in jeopardy. Women are left to ask their bosses whether they will continue to cover their birth control—a topic of conversation which women should never be forced to bring up at work, an issue which is certainly not a boss's business.

Throughout my time in Congress I have long believed we all have the fundamental right to live our lives as we choose, free from needless intrusion, whether by the government, by bureaucrats, or by corporations and CEOs, and certainly free from intrusion by politicians. Indeed, a women should be free to make her own health decisions based on what is right for her and her family, not according to her employer's religious beliefs.

So the reason I am standing here today is to make very clear that this type of intrusion will not stand. I am proud to lead the effort with Senator MURRAY to ensure that employers cannot refuse to cover health services guaranteed to women under Federal law.

Our bill, the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act, would restore a woman's power to make personal health care decisions based on what is best for her and her family, free from corporate interference. I invite my colleagues of both parties to join this effort, and I thank my colleagues who will stand with Senator MURRAY and me this week to say: Women's health care is not your boss's business.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to join with the senior Senator from Colorado, and I thank him for his excellent statement and leadership on this issue as we kick off this important debate on our bill, the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act, or, as we just heard, the ''Not My Boss's Business Act.''

I start off by asking our colleagues a few basic questions: First of all, who should be in charge of a woman's health care decisions? Should it be the woman making those decisions with her partner, her doctor, and her faith or should it be her boss making those decisions for her based on his own religious beliefs?

To me and to the vast majority of the people across the country, the answer to that question is obvious: Women should call the shots when it comes to their health care decisions—not their boss, not the government, not anyone else, period. But we are here because five men on the Supreme Court disagreed.

Five men on the Supreme Court decided there should be a group of women across America who are required to ask their boss for permission to access basic health care. Five men on the Supreme Court decided a corporation should have more rights than the women it employs. Five men on the Supreme Court rolled back the clock on women across America, and we are here today because we cannot allow that to stand. People across the country think the Supreme Court was dead wrong on this decision, and we are here to be their voice.

When we passed health care reform, we made sure every woman has access to basic health care, including contraception, which is used or will be used by 99 percent of the women in this country. When 58 percent of women use birth control for purposes other than pregnancy prevention—including managing endometriosis, ovarian cysts, and other medical conditions—we know this provision could have a sweeping impact on women across our country. In fact, according to the Department of Health and Human Services, 30 million women nationally are already eligible for this benefit, and when the law is fully implemented, 47 million women nationally will have access to no-pay birth control, thanks to the Affordable Care Act. By the way, thanks to this benefit, women have already saved $483 million, and that is just in the last year alone.

Contraception was included as a required preventive service in the Affordable Care Act on the recommendation of the independent nonprofit Institute of Medicine and other medical experts because it is essential to the health of women and families. After many years of research, we know ensuring access to effective birth control has a direct impact on improving the lives of women and their families in America. It is directly linked to declines in maternal and infant mortality, to reduced risk of ovarian cancer, to better health outcomes for women and, by the way, far fewer unintended pregnancies and abortions, which is a goal we all should share.

We should all know improving access to birth control is a good health care policy and it is good economic policy. We know it will mean healthier women, healthier children, and healthier families, and we know it will save money for businesses and consumers. But with their ruling, setting a potential dangerous precedent, the Supreme Court has not only inserted a woman's boss into her health care decisions, in many cases they have given him the final word.

In the aftermath of this decision, women across America are turning to

Congress and demanding we fix this. And by the way it is not just women who want Congress to act. People across the country understand, if bosses can deny birth control, then they can deny vaccines or HIV treatment or other basic health care services for employees and for their dependents. I think what men across America understand is it is not just the female employees who are impacted, it is their wives and their daughters who are on their health care plan as well.

As the ink was still drying on Justice Alito's misguided opinion in this case, I made an unwavering commitment to do everything I could to protect women's access to health care since the five male Justices of the Supreme Court decided they would not. That is why I have been working with my partner, the senior Senator from Colorado, to introduce this bill, and I am proud that in the many days since then we have received such strong support from people across the country.

Our straightforward and simple legislation will ensure that no CEO or corporation can come between people and their guaranteed access to health care, period.

This shouldn't be a controversial issue. The only controversy about birth control is the fact that it is 2014 and women across America are still fighting for this basic health care.

The data is clear. Ensuring access to contraceptive coverage isn't just the right thing to do, it is a critical part of making sure women and their families have a fair shot. In the 21st century, women and their families shouldn't be held back by outdated policies and unfair practices.

Again, it is not just about access to contraception. This includes pay equity, access to childcare, higher minimum wage, and it absolutely includes the right to make their own medical and religious decisions without being dictated to or limited by their employer.

The bottom line is this: Women use birth control for a host of reasons, none of which should require a permission slip from their boss.

I thank Leader REID for moving this bill to the floor so quickly and for his commitment to getting this done because women across the country are expecting action. They do not want to wait. As we move forward on this bill this week, I hope enough Republicans can put proven science over their partisan politics and join us and revoke this Court-issued license to discriminate and return the right of Americans to make their own decisions about their own health care and their own bodies.

I thank Senator UDALL once again for his work with me on this commonsense and bicameral legislation. I also thank the Members of the House Pro-Choice Caucus who introduced their companion legislation in the House, and I sincerely hope our Republican colleagues on both sides of the Capitol will join us. For those who don't, for those Republicans who have already said they oppose our legislation, I am interested in hearing their answer to the question I posed a few minutes ago: Do they think bosses should be in charge of a woman's health care decision? Do they think women should have to ask their boss permission for health care used by 99 percent of the women? Do they think we as a country should start down the path where CEOs and corporations can start making decisions for all kinds of health care for their employees?

Women across the country will be watching this debate, and I think they will be very interested in seeing who is on their side.

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. BOOKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). No objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I rise to support the ''Not My Boss's Business Act,'' which will help to fix the recent Supreme Court Hobby Lobby decision by making it illegal for a company to deny their workers specific health care benefits, including birth control, as is required to be covered by Federal law.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill which is necessary to ensure that all women have access to preventive care.

I wish to say, on a personal note, I was a young child growing up in a household with a working mother. Mom worked for a big corporation and worked in human resources. My table would often be one where it was discussed that my mother was dealing with challenges of racial discrimination, challenges of sexism in the workplace. I watched how my mother, in human resources, would fight to make sure that we as a nation, as well as this particular corporation, continued to advance in fairly treating all of its employees. I was proud to watch my mother assert her independence, her freedoms, and her basic sense of equity, which resonates with the highest values of this Nation.

What is frustrating to me now is here we stand in 2014, and we seem to be fighting so many battles and advancements we won before that are still needing to be fought.

It is unthinkable to me that as we should be turning our focus toward other things such as paid family leave or raising the minimum wage, here we are again fighting about whether women should have the right to have access to birth control. This is unfortunate because contraception is essential to a woman's right to make her own personal health care decisions. Birth control is not only basic to making health care decisions, but it is one in which 99 percent of women avail themselves. Throughout their lifetime we will see 99 percent of American women avail themselves of birth control.

These women should not be forced to decide between contraception and a tank of gas or between contraception and meals for their family, contraception and paying rent.

The Hobby Lobby decision, if you think about it, is imposing the will of a corporation—one corporation's board member's religious beliefs or what-have-you can be imposed such that it would cost women who now want to exercise their freedom up to $1,000 a year. For minimum-wage or low-wage workers, the out-of-pocket cost for birth control each month is a real and substantive financial burden.

Let's be clear. Workers have insurance coverage through their labor. It is part of their earned pay. This is not a free giveaway. They earned this coverage. What they spend their health care coverage on is their business, not their boss's business.

I deeply value ideals of religious liberty. This is what this country was founded on. But religious liberty belongs to all of us; it does not belong to a corporation. Religious liberty means being free from having other people's religions foisted upon you, imposed upon you, or forced upon you.

Most employees would never dream of telling their bosses what they must decide and abide by in terms of religious freedom. And by that same principle, no boss should have the right to impose his religion on the people who work for him.

That is one of the reasons why so many faith leaders have spoken against the Hobby Lobby decision. It is now making it acceptable for a corporation to impose on the individual liberty of others their religious beliefs, also the financial freedom that goes along with that, and also the ability for a woman to make critical health care decisions. They might even be interfering with a doctor telling a patient what is best for them and their health.

The views held by companies' owners should not be able to interfere with this basic understanding of fundamental rights. The Not My Boss's Business Act protects workers' religious liberty by not allowing their bosses to impose this hardship, to impose their religion, and to impose what I believe ultimately comes down to discrimination.

Finally, the precedent set by this decision could open the door wider and wider for more court cases and more employers who want to deny more aspects of basic health coverage and services because they claim it conflicts with the boss's religious beliefs. From blood transfusions to vaccinations, we are now in a minefield in which we can have the destruction of religious freedom of employees and the health care freedom we have fought so hard to manifest.

The Hobby Lobby decision is a step backward that we must correct. It is a step against women's rights. It is a step against religious freedom. It is a step against workers who earn basic benefits to have the ability to make those benefits real in their lives.

The Not My Boss's Business Act will make it clear that bosses cannot discriminate. The Not My Boss's Business Act will make it clear that there should be equal treatment under the law for the tens of thousands of workers whose coverage now hangs in the balance.

A woman's health care decisions should be between that woman and her doctor. There is no room for a boss's religious beliefs in that equation, period.

I watched for decades, growing up, not only my mother but countless people fight to establish basic principles in the workplace. We cannot go back now. This is such a critical piece of legislation, to correct for the mistakes in this Supreme Court decision and assert those fundamental American ideals, that individuals should be able to make their own health care decisions, that bosses and corporations should not impose religious beliefs on others, and that we are a nation where every woman can create a sacrosanct and private relationship with her doctor and make ultimately the health care decisions that are best for her, not ones in any way influenced or affected by a corporation.

I thank again the Senate and the Presiding Officer for this time but, most importantly, I thank Senator MURRAY and other Senators who have led on this issue. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I am proud to follow my colleague from New Jersey, and I am proud to say I am a cosponsor of Senator MURRAY's bill and Senator UDALL's bill, the Udall-Murray bill, that is going to make sure we protect the health of our families.

I am going to put up a beautiful photograph of the Supreme Court where above the portico these words are inscribed: ''Equal Justice Under Law.'' We have reprinted them here. I am going to keep this for the remainder of my remarks, because I think that is the essential issue before us. Those four words are the promise of our country that every American should be treated equally, should be respected, should be honored.

I wish to note that these words don't say: Equal justice under law except for women. They don't say: Equal justice under law except for birth control. And they don't say: Equal justice under law as long as it is OK with your boss.

The beauty of this Nation is we respect each other's rights and freedoms, and we have shed blood to make sure those freedoms are protected.

Yet with this Hobby Lobby ruling, five men, who happen to be appointed by Republicans, decided that a corporation has the power to deny me or to deny you coverage of critical health care for us and for our families.

What is very upsetting to me is that they have seized on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 to justify giving for-profit companies the sweeping power to deny their employees access to affordable birth control, and we believe it will prove to be other health care benefits required under Federal law.

I speak as someone who voted for the Kennedy bill, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, that if anybody thinks Ted Kennedy wanted to deny access for birth control, then they didn't know Ted Kennedy and they didn't read at all the RECORD as we debated that bill.

I voted for the Religious Freedom Restoration Act because it was written to protect an individual's freedom of religion so that if I, as a religious individual working for a corporation, don't want to use the birth control coverage, I don't have to. But if I want to, I make that choice. If I, as an independent individual, want to vaccinate my child, it is covered under law, under the insurance. I can if I want to. No one can force me to do that.

The idea behind the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was to protect the individual, and I quote: ''Government shall not substantially burden a person's exercise of religion.''

Let me repeat: ''a person's exercise of religion.'' It doesn't say a corporation's exercise of religion, your boss's exercise of his religion. It was about protecting the individual.

What the conservative majority of the Court did 2 weeks ago turned the Religious Freedom Restoration Act on its head. As someone who supported that act, it made me angry, sad—put in the adjective. It is wrong to reinterpret what a law meant. It stood the Religious Freedom Restoration Act on its head when they ruled a corporation can put its own ideology ahead of the religious freedom and health care needs of its employees.

A female employee should be able to decide whether to use birth control. And that is not all that is at stake after the Hobby Lobby decision, because we know if you follow their logic that if a corporation can deny birth control because of a religious objection, what if they object to a blood transfusion? There are certain religions that do. Then the employee can't get a blood transfusion. And what if they object to a vaccine or HIV treatment? Then, in order for employees to have access to those treatments, they wouldn't have the insurance. We all know, from looking at the real world, if you don't have insurance, these treatments become very expensive and you may not be able to avail yourselves of them.

Chief Justice John Roberts, during oral arguments in the Hobby Lobby case, made it clear that Congress can fix this and override the Court's decision, and I agree. That is why I am so thankful to Senator MURRAY and Senator UDALL for working so hard and so fast so we can have the remedy right now. It is important that we act fast. People are very confused out there as to what they can count on in their insurance coverage.

We are going to have a vote on this tomorrow. It is a cloture vote to end debate so we can actually get to a vote on the substance. Sadly, it means we need 60 votes, a supermajority. But I hope and frankly pray that we get those 60 votes because we need to protect women's health.

The Murray-Udall bill is called the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act, but they have nicknamed it Not My Boss's Business Act, which I like. It is not my boss's business what I decide to do.

It would require employers to follow the Federal law when offering health insurance to their employees, notwithstanding the Religious Freedom Restoration Act which, as I said, I believe the Court stood on its head. It was meant to protect individuals, not corporations, not your boss.

The bill says corporations cannot hide behind the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to deny their workers coverage to the benefits we have in law. More than 180 House and Senate lawmakers have cosponsored this bill so far, and I hope our colleagues will vote for it.

I was saying we need to act fast because there is confusion out there. Virtually so many women rely on birth control at some point in their lives, it is amazing. Sixty percent of women who take birth control, 6.5 million American women, do so in whole or in part to treat painful and difficult medical conditions.

Let me say that again. One may take a birth control pill for birth control, but there are many other uses for that pill; 1.5 million women out of the 6.5 million who use it, at least in part for other conditions, use it solely as a medication to treat those painful and difficult conditions.

By allowing employers to deny coverage for contraception, the Court is depriving many women and families of health care. Surveys have shown that 55 percent of young women, aged 18 to 34, struggle to afford birth control, which can cost as much as $600 per year. Maybe the Supreme Court Justices in their ivory tower think that is not a lot of money, but let me state, for women working the minimum wage, even for women earning more than the minimum wage, it is quite a hit to their pocketbooks.

Ruth Bader Ginsburg pointed out in her dissent that a woman earning the minimum wage would spend nearly an entire month's wage to get an IUD, $1,000. Imagine. This case has unjustly singled out women's health services.

I have to make a note here. I do not know of any employer that is dropping coverage for Viagra. I don't. I have

asked around. I have been on TV, I have invited folks to let me know. Oh, no, Viagra is fine; birth control is not fine. Just put the pieces together yourself. I think this decision discriminates against women, and in the slippery slope argument you are going to see it affect everyone. And we need to listen to the women who rely on birth control to improve their health and the health of their families. Let me tell you a few stories. Raquel from Sacramento was diagnosed with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma in 2010. After her treatment her doctors told her she needed to use birth control to ensure she did not become pregnant for the next 3 years because she was really sick. Luckily, her employer covers birth control and now, happily, 4 years later she is pregnant with her first child. What could have happened to her if she had gone through an unintended pregnancy? It could have been pretty devastating. What if she had worked for a different employer who refused to offer her that birth control? Her health and the health of her child would have been at risk and that would have been tragic. So let's listen to her.

Let's listen to Katherine from Pleasant Hill, CA, who relies on birth control after having her first child.

> Both my husband and I want to be the best possible parents for our son, and having another child so soon would hurt our ability to do that. A variety of affordable birth control options are crucial for me and for all first-time moms like me!

Many years ago I was on the board of Planned Parenthood, and what we said all the time was that our dream was that every child be a wanted child—a wanted child. As a parent myself and as a grandparent I tell you right now it takes a lot to raise a child. Hillary Clinton said it takes a village. It certainly takes loving parents, and it takes a loving family. It certainly costs money, and it certainly takes energy.

We want our families to be healthy. We want our families to be productive, and birth control is a success story. It breaks my heart that women just like Katherine who work at Hobby Lobby and other for-profit corporations now could be denied access to affordable health care unless we fix this.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act was not about giving your boss the power over you like this. It was about giving you the right to make your own choices and decisions. We need to listen to women like Ariana in Redding, CA, who wrote:

> I am a recent college graduate trying to make ends meet and pay off my student loans. It is a great relief to know I can get the birth control I need without a copay.

These are real stories. If the boss doesn't like that you choose birth control, that is his right. If he wants to sit down with his daughter and tell her his religious objection, and if she agrees with him, that is fine. I mean, that is what America is about. But don't take your religious beliefs, your ideology, your biases, your prejudices, and your opinions and foist them on your employees. That is not this country. That is not what we are about.

Shouldn't we care more about the rights of women and their families than the rights of a few employers who can exercise that in their families? This bill we are going to vote on is critical, and I hope it won't die as a result of partisanship. We have to rise above partisanship around here.

''Equal justice under law''—that is what it says over the portico. And frankly, there is another issue. If you look at what has happened to the rates of abortion since we have seen more use of birth control, they are going down. There has been a study in one of our Nation's big cities that proved that because there was broad use of birth control, abortions went down by 50 percent. Imagine. So if that is our concern regardless of whether we are pro-choice or not, we shouldn't be embracing decisions that make it more difficult for women to get access to birth control.

So equal justice under the law doesn't say: ''except for women.'' It doesn't say: ''except if my boss disagrees with me.'' It is pretty beautiful. It is pretty clear. It is something that we have to respect. It is for the ages, and tomorrow we are going to see if our colleagues agree. Every Senator must take a stand tomorrow for individual liberty. When we vote tomorrow, let's be reminded: Women are watching. The American people will hold each of us accountable if we fail to protect their rights and their ability to decide what is best for their families.

I have been around a while. I was around when one of the Bushes was actually on the board of Planned Parenthood—George Herbert Walker Bush. Suddenly this issue is back—birth control—and suddenly we are arguing over it again.

So I say this. I may be wearing a white jacket, but it is not a white doctor's coat. I am not a doctor, and I don't want to put myself, as a politician, in between a woman and her doctor or in between a family and their doctor. Let's leave important health care choices where they belong: with women, with families, with doctors, and not with politicians, in the Senate or Justices sitting in a courtroom.

Thank you very much. I yield the floor.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on either the Bay or LaFleur nomination the confirmation vote or votes occur at 3:15 p.m. with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act, to stand up for what I thought was a commonly shared value—that a woman's health care decisions are between her and her doctor, not her and her boss. I thought that was well-established, straightforward—simple, even.

But it turns out that the majority of the Supreme Court thought differently when it came to certain kinds of health care decisions: whether a woman would have access to contraceptives without copays as guaranteed by Federal law. As we all know now, 2 weeks ago the Supreme Court held in Hobby Lobby that an employer's personal beliefs can trump some of the most private and significant health care decisions a woman makes.

So let me be very clear on where I stand: What kind of birth control a female employee uses is not her boss's business.

I have heard some of the supporters of the Supreme Court decision argue that ruling is a narrow ruling, and that it only applies to closely held family businesses. That doesn't tell the whole story because just 3 days after this ruling in Hobby Lobby the Court said that a nonprofit religious college didn't have to comply with a contraceptive coverage requirement even though it had already had an accommodation that allowed it to avoid paying for such coverage itself.

The majority even pointed to this accommodation in the Hobby Lobby ruling as an example of a less restrictive alternative that could be open to for-profit businesses. A few days later that same accommodation wasn't good enough.

In her dissent Justice Sotomayor wrote:

> Those who are bound by our decisions usually believe that they can take us at our word. Not so today.

In other words, in less than a week the Supreme Court's conservative majority went from issuing a supposedly narrow ruling to potentially broadening it to encompass a new class of institutions. The impact of the ruling in Hobby Lobby will most definitely not be limited to those closely held businesses, as some say. I have heard others argue, in essence: Don't worry. The ruling doesn't expressly ban access to contraceptives. It just shifts the additional cost of the coverage back to the women.

But those who say erecting a barrier of cost between a woman and birth control will give her the same access she had before the decision don't understand what women have to go through to get covered and don't understand the many reasons why women use birth control. Since the coverage requirement went into effect last year, the number of women who got their birth

control without a copay jumped from 14 percent to 56 percent. That means some serious costs were avoided for many women.

The average annual savings for women last year was $269. In total, women in the United States saved $483 million on contraceptives, thanks to the Affordable Care Act. Among those women were 917,000 in North Carolina alone who were eligible for preventive services without additional copays. Many of these women sought and used birth control medications for reasons that had absolutely nothing to do with planning pregnancy. In fact, oral contraceptives are a key treatment for at least three major medical conditions that affect women. Polycystic ovary syndrome affects 5 to 10 percent of women of reproductive age, and if left untreated can lead to the development of ovarian cysts or infertility. In addition, 11 percent of women are affected by endometriosis in their lifetime, and 40,000 women each year are diagnosed with endometrial cancer. Many women are at risk of developing ovarian cancer—one of the most deadly cancers in the United States—and women with ovarian cancer also can receive treatment via birth control. And yes, one of the best known ways to reduce the risk of these conditions is birth control.

Employers who make their female employees pay out of pocket for contraceptives aren't just imposing their personal beliefs, they are also making it more difficult for women to access important lifesaving medical treatment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I would like to ask for another 45 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HAGAN. That is why I believe it is so important to debate and to pass the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act. This bill would fix the Hobby Lobby decision by making it illegal for any company to deny their workers specific health benefits, including birth control, that would be required to be covered. It would make clear that bosses cannot discriminate against their female workers and would ensure equal treatment under the law for tens of thousands of workers for which coverage hangs in the balance. It would preserve and codify the existing accommodation for our nonprofit religious employees.

It is troubling to me that in 2014 we are even debating women's access to contraception. Nearly all women—99 percent—will use it at some point in their lives, and they should have access to safe, effective birth control if they choose to use it—plain and simple.

This bill would ensure that those decisions about an employee's health can stay between the woman and her doctor, not between the woman and her boss. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

CONGO ADOPTION POLICY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I want to talk about an issue today that transcends party lines: the humanitarian crisis we are seeing in Africa and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

In September of last year the Congo informed the United States that they would no longer issue exit visas for Congolese children who were in the process of being adopted by American parents. These are kids that have gone through the adoption process and yet the Government of the Congo says they cannot leave the country. This terrible and unjustifiable action has left hundreds of children and their families here in the United States in limbo.

Last Friday the Congolese Government announced an end to exit permit exceptions until the country passes what they deem are new adoption laws. I stand here today to express our deep concern and commitment to resolve this crisis from so many in the Senate. We have over 50 cosponsors for a resolution calling on the Congo to do the right thing. Those of us who have cosponsored this are looking for a way to help these children who have already been adopted to be reunited with their families permanently.

More than 350 families have finalized adoptions of Congolese children. They have obtained the necessary U.S. approvals, including U.S. visas authorizing their children to immigrate to the United States. There were 400 additional families in the process of completing adoptions at the time Congo imposed this moratorium. In every way that matters, including in what they feel in their hearts, these are their children.

All told, more than 800 children are caught in this diplomatic nightmare. By the way, that is about 10 percent of total adoptions worldwide by American families last year. These are international adoptions, so it is a significant number. Many of these kids have special needs, and those needs are not being met. Until they are able to come home and be with their families, those needs will not be met. In fact, some lives have been put at risk. In fact, six of these children have already died.

I had the opportunity to meet with some of the parents of some of these children and have seen some of the photos and heard some of the stories. If the Congolese Government would simply do the right thing and allow these exit permits, lives would be saved. We can't remain silent in the face of this tragedy.

Together with Senator LANDRIEU of Louisiana, I am offering a resolution calling on the administration to take action and demand that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo resume processing these adoption cases and issuing exit permits so these kids can leave. They need to prioritize the processing of intercountry adoptions which were initiated before the suspension began.

I thank Senator LANDRIEU for her hard work on this matter, as well as 50 of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle who have joined us.

Last week I met with a number of families from Ohio, and we had the opportunity to talk about some of these kids and some of their specific circumstances. We also talked about what these families are ready to do, and they are ready to give these kids the support and love they need.

I met with the Millimans from Columbus, OH. They are adopting a little girl who has very serious medical conditions. They are in the final stages of the adoption process, and they fear they will not be able to provide her the treatment and care she needs.

I also met with the Webb family. The Webbs are in the process of adopting a child from the Congo to bring to their home in Wooster, OH. The Webbs' biological daughter Heather is also in the process of adopting from the Congo. They were both in the Capitol to talk about their kids and what they have been through.

These families represent the very best of our country and our values, a respect for these young people's lives and a commitment to live with humility, prioritizing the needs of the most vulnerable children. This diplomatic impasse is keeping these families apart. It is time the administration joined with Congress to support the families and the children involved in this crisis in every way possible.

In the coming days, I hope we will speak with one voice and demand that Congo reverse their decision and process these adoptions as quickly as possible. It is my sense this is an issue that will come up in committee this week. I hope before this session is out we will be able to take this up on the floor of the Senate, pass it, and begin to put some pressure on the Congolese Government to do the right thing. It is time to allow these children to be with their loving families.

With that, I yield back all time and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last week I heard the majority leader speak about people who are happy with the President's health care law. While I agree that some people have been helped by the law, many Americans have been hurt by the law's destructive side effects. Republicans have given examples of people from all across the

country of all ages and in all kinds of situations being harmed by the health care law, and we found that a disproportionate number of those being hurt are women. These are middle-class Americans who work hard, do the right thing, and they just want to care for themselves and their families.

The health care law that the President wrote—and every Senate Democrat in the Senate voted for—is standing between them and the lives they want to live. That is what I am hearing from my neighbors back home in Wyoming, and I think I hear from more individuals than many of the Senators do because I was a physician and practiced medicine in Wyoming for 25 years. I have taken care of patients and families.

I would like to share with everyone what I have been hearing from the women around the State of Wyoming and how this law has been impacting their lives.

I got a letter from a woman in Gillette, WY, and she said: ''I wanted to share with you my frustration and worry concerning the Affordable Care Act.''

She said she and her husband have three daughters—ages 12, 9, and 3—and her husband started a new business. She said: ''Thanks to the new health care law our insurance premium increased $560 per month.'' That is $6,700 more a year that this family has to pay for insurance under the President's health care law.

She wrote:

> As we struggle to plan for our girls' futures, attempt to make my husband's business prosper, and dream of what our future may hold once our children are raised, it is disheartening that we will now pay nearly $17,000 a year for health insurance.

She said:

> There are so many things we could, and should, be able to do with that money. That additional $560 per month could be put in our girls' college funds, be given back to our church and community. Sadly, we don't have the luxury of deciding how to use that hard-earned money.
>
> We have been told by Washington that we will spend our money on health insurance. I have never felt so completely let down by the American government.

Here is a woman who just wants to raise her family, send her daughters to college, maybe grow the family business, and there she is in Wyoming struggling with the burden Washington Democrats imposed on her with this terrible health care law and its damaging and disheartening side effects.

President Obama says the Democrats who voted for this law should ''forcefully defend and be proud'' of the health care law.

Are Democrats in the Senate who voted for this health care law proud of what they are doing to this woman and her family? Are Democrats willing to come to the floor and forcefully defend and be proud that this Wyoming family has to spend thousands of dollars on health insurance instead of on their daughters' college funds?

Millions of women all across America are in the same situation as this woman in Gillette, WY. There has been a new study that looked at how much more money people are paying this year for insurance in the ObamaCare exchanges than they paid last year before the Obama health care law kicked in. They found that a lot of women are paying much more because of the President's health care law.

In North Carolina—and we just heard from the Senator from North Carolina—an average 27-year-old woman is paying $1,100 more for health insurance coverage than she did last year. In North Carolina a 64-year-old woman is paying $5,000 more because of all of the requirements of the health care law. Is that Senator willing to come back and forcefully defend and be proud of this health care law and what it has done to these women in her home State?

It is the same in Arkansas. An average 40-year-old woman pays $1,300 more this year because of the law. A 64-year-old woman in Arkansas is paying $3,400 more this year in the exchanges. In one State after another, women are paying more. Women of all ages are getting hurt. The Washington Post had a very interesting story about this on June 24.

It said: ''Older women bear the brunt of higher health insurance costs under Obamacare.'' That is the headline from the Washington Post—''Older women bear the brunt of higher insurance costs under Obamacare.''

The article says a new report found ''women age 55 to 64 will face a huge spike in cost when they go out to buy individual insurance on the federal exchange.''

The article says, ''These women bear the brunt of the increased premiums and out of pocket expenses after the Affordable Care Act.''

Under President Obama and the Democrats' plan, older women are bearing the brunt of higher health insurance costs. This is a disgraceful side effect of the Democrats' health care law. Women across the country are paying more money for insurance they do not need, do not want, and will likely never use.

Are Democrats willing to come to the floor of the Senate and forcefully defend and be proud of the fact that older women are bearing the brunt of higher health insurance costs under this law?

I got another letter from a rancher from Newcastle, WY. She and her husband were paying $650 a month for insurance. She said, ''We don't carry maternity insurance because we have completed our family.'' This woman has had a hysterectomy.

I get letters more than maybe most because I am a physician who practiced in Wyoming for a long time.

She says their insurance agent told them they couldn't renew their policy at the end of last year. The reason? Because it didn't meet the President's requirement that they have to have maternity coverage, so they had to choose a new policy from the exchange.

Now, remember, she doesn't need or want maternity coverage and she is never going to use it because she has had a hysterectomy. According to President Obama and the Democrats, it doesn't matter one bit. It doesn't matter.

They were paying $650 a month before ObamaCare. She said her insurance agent quoted her rates for a comparable policy of anywhere between $1,300 and $1,600 a month or they could take a bronze policy with much less coverage than they had before for $900—still more than they were paying before. So $3,000 a year more than they paid before ObamaCare, and the out-of-pocket costs would be much higher and much more difficult for the family.

This woman from Wyoming writes:

> We're being forced out of a good policy, which we pay for with hard-earned money, which we choose, into a dangerous financial health care situation, with less coverage, and which puts my husband and I, who are proud of our own sustainability, on to what we consider the welfare rolls by needing a government subsidy to afford a plan that we don't want or need.

We don't want, we don't need, and we are forced on to it.

She writes:

> To say that we're angry is an understatement. Why is this happening? Why can Obama force me into this? We feel helpless.

This isn't what the President of the United States promised the American people. It is not what every Democrat who voted for the health care law promised the American people.

It seems to me that President Obama and Democrats in the Senate just don't get it. All these women wanted was a chance to buy insurance coverage that worked for them. They wanted the right to be left alone to make their own choices about their family's health care, not to have Washington make choices for them. They wanted the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower cost.

President Obama wasn't interested in listening to what women wanted. He wanted to tell—he wanted to mandate—he wanted to tell them and mandate what he thought was best for them. It is outrageous.

I hear from people almost every day who are feeling the costly and cruel side effects of the health care law.

I heard from a woman in Casper, WY, where I practiced and was chief of staff of the Wyoming Medical Center in Casper. She gets her insurance through her job. The costs have gone up so much under ObamaCare that she is worried about what might happen. She writes:

> I am concerned for what I might be facing when my employer has to comply with the [health care law] next year. I have not had children yet because of the effects the recession had on me and my husband. I would very much like to think we could have one in the next couple of years, however, the insurance fiasco worries me.

So this woman is worried that the health care law might actually affect her and her husband having a family.

Why did President Obama take away the rights of women to choose what

health coverage is right for them and their families? This was an active decision made by Democrats in this body and the President of the United States to take away the rights of women to choose what health coverage is right for them and their families.

Why did President Obama raise the cost of health care and make it more expensive for women?

These are just a few of the women who are being hurt by ObamaCare and just a few of the ways the President's health care law is affecting women all across America.

Again, there are some people who have been helped by the law. Some people are happy with their insurance. Nobody is denying that. There are also people who have been hurt by the law and who can't afford it and who are devastated because of it. What does the President have to say to those people? Why won't President Obama sit down with just one of these women who has written to me and actually listen to the damage he has done to them, to their families, and to their health care as a result of his health care law?

Why won't Democrats come to the floor of the Senate and talk about these millions of Americans—millions of women—whom they have harmed with the health care law?

Republicans have offered ideas for health care reform that allow women to make choices on what is best for them and their families. If they want maternity coverage, they can find a policy that offers it. They wouldn't be forced to pay for what they don't need or don't want just because someone in Washington tells them they must. People wanted health care reform to give them access to quality, affordable care—not more expensive coverage.

Republicans are going to keep coming to the floor. We are going to keep offering real solutions for better health care without all of these expensive and offensive side effects.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, as have many Americans, I have watched with increasing concern and increasing frustration the rapidly growing humanitarian crisis on our southern border. More than 60,000 unaccompanied alien children—mostly minors from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador—have been apprehended at the border in this fiscal year, and we have 2½ months remaining. The numbers are staggering. Another 40,000 family members—one or both parents traveling with their children—have also been apprehended just in this fiscal year.

To put these numbers in perspective, in 2008, the number of unaccompanied alien children apprehended at the border was 8,000. Three years later, in 2011, the number had doubled. It had doubled to 16,000. This is a situation we perhaps didn't see coming, but should have.

Today, of course, the numbers are staggering, as I mentioned. The number has skyrocketed. In fact, in April and May of this year, 10,000 have arrived. We simply cannot sit back and let this situation grow worse as it does day by day. We must now find a way to solve this crisis and stem the flow of unaccompanied minors entering our country. It is imperative that this Congress and this administration work together to do this and do this immediately. We dare not move toward our regularly scheduled August recess without accomplishing the solution or resolution of this current crisis, which is impacting children, impacting families, impacting communities, impacting many across the United States in terms of this crisis.

As we do this, I think it is important that we be guided by some key principles, including laws that are currently on the books—laws that might need to be adjusted—as well as compassionate hearts in terms of how we deal with those who are here but will need to be returned to their homeland.

First, clearly and foremost, we have to enforce existing law. Existing law says we need an orderly process. Immigration needs to be legal. It needs to be processed in an orderly way and in a way so that we can accommodate those who come from out of the country. I am the son of an immigrant who was processed through a legal process, a process that speaks for many of us not only here in this Chamber but for many across America. We are all in a sense immigrants. For over 200 years, we have come as immigrants through a legal process. Today we find a situation where our borders are being swamped with those who are attempting to come illegally, for whatever reason. More importantly, we have to make it clear to them that the law does not allow this to happen. So we have to get control of the border. We have to get control of our immigration process.

I think all of us feel the need for immigration reform. Step No. 1 has to be securing our borders so we can convince the American people we can return to an orderly process of bringing immigrants to this country and not be overwhelmed by the illegal immigration flowing to our southern borders. It is also important because we need to let the families know and the children know their trip to America is not what has been promised them.

Many believe this humanitarian crisis is focused on how we handle these children once they arrive at the border, and there is a need to address that issue. But in reality, the crisis for these children begins when they start their trip, given the dangers of the journey. We now know the children who are making these dangerous treks from Central America are often in the hands of smugglers, drug cartels, coyotes—criminal elements that are delivering a false lie to families and individuals in these countries. They are basically saying, Get your children across the border and they will then be absorbed into American society and they will be in a better place. And, by the way, write us a check for $7,000 or $10,000 or $5,000, whatever the market bears, and we will ensure that your children arrive safely, and then you won't have to worry about them anymore. That is simply not true.

Sadly, from the latest information that has come to us, in surveys that are being taken and investigations that are being made, the story is horrendous. Often, for those in the hands of those who are seeking to bring them along the approximately 1,500-mile trip from Central America to the Texas border, the reality of what these children are facing and what these families are facing is startling and it is an issue that absolutely has to be addressed.

Doctors Without Borders exists in southern and central Mexico, and they did surveys of those who were attempting to make this trip. They indicated that 58 percent of their patients suffered at least—at least—one episode of violence along their way from Central America to the United States. One media network did an investigation that followed the path of Central American migrants, including children, and while their numbers have not been verified or documented, they are staggering. Even if the results are half of what they claim, it is a situation of immense humanitarian dysfunction. They found that 80 percent of all migrants will be assaulted, 60 percent of women will be raped, and only 40 percent will actually make it to the border.

Let's say those numbers are exaggerated. There is some indication this media outlet was, perhaps, sensationalizing their numbers. Let's say it is just half of that. But if it is half of that, it is a situation we absolutely cannot tolerate. We absolutely cannot sit by and say the only humanitarian crisis is taking care of these children once they cross the border—making sure they have vaccinations, sustenance, and a place to sleep until we get them processed. Those who claim that need to understand the crisis that exists before they ever get to the border, and the impact on these children in particular.

In 2010, when the narrative coming out of the administration was chipping away at our Nation's immigration laws through the abuse of prosecutorial discretion, this generated whispers of hope that ran rampant through the families of our Central American neighbors and gave a false confidence that if you illegally enter our country, once you are here, you will be able to

stay. The belief spread in 2012 when the President took his prosecutorial discretion a step further by essentially halting the removal of illegal immigrants who arrived as minors.

There was a process where, of course, they were given a piece of paper, which basically said: You have to appear before a judge, who will determine whether you are able to stay in the country or whether you will have to be sent back home.

The narrative there was: This is your document that allows you to stay in America. In fact, it was not that at all. But because of the overwhelming number of people who received these documents, allowing them to stay here until they were adjudicated by a judge—because that number now exists around 375,000, and there is no way we can possibly adjudicate these and make these decisions in a short amount of time—those who arrived simply melded into the society, and most never showed up before a judge who was making a decision about their legality or illegality.

A key part of what we have to do here, in my opinion, is a repatriation plan. It is easy to just simply throw money out there and say we will come up with a plan later. I cannot support a provision that does not have policy changes to address this situation—policy changes that will allow us to inform our Central American neighbors that they must make every possible effort to engage with us in telling the truth to their constituencies and the parents of these children as to what lies ahead for them: the fact that they will be subjected to potential brutality, unspeakable, brutal efforts and consequences of this trip, as well as returned to their families and their countries.

We have to together make this message clear that our laws require that these children be sent back, but we also have to make it abundantly clear they are putting their children at great harm and great risk to believe this narrative that says: They will be fine, they will be taken care of. Just give us the money and we will make sure your children become Americans and they will be fine in the future.

Secondly, I think we need to go a step further. To deter children from making this journey, we have to return those who have already come.

Included in a viable repatriation program has to be a streamlined process. I mentioned the number of the hundreds of thousands who are still waiting for their adjudication. There have been efforts and suggestions made by some of our colleagues on a bipartisan basis that we address and dramatically increase the number of judges who can go down to the border and make these decisions quickly so we can safely return these children home without having the horror of seeing these children rejected in different communities and no place to put them, as the numbers simply overwhelm our ability to care for them.

The administration does have some flexibility under current law to move families and children through these immigration proceedings in an accelerated manner. However, I believe—and the Secretary of Homeland Security has stated—that we need to go further to change current law to treat all unaccompanied alien children the same.

Now this is the President's own Secretary of Homeland Security, who has been to the border, whom I have met with and talked to several times, who is assiduously trying to address this issue in a bipartisan way. We need to work together to make sure we put the processes in place and the policies in place before we simply decide on a number and hope for the best later.

We need to change the law to allow Central American children who qualify to choose voluntarily to return as well, rather than go through drawn-out immigration proceedings that should still lead to their removal and damage any chance they have to seek legal immigration in the future.

This narrative out there, this story out there, is: Oh well, just go back across the border. Then maybe tomorrow you will get back here, and someone else will pick you up, and you will go to a different place, and you will start the process all over again, and you will finally get handed a piece of paper, and then don't worry about showing up in 12 to 18 months later. You can meld into society, and everything will be well. That absolutely has to be addressed. If we do not do that, we will not succeed with this process.

We also need to use our leverage with these foreign countries to gain their cooperation if they refuse to cooperate with us—whether it is withholding foreign aid, whether it is any number of punitive measures. We need to make sure the governments of these nations understand the risk to their children, the harm to their children, and the fact that we are going to enforce the law, and that if they want to continue future relations with the United States through a legal immigration process, they have to work with us to convince their constituencies and give them the truth as to what is happening to their children—to engage in this process of working with us to stop this flow of illegals.

Now, obviously, we have to provide reasonable care for those who are already here. The vast majority of the new funding the President is requesting would go for caring for the illegal immigrants who are already here. It includes housing, transporting, and caring for the children and families already in the United States.

I believe it is our responsibility as a nation and as a compassionate society to care for the hurt and displaced. But we cannot simply open our arms and encourage all the world's children to strike out on their own, face endless dangers, and come to our shores with the belief that they will be welcomed and accepted and integrated into our society. We simply do not have the capacity to do that on a worldwide basis, and we see the trouble we are having from just three countries. What are we actually doing to stem the flow of unaccompanied alien children coming to the United States? And when will we begin to see the tide turn? That is something that has to happen and must happen initially.

Finally, in addition to the care which we must provide—the sustenance and the health care and the bedding and the nutrition and the efforts we need to make; and thank goodness for so many nonprofit organizations, churches, and others that have volunteered to join us in this particular effort—but it cannot be an ongoing effort. It has to be something that is accompanied by significant changes I have talked about before in terms of policy. You have to stop the bleeding. You have to stop the effort first and convince the American people that we finally gained control of our borders before we can move to any kind of sensible immigration reform.

This is going to be expensive. We are going to have to make sure the money we are spending is spent as part of a plan to address the problem—not just simply address it and have the problem continue, but address it in a way, on a one-time basis, that we put an end to this story: Send your children and they will be just fine.

Mr. President, the time is moving on, and I know my colleague is waiting to speak and we have votes coming up. So let me shorten this by simply concluding, at the end of the day, we have a huge humanitarian crisis on our hands on our border. I believe we have a moral responsibility to swiftly address and solve this crisis. We have to understand that the crisis involves more than just unaccompanied minors. We cannot ignore the national security implications of a weak border. There are many dark powers in this world that wish to see the influence of the United States diminish—that wish to extinguish the beacon of freedom that we have been to the world.

So for the sake of the rule of law, for the sake of our national security and the safety of these children, it is imperative we act now and get it right. It will only happen if this body, the Congress—the House and the Senate—and the President will work together to put in place, on an expedited basis, a sensible plan to address this humanitarian crisis. ''Save the children'' means: Don't put those children in the hands of smugglers, coyotes, criminal elements, only for them to go through the horrendous consequences that have become the humanitarian crisis we are addressing.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP.)

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF NORMAN C. BAY TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Norman C. Bay, of New Mexico, to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote to invoke cloture on the Bay nomination.

Mr. KAINE. I ask unanimous consent that the time be yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Norman C. Bay, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Harry Reid, Tom Udall, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Patrick J. Leahy, Barbara Boxer, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Martin Heinrich, Tom Harkin, Tammy Baldwin, Cory A. Booker.

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 Norman C. Bay, of New Mexico, to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''nay'' and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 222 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heller	Pryor
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Brown	Kaine	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	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

NAYS—45

Ayotte	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Blunt	Grassley	Paul
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Chambliss	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Coburn	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johanns	Sessions
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	King	Thune
Crapo	Kirk	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	McCain	Walsh
Fischer	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Alexander	Corker
Begich	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 51, the nays are 45. The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote to invoke cloture on the LaFleur nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. REID. I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Cheryl A. LaFleur, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Harry Reid, Tom Udall, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Cory A. Booker, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Patrick J. Leahy, Barbara Boxer, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons, Angus S. King, Jr.., Richard Blumenthal, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Tom Harkin, Tammy Baldwin.

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 Cheryl A. LaFleur, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2019, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea'' and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 85, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 223 Ex.]

YEAS—85

Ayotte	Hagan	Murray
Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Barrasso	Hatch	Paul
Bennet	Heinrich	Portman
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blunt	Heller	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Boxer	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Brown	Johanns	Rubio
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Cantwell	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Carper	Kaine	Sessions
Casey	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Cochran	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Landrieu	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Levin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Markey	Vitter
Enzi	McCain	Warner
Feinstein	McCaskill	Warren
Fischer	McConnell	Whitehouse
Flake	Menendez	Wicker
Franken	Merkley	Wyden
Graham	Murkowski	
Grassley	Murphy	

NAYS—10

Cardin	Isakson	Schumer
Chambliss	Mikulski	Walsh
Cruz	Moran	
Gillibrand	Roberts	

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander	Coburn	Schatz
Begich	Corker	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 85, the nays are 10. The motion is agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:48 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF NORMAN C. BAY TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NOMINATION OF CHERYL A. LAFLEUR TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3:15 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. If neither side yields time, both sides will be equally charged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, are we in a quorum call presently?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are not.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I have come to speak about the two nominees on the executive calendar who are before us this afternoon. Norman Bay and Cheryl LaFleur are nominated to be commissioners on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, an increasingly critical, independent regulatory commission.

As the Senate has considered these nominations, there has been kind of a weird drama that has played out throughout the entire community that follows the FERC and, as I understand, the agency itself has been really very distracted by it. Many are concerned the wrong person is set to take over as chair of the FERC and that the Commission is at risk of losing its reputation for objectivity. So for the benefit of Senators who are not on the energy committee and for members of the public who have not followed the controversy surrounding these nominees, let me provide a little bit of perspective this afternoon.

Both nominees have been serving at the FERC. Ms. LaFleur currently leads the agency as its chair. She has done so with distinction for the better part of a pretty difficult year. This is a year that has brought about the polar vortex and challenges to bulk power system reliability. The other individual, Mr. Bay, is an employee. He is the director of the agency's Office of Enforcement. He was appointed to that post by its somewhat controversial former chair, John Wellinghoff of Nevada.

If confirmed, Mr. Bay will become the first FERC employee in the agency's history who would go directly and immediately to the commission itself, despite just 5 years of relevant experience. Furthermore, Mr. Bay will not only be elevated to the post of commissioner; President Obama has announced that Mr. Bay will be designated as chairman after his confirmation. That means that Ms. LaFleur, the FERC's only female commissioner, will be demoted when Mr. Bay takes over as chair. How soon Ms. LaFleur's demotion will take place is unclear at this moment.

At the energy committee's business meeting to consider these nominees, there was a lot of talk about a deal that would allow Ms. LaFleur to remain as chair for a period of time. It was suggested that this would give Mr. Bay some much needed on-the-job training as a rank and file commissioner. So there was a lot of discussion going back and forth. I was certainly part of that discussion. But talk of a deal and confirmation of a deal, giving the assurances that certainly this Senator has sought and yet was not given—talking about a deal and getting a deal are two different things.

So as we discuss where we are with these nominees, I think it is important to recognize that even if Ms. LaFleur stays on for a period of months—whether it is 9 months as some have suggested the deal is or a different period of time—what we understand is that Ms. LaFleur will only be allowed to continue in an acting capacity.

So stop and think about this. We have President Obama who has nominated Ms. LaFleur twice for high office, and despite what I think has been her distinguished service as a commissioner and as chair of the FERC, the White House dismisses her as an acting chair. The administration reportedly has limited her authority even to hire staff. As some have suggested, this is just a technicality and this is what happens within the Commission. That is not my understanding at all. I would view it as an affront. If one is going to be the chair, one should have the full authorities of the chair.

Even though I disagree with ''Acting'' Chair LaFleur on some key policy matters, by all accounts, from both Republicans and Democrats, she is doing a good job. She is fair. She seeks balance. She has the temperament I think we need for this commission. She has the personal qualities of leadership we look for. She clearly has the experience. She has 25 years' worth of experience, in fact. I certainly hope she will be easily confirmed this afternoon. In fact, I hope Chair LaFleur's bipartisan support has not hurt her prospects.

Chair LANDRIEU observed during the committee's consideration of these nominees that Ms. LaFleur's renomination ''was not a sure thing just a couple of months ago.'' But we have to ask: Why not? Why wasn't the renomination of the only woman serving as a FERC commissioner—a Harvard-educated Obama appointee from Massachusetts—why wasn't she a sure thing from the get-go? Was it her bipartisan appeal? I would certainly hope not. Was it her good work as a chair? Again, I hope not. To me, those are reasons one would choose her to lead the FERC, not someone else.

One hint came from our majority leader, Senator REID. He recently told the Wall Street Journal that Ms. LaFleur ''has done some stuff to do away with some of Wellinghoff's stuff.'' Now, he didn't really define what ''stuff'' that was and didn't acknowledge that much of Mr. Wellinghoff's ''stuff'' was either controversial or incapable of withstanding legal challenge.

Before we turn to Mr. Bay and his unprecedented promotion from Director of the Commission's Office of Enforcement in the face of Ms. LaFleur's demotion, let's discuss the agency the White House proposes he would lead for just a second. Why does the chairmanship of the FERC matter so much? Well, the Presiding Officer sits on the energy committee. She knows. She is watching this. She is looking at the issues of reliability. In the energy world, FERC regulates ''midstream everything.'' The chairman is its CEO, and under his or her leadership, FERC regulates interstate natural gas and oil pipelines, LNG import and export facilities, the sale of electricity at wholesale, the transmission of electricity in interstate commerce—basically the Nation's bulk power system, practically speaking, its high voltage transmission networks, also the reliability of the bulk power system, the licensing of hydroelectric facilities and the safety of dams. The list goes on and on.

One further example is the safeguarding of sensitive information about our critical energy infrastructure—information that was compromised by FERC during the tenure of former Chairman Wellinghoff. That series of events is now subject to an ongoing inquiry by the inspector general of the Department of Energy, and it is a breach that Ms. LaFleur has vowed will not happen again.

Given the significance of this agency, let's consider Mr. Bay. So, beyond the demotion of Ms. LaFleur, and beyond his lack of relevant experience, what is causing me pause? To begin, there are questions about the fairness and transparency of the functioning of the FERC Office of Enforcement during Mr. Bay's tenure there. I haven't resolved those questions, but I know others are looking at them. Senator BARRASSO has called attention to some of the questions. He has called for an independent review of the facts in dispute.

Second is the question of the circumstances under which Mr. Bay would recuse himself from at least 43 different matters, including some high profile matters that have been pending in the Office of Enforcement on his watch. But, unfortunately, Mr. Bay apparently doesn't see a need to recuse himself from these proceedings.

Third are the answers that Mr. Bay provided to questions from those of us on the energy committee. At best, many were unclear and, at worst, his responses were simply evasive.

Finally, I keep coming back to the deal—the waiting period that was needed to attract enough support on the Democratic side to report Mr. Bay's nomination from committee. So we

have to ask the question: What are those terms? Will the acting chair have the opportunity to serve fully and completely as chair? Will it be clear that Mr. Bay is not a ''shadow chairman'' or a ''chairman-in-waiting'' during this crucial period? At a minimum, before we make a choice about who should lead the FERC, the President owes Senators a clear time line of who will be in charge and what the powers are that will be given to him or her.

FERC is just too important a commission. It is too important for appointees to be handled in this way.

So, today, I am going to be supporting the confirmation of Ms. LaFleur. In fact, I am pleased to support her, even though I don't always agree with her policy views. But I do regret I will not give my support to Mr. Bay, and I urge other Senators to withhold their support as well.

With that, I would yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH FROM CORPORATE INTERFERENCE ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I wish to take this opportunity to speak in support of the Murray legislation to protect women's health from corporate interference. Because of an obligation to speak at a memorial service tomorrow, I will not be able to speak tomorrow morning. I feel so strongly about this issue that I would like to say a few words today.

This legislation ensures that the personal opinion of an employer doesn't trump the medical opinion of a doctor. I sure wish this legislation were not necessary, but, unfortunately, because of the recent Supreme Court decision now known as the Hobby Lobby decision, it is necessary.

Let's talk about how we got here. As the Presiding Officer knows, we worked on health care reform. We were so concerned that over 40 million people didn't have access to health care. We were concerned that just being a woman was treated as a preexisting condition. We were charged double for our insurance, and we often had to pay significant copayments for those procedures related to early detection and screening, for those procedures that would affect us such as mammogram care. So on a bipartisan basis we ended that discrimination so women couldn't be charged more than men of the same age or comparable health status.

We also wanted to be sure we could do preventive health care benefits. That was an amendment I offered on the Senate floor. We had a spirited debate, even with Senator MURKOWSKI. Senator MURKOWSKI and I agreed on the same goals, but we had different methods. Ours won; mine won. I wanted to be sure politicians didn't decide what was preventive health care. I wanted to be sure politicians didn't decide what should be covered or not, and I didn't want to bring politics into it. So we turned to one of the most distinguished organizations in our government that makes recommendations to our government on health care policy. It is known as the Institute of Medicine. It is a nonpartisan group funded by this Congress made up of scientific experts to advise us on medical and health care. We wanted them to tell us what should be the preventive services that were included.

So when we hear the criticism: ''Some government agency decided this; some bureaucrat decided this''—these are scientists, these are physicians, these are skilled researchers, and they determined that women should have access to eight preventive health care benefits for free. First of all, screening for gestational diabetes—that is, when a woman gets diabetes while she is pregnant or because she is pregnant— high risk to the mother, high risk to the child. That means high risk HPV DNA testing, annual counseling and screening for HIV, comprehensive lactation support, and counseling, screening for domestic violence, an annual well-woman preventive care visit, and a full range of FDA-approved contraceptive methods. That is what it was. It was the Institute of Medicine—the Institute of Medicine—not BARBARA MIKULSKI, not the Democrats, not President Obama—that said the FDA-approved contraceptive methods should be available.

That brings us to the Supreme Court and Hobby Lobby, a for-profit company, employing thousands of people of different faiths and religions.

Hobby Lobby's owners did not want to cover certain forms of contraception for their female employees. They said it was against their religious beliefs, and the Supreme Court agreed with that—actually, the five men on the Supreme Court said they did not have to. The women on the Supreme Court offered a dissenting opinion.

This ruling of the Court says the personal opinion of your employer is more important than the medical opinion of your doctor. As the Presiding Officer from Wisconsin knows—she, has put a lot of work into understanding health care and the delivery system—contraceptive methods are not always used to prevent pregnancy. Some are to deal with fibroids and other medical conditions. This ruling, unfortunately, says that a for-profit company can deny female employees coverage of important preventive health care based on religious objections of the company's health care ownership or leadership team.

I always felt health care decisions should be made by the patient and their doctor, by a woman and her doctor, not by an employer or an insurance company. So it concerns me greatly that the Supreme Court Justices decided against that. It concerns me greatly that the Supreme Court Justices decided the employers should have the power to determine what medical care is available to their female employees. This is pretty scary, actually. I support what Supreme Court Justice Ginsburg said. What exemption does this extend? Does this go to blood transfusions for some groups, antidepressants for some other groups, vaccinations for other groups? The Supreme Court said: Oh, no, it is only for this. Well, one Supreme Court decision leads to another Supreme Court decision.

So Senator MURRAY, who is an architect of a bill of which I am a cosponsor, has led the way. Her bill does two things. It prohibits employers from denying coverage of specific health care items or services if the coverage of that item or service is required by Federal law. It keeps in place, however, protections for religious organizations. So houses of worship can be exempted from this mandate of contraceptive coverage, religious nonprofits can certify that they do not want to offer contraceptive care, and insurers work separately with employees.

The Supreme Court decision is an attempt to deny women's access to birth control disguised as an effort to protect religious freedom. I am a strong supporter of religious freedom. I stood on this floor and voted with its architect, Senator Ted Kennedy—a happy memory—that we would always have this religious protection of religious organizations, their nonprofit affiliates.

So I hope we do support the Murray bill, that it follows the processes within the Senate, and it comes to our attention. I believe this will go a long way to clarifying this very important distinction between the religious freedom, particularly of religious organizations—houses of worship and the nonprofits affiliated with them—but it does not embody in a private business the rights of an individual.

Madam President, I thank you for your attention and that of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Thank you, Madam President.

I have to dispel some of the myths that are being told about the Hobby Lobby decision.

First of all, one of the biggest distortions I think has been this hashtag campaign #NotMyBossBusiness because before the Hobby Lobby decision—and as now—employers cannot deny their employees access to birth control.

So let's be clear. Employers cannot deny their employees access to birth control. So the #NotMyBossBusiness hashtag and I think some of the statements that are being made on the Hobby Lobby decision are a misrepresentation or distortion of what that decision stands for.

You do not have to take my word for it. In fact, the Washington Post Fact Checker yesterday debunked several of the outrageous claims that are being made about this decision. In fact, here are some of the things we know are true about the Hobby Lobby decision:

''Nothing in the ruling allows a company to stop a woman from getting or filling a prescription for contraceptives.'' ''Nothing in the ruling allows a company to stop a woman from getting or filling a prescription for contraceptives.''

The majority opinion of Hobby Lobby actually states expressly that ''under our cases, women (and men) have a constitutional right to obtain contraceptives.''

In fact, what the Fact Checker found in response to one lawmaker's claim about the Hobby Lobby decision—who claimed that it means employers can restrict the ability of their employees to use contraceptives—the Washington Post stated:

> No boss under this ruling has the right to tell an employee that they cannot use birth control. That's simply wrong.

I think that is very important for the American people to understand, for the women of this country to understand.

Also, the Washington Post, when debunking many of the claims made about the Hobby Lobby decision, said: ''Simply put, the court ruling does not outlaw contraceptives, does not allow bosses to prevent women from seeking birth control and does not take away a person's religious freedom.''

In fact, what the decision does is focus on the fact that under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which was a law that was passed with overwhelming support in the House of Representatives and in this body—in fact, by our count, as I understand it, over a dozen Democrat Members of the current Senate actually supported the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in some way. It was signed into law by President Clinton. So it used to be bipartisan that we would support religious freedom in this body. The notion that somehow Hobby Lobby as a closely-held corporation would have to give up all their religious beliefs seems to me to be antithetical to what we supported on a bipartisan basis in this Congress, which is the religious freedom of Americans that is reflected in the First Amendment to our Constitution.

In fact, contrary to the misleading rhetoric, the Hobby Lobby decision does not take away a woman's access to birth control. That existed before the Hobby Lobby decision and it exists today. That existed before ObamaCare and it exists today, thankfully.

No employee is prohibited from purchasing any FDA-approved drug or device. Contraception remains readily available and accessible to women nationwide. Prior to ObamaCare passing in this body, over 85 percent of large businesses already offered contraceptive coverage to their employees.

One thing that has not been mentioned is the ObamaCare mandate that has been the subject of the Hobby Lobby decision does not even apply to businesses that are under 50 employees in this country. So there are millions of women for whom the mandate that is addressed in the Hobby Lobby decision does not even apply to.

For lower income women, there are five programs at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that ensure access to contraception for women, including Medicaid.

In fact, more than 19 million women were eligible for government-supported contraceptive assistance in 2010, and that has not changed.

So for those who would distort the Court's decision and insist that we cannot stand for religious liberty while simultaneously ensuring that women continue to have safe, affordable access to birth control—it is just not true. We can do both and we need to do both on behalf of the American people because people have deeply held religious beliefs, and it was so important to our Founding Fathers that they put respect for religion and protection of people's ability to choose what they believe in in the First Amendment to the Constitution.

Americans believe strongly that we should be able to practice our religion without undue interference from the government. That goes to our character. So what happened in the Supreme Court's decision in Hobby Lobby is reaffirming that, but it did not say an employer will somehow now be making the decision whether a woman can have contraception. That is not what it said. In fact, employers have no right under the law to even know what my prescriptions are or any other woman's prescriptions are for contraception. So any suggestion to the contrary is entirely misleading.

The decision applies to closely-held businesses whose owners have genuine religious convictions. In this case, the company's owner, the Green family, agreed to provide coverage for 16 of the 20 contraceptive methods that are required under ObamaCare, including birth control pills. So I want people to understand that. They only had a moral objection to the remaining four methods.

In the narrow ruling, the Court agreed, based on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act—an act that was introduced into Congress by the late Senator Edward Kennedy from Massachusetts and then-Congressman CHARLES SCHUMER from New York. Again, it was supported by over a dozen of my Democrat colleagues at the time. They brought forth the law because they were concerned at the time about another Supreme Court decision which held that generally applicable laws that have nothing to do with religion could effectively prevent Americans from fully exercising their religious rights. And guess what? It passed a then Democrat-controlled House by voice vote and was approved by a Democrat-controlled Senate by a vote of 97 to 3. There is not much that happens around here 97 to 3.

When President Clinton signed it into law, he said: ''What this law basically says is that the government should be held to a very high level of proof before it interferes with someone's free exercise of religion.''

In the Hobby Lobby decision, the government did not even try to meet that standard. They have tried to meet that standard with other religious organizations, but they did not even try in this situation to contend what the Court found to be genuinely-held religious beliefs on a very limited basis.

There have been a lot of misrepresentations about the breadth of this decision. The Court's majority opinion explicitly states that the ruling does not ''provide a shield for employers who might cloak illegal discrimination as a religious practice.''

Additionally, the Court said that ''our decision should not be understood to hold that an insurance-coverage mandate must necessarily fall if it conflicts with an employer's religious beliefs,'' meaning that someone must show a genuine religious objection. The government can overcome it if they are willing to show that they can do it in a less restrictive way. They did not even try in this case.

Well, some Americans may disagree with the family who owns the Hobby Lobby stores. All Americans believe religious freedom is a fundamental right that should not be abridged. When President Clinton signed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act into law, he said:

> Our laws and institutions should not impede or hinder, but rather should protect and preserve fundamental religious liberties.

I come to the floor today because I want people to understand this decision. Employers cannot tell you what kind of contraception you can have as a woman. Employers cannot even know what kind of contraception you have as a woman. That is protected under HIPAA laws, privacy laws that are very important.

Finally, this notion that it is not my boss's business—of course an employer cannot tell you that you cannot go fill a prescription for contraception. I think that to suggest otherwise is really to distort what the facts of this case are.

I believe we can protect people's fundamentally-held religious beliefs and provide women safe, effective access to contraception. Because of that, I will be introducing legislation on the Senate floor. That legislation would reaffirm that no employer can restrict an employee's access to contraceptives. Finally, it would also ensure that we look at ways to potentially give women greater access to contraceptives.

The legislation I will be introducing would also ask the FDA to study whether women can purchase contraceptives over the counter and whether it would be safe and effective for adult women to be able to do so. So we should have the FDA look at this issue to see if women can perhaps have even greater access than they do right now.

But the American people need to understand that the Hobby Lobby decision did not change women's access to

contraceptives. In fact, under our HIPAA laws, no employer can know what kind of contraception you may have been prescribed or are using. No employer can tell you that you cannot fill a prescription for any kind of contraception that you think is appropriate and that your doctor thinks is appropriate for you.

Finally, I would say our bill also does one other important thing; that is, it repeals the restrictions ObamaCare put on health savings accounts and flexible spending accounts. ObamaCare actually reduced the amount someone can put aside on a tax-free basis to pay for their own health care. ObamaCare also restricted the use of those accounts for purchase of over-the-counter medications. I have had many of my constituents complain to me about this. We would like to eliminate those restrictions and give people greater ability to set aside money on a tax-free basis to pay for their own health concerns, including over-the-counter medications.

One thing I would say finally is that I have heard so much from my constituents about the concerns they have with ObamaCare. I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who voted for ObamaCare, now come to the floor and complain about the Hobby Lobby decision. Well, I would argue that we are where we are today because they decided that ObamaCare was the way to go for health care in this country.

I have heard from a lot of my both male and female constituents about the real concerns they have with ObamaCare that I hope we will debate on this floor. I have heard from people who lost policies they liked, who are paying more for coverage than they were before, have higher deductibles. I have had women write me about concerns that their employer is going to cut their hours because of ObamaCare. Talk about a bad mandate. It redefined the 40-hour workweek. It is now a 30-hour workweek. So people are losing hours.

In my own State of New Hampshire, right now 10 of our hospitals are excluded from the exchange. We are not a very big State. It is a big deal. So some people have lost access to the doctor with whom they had a longstanding relationship or the hospital where they had their first child. Now, if they are expecting their second child and they are on the exchange, that hospital is excluded, and they are in a situation where ObamaCare is restricting women's rights as far as what hospital they can go to, when they could have gone there before.

Those are the real issues as we think about what has happened with ObamaCare. There are so many other issues I could talk about, stories my constituents have written to me. But I would hope the American people understand that employers cannot restrict your access to contraception. We will reassert in our bill that no employer can do that. We will look at the FDA studying whether women can potentially have greater access to contraceptives in a safe and effective manner by looking at whether adult women can safely purchase contraceptives over the counter.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. I rise to speak on the pending nominations.

I appreciate the majority leader scheduling this vote to confirm Mr. Norman Bay to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

FERC is one of the lesser known but perhaps one of the most important independent agencies in the Federal Government. It has jurisdiction over interstate transmission of electricity, oil, and natural gas, as well as licensing of hydroelectric power.

I believe Mr. Bay will be an outstanding member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. I urge all of my colleagues to support his nomination today.

Since 2009 Mr. Bay has been the Director of the Office of Enforcement at FERC, where he has gained extensive experience in the regulation of energy markets. The Office of Enforcement is responsible for market oversight and surveillance and for implementing the antimanipulation authority Congress enacted in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This authority provided FERC new tools to combat the type of market manipulation that produced the devastating power crisis a decade ago across the West.

Under Mr. Bay's leadership, FERC has increased transparency in its work, while bringing a number of enforcement actions that have helped protect the integrity of the energy markets and provided $300 million in relief to consumers—$300 million back into the pockets of energy consumers.

He is a graduate of Dartmouth College and Harvard Law School and has had a long and distinguished career of public service. Before joining FERC, he taught law at the University of New Mexico. He also served as an assistant U.S. attorney and in 2000 was nominated by the President to be the U.S. attorney for the District of New Mexico. He was confirmed in that position by the full Senate by unanimous consent.

Mr. Bay is an outstanding public servant with extensive experience in the field of energy markets. I am confident he will judiciously implement FERC's statutory responsibility of oversight of our Nation's energy infrastructure, competitive markets, and reliability.

At his confirmation hearing in May, members of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee had a chance to question Mr. Bay extensively on his work at the FERC and his views on regulatory policy. Senator Pete Domenici, a former chairman and longtime member of the energy committee from my home State of New Mexico, spoke at the hearing in strong support of Mr. Bay's nomination. Senator Jeff Bingaman, another former chairman of the energy committee from New Mexico, wrote a letter in support of his nomination.

The Senate must give consent to the President's nominees to be members of the FERC. The Senate is fulfilling that responsibility with this vote today. However, there should be no misunderstanding—Congress gave the President alone the responsibility of designating a member of the Commission to be the Chairman of the Commission. The law enacted by Congress in 1977 remains very clear: The President, and not the Senate, determines who will serve as Chairman of the Commission.

I believe Mr. Bay will be fair, balanced, pragmatic, and a consensus-oriented member of the FERC. He will decide cases on the merits, based on the facts, based on the law and on the record.

I am pleased to support the nominations of both Commissioner LaFleur and Mr. Bay to be members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. I hope the Senate will vote today to confirm them both.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes and that it not be counted against the majority's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last week the President was in Denver, CO, where he talked about the economy. He said this: ''By almost every measure, we are better off than when I took office.'' That is quite a statement. ''By almost every measure we are better off than when I took office.'' I know a lot of Americans struggling with high health care bills who might disagree with that because the truth is that very few Americans are better off than they were 5½ years ago. Household income has plummeted by more than $3,300 since the President took office. Meanwhile, the price of everything, from milk to the refrigerator to store it in, has risen. Gas prices have nearly doubled since the President took office. College costs have soared. Of course, family health insurance premiums have increased by nearly $3,000 per family.

Combine reduced income with higher prices and you get a reduced living standard. Under the Obama Presidency, families who were once comfortably in the middle class are now struggling to make ends meet. Other Americans have dropped out of the middle class altogether.

There are 3.7 million more women in poverty today than there were when the President took office. Mr. President, you want to talk about the war on women?

When the President took office, 33 million Americans were on food stamps. Today more than 46 million Americans receive food stamps. Americans struggling financially have had few opportunities to get ahead because the Obama economy has offered very little in the way of opportunity.

The President likes to talk about the jobs the economy has gained recently. But what he does not say is that 5 years after the recession officially ended, our economy is still posting recession-type levels of unemployment.

Back in 2009 the President's economic advisers confidently predicted that unemployment would fall below 6 percent in 2012. Well, here we are 2 years later. We are still not below 6 percent unemployment even after a historic expansion of monetary policy and the largest fiscal stimulus since World War II. The only reason the unemployment rate is not higher is because so many Americans have given up looking for a job entirely and dropped out of the workforce. The labor force participation rate currently stands at 62.8 percent—near a 36-year low. To put it another way, if the labor participation rate today were what it was when the President took office, unemployment would not be a little over 6 percent, it would be 10.2 percent. That is how many people have completely dropped out of the labor force and are no longer even looking for a job.

Then there are the millions of Americans who are working part time because they cannot find a full-time job. The Labor Department reported that the economy lost more than half a million full-time jobs in June and gained almost 800,000 part-time jobs. That is not a good statistic. It is the rare part-time job that pays all the bills and gives financial stability. Americans need more full-time jobs, not more part-time jobs.

They also need the opportunity for higher paying jobs, but that is another opportunity which is in short supply in the Obama economy. Forty-one percent of the jobs lost during the recession were high-wage jobs, but just 30 percent of the jobs recovered have been high-wage jobs. Similarly, 37 percent of the jobs lost in the recession were midwage jobs, while just 26 percent of the jobs gained since the recession have been midwage jobs. Meanwhile, while just 22 percent of the jobs lost during the recession were low-wage jobs, 44 percent of the jobs gained since the recession have been low-wage jobs.

We are trading high-wage jobs for low-wage jobs, full-time jobs for part-time jobs. That is the reality that many Americans are experiencing. The Obama recovery, however, has been producing low-wage part-time jobs—not the types of jobs that Americans need for a future of financial security and stability.

No policy is threatening Americans' economic future more than ObamaCare. As every American knows, ObamaCare has failed to deliver on its promise of making health care more affordable. The President promised that his health care law would reduce premiums by $2,500. Instead, premiums have risen.

Millions of Americans had their insurance plans cancelled and were told that their new plans would cost more—sometimes much, much more. One constituent wrote to tell me that the cheapest plan she could find for her family of four would cost $17,000. Another wrote to tell me that his insurance plan was cancelled due to ObamaCare and the cheapest bronze plan he could find was $987 a month—more than double what he was paying before. On top of that, the plan had a higher deductible and significantly higher cost-sharing requirements than his old plan.

I am sure every one of my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans—has received letters just like this. Our constituents are hurting. What middle class family can afford to pay $17,000 a year in insurance or double its health care premiums from the year before?

ObamaCare is placing an immense burden on middle-class families. The huge premium hikes that many Americans are facing are having a real impact on families' budgets. Money eaten by health care costs is money that can't be spent on a daughter's college education or a new car to replace the failing one or on repairs for the roof—and there is seemingly no end to ObamaCare's penalties.

In addition to hiking insurance premiums, ObamaCare is also encouraging companies to drop spousal coverage from their health plans. UPS and the University of Virginia, for example, have already dropped spousal coverage because of ObamaCare. Women are particularly affected by this since, as the Wall Street Journal reports, they tend to be the ones being dropped from employer-sponsored health care plans.

Then there is ObamaCare's marriage penalty. A woman who qualifies for a tax subsidy to help her purchase insurance could lose that subsidy if she gets married—even if both she and her husband qualified for the subsidy when they were single.

ObamaCare isn't just hiking Americans' health care bills, it is also damaging their economic prospects. Thanks to the 30-hour workweek rule, ObamaCare is helping to drive the surge in part-time employment. Businesses that couldn't afford to give health insurance to workers working more than 30 hours have been forced to reduce their employees' hours and, by extension, their wages. Sixty-three percent of those affected by this provision are women.

Then there is the employer mandate, which is discouraging wage growth and making it more difficult for employers to grow their businesses and to hire new workers. When employers are forced to pay for benefits they can't afford, they often have no choice but to reduce wages or cancel raises and abandon plans for growing their businesses.

Then there are the other ObamaCare provisions that discourage job growth, such as the tax on medical devices such as pacemakers and insulin pumps, which has already been responsible for the loss of thousands of jobs in the medical device industry.

The last thing that we need right now in this weak economy is the kind of widespread devastation ObamaCare is causing. Americans are being hit from both sides. ObamaCare is raising their medical bills and it is destroying their job opportunities.

If the President were serious about trying to help middle-class Americans, he would be looking at where his health care law went wrong and at least supporting fixes for its most damaging provisions.

If Democrats were serious about fixing health care and helping the economy, they would be taking up Senator COLLINS' Forty Hours is Full Time Act, which would fix the ObamaCare 30-hour workweek rule and put Americans back to work or they would support my bill to eliminate the employer mandate for schools, colleges, and universities, so that these institutions aren't forced to cut wages or to eliminate positions.

Democrats thought if Americans found out what was in ObamaCare and what it meant for them, they would come to like it. Well, Americans have found out what is in the President's health care law, what it means for them, and they don't like it.

ObamaCare is hurting American families, it is hurting our economy, and it is time to start over and replace this bill with real health care reform, the kind that will lower costs, that will increase choice, and that will put Americans back in charge of their health care.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Cheryl LaFleur to serve as a commissioner on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and in opposition to the nomination of Norman Bay to serve as a commissioner on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

On May 20, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, of which I am a member, held a hearing on these two nominations. I had questions regarding Mr. Bay's qualifications prior to that hearing, and they were not allayed. If anything, they were reinforced. Mr. Bay's experience in the energy field consists of his service over the past 5 years as Director of the Office of Enforcement at the FERC, a tenure which has been marked by that office's controversial theories of market manipulation and concerns by long-time industry experts about due process. Mr. Bay has 5 years of enforcement experience, but he has no regulatory experience. By contrast, Commissioner LaFleur, currently serving as the Acting Chairman of the FERC, has 5 years of experience on the FERC and decades of experience in the energy sector, including as a State utility commissioner.

Yet we are being asked to demote Commissioner LaFleur to commissioner and replace her with an unproven and arguably less qualified candidate.

But most important from my perspective is whether a nominee will address the key responsibilities assigned to the agency to which he or she is being nominated. At FERC, job one with respect to the electric sector is assuring just and reasonable electric service in interstate commerce, which Congress has found for the past 80 years to be in the public interest. Assuring the reliability of such service is an important task that Congress explicitly made part of FERC's responsibilities nearly a decade ago.

At our May 20 hearing, I asked Mr. Bay whether he agreed with the developing consensus that baseload power plants, the ''always on'' energy resources vital to reliable operation of the grid, deserve additional consideration for the irreplaceable reliability benefits they provide. Mr. Bay answered that he looked forward to reviewing comments on the issue. I then asked whether as a commissioner he would look at the cumulative effect of EPA rules that, by various estimates, have resulted in the announced closure of 40,000 to 70,000 megawatts of coal-fired power plants across the country, many of them in Ohio, the closure of which has raised strong concerns about maintaining electric reliability in many parts of the country. He answered that if confirmed, he would be willing to discuss the issue with his colleagues to see if consensus could be reached.

Mr. President, these are simple questions that go to the heart of FERC's mission. On both, Mr. Bay gave non-answer answers that are the basis for substantial concern. Either you agree that something needs to be done to keep power plants running that are vital to maintaining a reliable electric system, or you don't. Either you are concerned that EPA's rules, which even the environmental groups attribute to shuttering more than 68,000 megawatts of coal-fired generation, need to be evaluated for their electric reliability impacts, or you don't.

A presidential nominee deserves the benefit of the doubt, but in the case of Mr. Bay, whose nomination has been rushed to the floor, the doubts remain too strong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—CALENDAR NOS. 894, 704, AND 508

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 842, the Senate remain in executive session and consider Calendar Nos. 894, Nealon; 704, Wood; and 508, Jaenichen; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes, following the first in the series, be 10 minutes in length; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. For the information of all Senators, we expect the nominations considered in this agreement to be confirmed by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments about nominees that are before the Senate for confirmation and to thank Members on both sides of the aisle for working together to try to move forward two very important nominees for FERC.

First, let me say there has been some criticism of one of the nominees from some Members of the other party and, of course, everyone is entitled to their opinion; that is what the Senate is for. But I would like to make sure that the Senate record reflects an opinion of someone whom I admire greatly and I believe is very admired—significantly admired—by every Member of this Senate, and that is the opinion of Senator Domenici, the Republican chair of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for many years and a long-serving Senator from the State of New Mexico.

Senator Domenici, it may not be clearly understood, actually came to the energy committee to testify on behalf of Norman Bay.

His testimony was one of the most artful and compelling I have seen in my days here—which are now quite long at almost 18 years—and unusual in the sense that he read from no script, spoke from the heart, and spoke to Democratic and Republican members of our committee. This is some of what he had to say:

> I am pleased to provide a strong statement of support to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee on behalf of Norman C. Bay. I first met Norman in early 2000, when he was nominated to be the U.S. Attorney in the District of New Mexico. I supported his nomination then and I support his nomination now to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission . . .
>
> He was a good U.S. Attorney—fair, capable, and non-partisan—and, with my support, he remained in office as U.S. Attorney until 2001.

He continues:

> In July 2009, Norman became the Director of the Office of Enforcement (OE) at FERC. This is a big job, because among other things OE must administer the anti-manipulation authority of the Energy Policy Act of 2005—a bill that I had authored when I was the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and one that passed with wide bipartisan support. The anti-manipulation authority was intended to give FERC the tools to combat the type of manipulation we saw in the Western Power Crisis from 2000 to 2001. I am pleased to hear that FERC has brought a number of significant anti-manipulation cases and that the EPAct authority I gave to FERC has been put to good use to protect consumers, as well as the integrity of the wholesale natural gas and power markets.

I could not think of a more compelling person to have in your corner than the former Republican chair of the energy committee in support of the Bay nomination.

Now, there are a handful of Members on the other side that have opposed every nominee put forward by President Obama because their agenda is very different. It is a political agenda. But on policy, Senator Pete Domenici's testimony goes a long way in his support of a man who he believes is extremely qualified for the job to which the President has nominated him.

In addition to the compelling testimony of Senator Domenici, which was very influential in my final decision to support this nominee, I also want to present for the record the letter from the Republican Governor of New Mexico, Susana Martinez, who let me know personally that she would have loved to have been there personally to testify on behalf of Norman Bay but was unable to do so because of her schedule. She goes on to write a strong letter of recommendation, which is in the record of our committee. She says:

> I am certain that Norman has been dedicated in his efforts to protect consumers, has been fair and balanced in his approach, and has focused on doing the right thing on behalf of the public interest.
>
> For all those reasons, I hope the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will approve Norman's nomination to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

These are just a few of the strong testimonials that led me to finally consent to my support of Norman Bay, but I did so with the support of the Presiding Officer as a member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, making sure that the current chair, Cheryl LaFleur, could stay on for an additional length of time. I would have liked another year. Some people wanted 3 months, some people wanted 6 months, and some people wanted a full term. But we settled on a 9-month compromise—which is actually the fundamental nature of our business in the Senate.

It has been lost in the last couple of years, but I continue to be an optimistic believer that a good compromise can help us move the country forward, reduce rancor, hold people together, and make some decisions that are so important for the people who we are trying to serve.

FERC is not an insignificant entity. FERC, given the power by us, is the guardian of the public interest in our natural gas and electricity markets,

something that Louisiana knows a lot about—natural gas and electricity markets.

We produce a tremendous amount of oil and gas for this Nation, and we consume a lot of oil and gas as producers of chemicals and other products that use natural gas as a feedstock. We are proud of our industry, and I would never casually support members on FERC if I didn't believe they were prepared to do this job and to do it well.

In particular, with the testimony from the former Republican chairman of the committee and a current serving Republican Governor for Norman Bay, I feel confident, based on his background, that he could do a good job, after working with Cheryl LaFleur for 9 months, which is the agreement that the White House and others have made.

Let me talk about Cheryl LaFleur for a moment. She is a graduate of Princeton. She is able, she is competent, and she has served as a member of FERC. She, in my view, has also been doing a spectacular job. She will continue to serve as chair of FERC for the next 9 months—should she be confirmed today—and will continue with the members of FERC to try to provide reliable power and electricity to our country—being fair and protecting the public interest.

This is a very complicated field of law and policy, as we know. This is not an easy part of the law to interpret.

There are many different electricity markets, there are many different ways to supply it. They are not-for-profits, they are municipals, and they are public utility companies. They all have pipelines and issues that have to go before FERC, and there are over 2,000 people who work for this agency. It may not be a household word, but it affects every household in America. So Cheryl LaFleur will remain, at my request, as chair for 9 months. Norman Bay will come on and train, if you will, under her leadership, and I think grow into the role as a policymaker. He clearly is qualified—by the demonstration of the letters I have put in.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the leadership role he has played in outlining that path forward, trying to broker a compromise between people who wanted to do it very differently.

We had opposition on both sides for what is actually happening today, as we know, but we worked with Democrats and Republicans, trying to find a way forward, honoring the right of the President to make his nominations and still doing the right thing by FERC and the country. I personally think we have achieved that. I wanted to put that on the record before we vote. I understand the vote should be called any moment now.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON BAY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Bay nomination.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield all time back for both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Norman C. Bay, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2018?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''nay'' and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 224 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heller	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Landrieu	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Levin	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	
Hagan	Murray	

NAYS—45

Ayotte	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Blunt	Grassley	Paul
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Chambliss	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Coburn	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johanns	Sessions
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	King	Thune
Crapo	Kirk	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	McCain	Walsh
Fischer	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Corker	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON LAFLEUR NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the LaFleur nomination.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I yield back all time and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Cheryl A. LaFleur, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2019?

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea'' and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) would have voted ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 225 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Ayotte	Franken	Merkley
Baldwin	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Murphy
Begich	Hagan	Murray
Bennet	Harkin	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hatch	Paul
Blunt	Heinrich	Portman
Booker	Heitkamp	Pryor
Boozman	Heller	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Reid
Brown	Hoeven	Risch
Burr	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Isakson	Rubio
Carper	Johanns	Sanders
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Coats	Kaine	Shaheen
Coburn	King	Shelby
Cochran	Kirk	Stabenow
Collins	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Landrieu	Thune
Cornyn	Leahy	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Udall (CO)
Cruz	Levin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Manchin	Vitter
Durbin	Markey	Warner
Enzi	McCain	Warren
Feinstein	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Fischer	McConnell	Wicker
Flake	Menendez	Wyden

NAYS—7

Cardin	Moran	Walsh
Gillibrand	Roberts	
Mikulski	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Corker	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF JAMES D. NEALON TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS

NOMINATION OF ROBERT A. WOOD FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

NOMINATION OF PAUL NATHAN JAENICHEN, SR., TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nominations of James D. Nealon, of New Hampshire, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Honduras; Robert A. Wood, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the Conference on Disarmament; and Paul Nathan Jaenichen, Sr., of Kentucky, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration.

VOTE ON NEALON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Nealon nomination.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, we yield back time on all three nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Hearing no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James D. Nealon, of New Hampshire, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Honduras?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON WOOD NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert A. Wood, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the Conference on Disarmament?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON JAENICHEN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Paul Nathan Jaenichen, Sr., of Kentucky, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH FROM CORPORATE INTERFERENCE ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today in support of the Not My Boss's Business Act. I thank Senator MURRAY and Senator UDALL for introducing this legislation to help address the recent Supreme Court decision.

Women have gone to the tops of the mountains and to outer space. Women are serving as CEOs, as scientists, and starting our own companies. Here in the Senate we have gone from no women to 20, and that is a great accomplishment.

But for all of our progress—and there has been a lot—this stubborn fact remains: Women still struggle to attain the basic health care services that allow them to plan their families, protect their health, and contribute to our economy. This is fundamentally an issue of fairness and an issue of equality.

I have always said that the Affordable Care Act is a beginning and not an end. I would like to see changes to that bill. I have sponsored changes to that bill. But the law does take significant steps forward on health care for women. One that is of particular importance to women is requiring that all health insurance plans cover FDA-approved forms of contraception. This decision was based on the recommendations of the Institute of Medicine.

The Institute of Medicine had good reason to include contraception as an essential preventive service. We know that pregnancies that are planned are good for moms; they are good for babies. Better access to contraception prevents unintended pregnancies—something we can all agree we want. We do not want unintended pregnancies. We do not want to have abortions. So better access to contraception, as has been proven time and time again, brings down those numbers. And access to birth control is essential for women to meet their career and their education and their family goals.

Not every employer was required to provide contraceptive coverage. Certain nonprofit religious employers were allowed an exemption. It protected the beliefs of religious nonprofits but could be implemented in a way that still ensured all women could receive the same preventive services in their health insurance.

What I do not believe is sensible, however, is allowing any for-profit business to ask for an exemption. That, in practice, is what the Hobby Lobby Supreme Court ruling could do and what the bill we are considering today would correct.

First, what this bill will not do: It will not force churches or religiously affiliated nonprofits to offer contraception coverage. This bill maintains their exemption. It will not force anyone to use contraception. That decision is and must remain with each person.

What this bill will do, however, is to add a provision to the Affordable Care Act's requirements that would prohibit an employer from denying coverage of a health care service that is required under Federal law. It clarifies that this requirement applies even under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act—the law that the Supreme Court ruled was violated by the contraception coverage requirement.

In other words, it says if you work for an American corporation, you can expect that your health insurance—which you work for and receive as part of your compensation—will cover the same basic preventive health benefits everyone else receives. It says that your boss—regardless of his or her religious beliefs—cannot pick and choose what benefits your health insurance covers.

This is common sense. A woman's decision about her birth control is between her and her doctor, not her employer. What she chooses to use her compensation for is really not her boss's business, whether we are talking about a salary or other compensation, including health insurance.

There is no doubt that women have come a long way. But when a woman's boss can step in, as a result of this narrowly decided Court decision—a 5–4 ruling—and prevent her from making the best health care decisions for her health, her career, and her future, it makes me wonder just how far we have actually come.

Mr. President, that is why I urge you to support this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. This important legislation will help preserve the rights of employees while protecting religious employers. It will help women access the preventive services they need and it will prevent unintended pregnancies and improve the health of both women and their children. That is not just good for women; that is good for families, that is good for business, that is good for our economy, and that is good for our future.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to finish my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today in defense of the most fundamental principle on which our Republic was founded—what is rightly recognized as our first freedom—religious liberty.

Our fellow citizens today do not think much of Congress. The Gallup organization, whose results are actually less grim than some other polls, gives Congress a job approval rating of just 15 percent. That figure has not risen above the teens in more than 3 years.

Now and then, however, Congress does rise to the occasion, putting aside partisan or ideological differences to achieve something important for our Nation and its citizens.

One example occurred in 1993—I had a lot to do with it—when liberals and conservatives, Democrats and Republicans, stood to defend a fundamental human right. On October 27, 1993, this body passed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act by a vote of 97 to 3.

It went through the House by a unanimous vote. By mid-November the House had passed it unanimously and President Bill Clinton had signed it into law. I was there at the signing ceremony on the south lawn. Despite the overwhelming bipartisan support for final passage of RFRA, it took Congress 3 years to achieve that defense of religious freedom.

The House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights held hearings in 1990 and 1992, and the full Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing in 1992. Concerned citizens and groups came together to form the Coalition for the Free Exercise of Religion—a grassroots effort more diverse than any I have ever seen in all of my 38 years here. Americans of every political stripe joined hands to defend the first freedom mentioned in the Bill of Rights. The resulting legislation, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, allows the Federal Government to interfere with the exercise of religion only for the most compelling reason and only in the least restrictive way. This law was necessary because in 1990 the Supreme Court had changed the legal standard, making it easy, rather than difficult, for the government to burden religious exercise.

A bill recently introduced here in the Senate, S. 2578, would turn the clock back, requiring that Federal laws and regulations ignore rather than respect religious freedom. This is the first time in American history that the Congress will consider a bill intended to diminish the protections for the religious liberty of all Americans. It is part of a broader campaign to demonize religious freedom as the enemy, as an obstacle to certain political goals.

It is important for the American people to know the truth about how we got here. The Affordable Care Act requires that most employers provide insurance coverage at no cost to employees for what it calls preventive services. Regulations from the Department of Health and Human Services define that category as covering all forms of birth control approved by the Food and Drug Administration, including both contraceptives and methods that can act after conception.

The difference between a contraceptive and an abortifacient is the difference between preventing and taking human life. That discrepancy may be meaningless to some, but it is very important to many and can be a matter of the most profound moral and religious significance. As a result of the birth control mandate, many religious employers faced massive fines if they followed their religious beliefs, so some of them filed suit to prevent its enforcement.

This is exactly the kind of situation that the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was enacted to address, the kind of situation that should require the government to justify why it wants to interfere with the exercise of religion.

Cases brought by two companies owned by religious families made it to the Supreme Court. These companies do provide insurance coverage for the FDA's 16 methods of contraception, but they believe that doing so for its 4 methods of birth control that can cause abortion violates their deeply held religious beliefs.

Two weeks ago, in a case titled ''Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores,'' the Supreme Court ruled that the HHS birth control mandate does not sufficiently accommodate these employers' exercise of religion as required by the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

It took a lot of work to establish RFRA's defense of religious freedom, but it would not take much work to destroy it. The bill we will soon consider, S. 2578, would in one fell swoop reduce the free exercise of religion from a fundamental human right to a cheap election-year prop.

RFRA was developed after months of discussion and debate. It was the product of bipartisan deliberation and considered judgment. I know. I was there. I was the one who talked Senator Kennedy into coming on this bill. When it was signed on the south lawn—when President Clinton signed it, Senator Kennedy was one of the most proud people there. This bill represents vindication of the fundamental and natural rights that we originally established government to protect.

By contrast, S. 2578 was thrown together in a matter of days. It has not received a single committee hearing in either Chamber. In fact, here in the Senate it is not even being sent to a legislative committee. The majority has put their finger to the political wind and decided that all they want is a show vote they can spin to their advantage in the election this fall. That is ridiculous. They ought to be ashamed.

One sign of what is really going on is the fact that the bill's ''findings'' are about four times as long as its actual provisions, and it reads more like a series of press releases than serious legislative language. The bill's supporters wish to ram it through Congress without meaningful deliberation, without hearings, without the kind of scrutiny that would expose this effort for what it is. The bill's findings, for example, say not one word about the exercise of religion that gave rise to the Hobby Lobby litigation in the first place. Instead, one of the bill's findings claims that those lawsuits were filed by employers who simply wanted to deny their employees health insurance coverage for birth control. I guess you can call it contraception. In reality, the employers do not want to take anything away from anyone. They simply ask, as the Religious Freedom Restoration Act requires, that laws and regulations about health insurance coverage also consider and balance their basic right to religious exercise.

I have heard proponents of this legislation make wild claims that corporations are denying access to health care, intruding into people's bedrooms, and even taking away their freedoms. Nonsense. Such claims do not even pass the laugh test. They are so clearly false that those who peddle such fiction must ignore both RFRA and the Supreme Court's decision in the Hobby Lobby case or deliberately distort them beyond recognition.

Just yesterday the Washington Post Fact Checker listed example after example of what it charitably described as the rhetoric getting way ahead of the facts as Democrats have made one outlandish claim after another.

Finding 19 in this bill is perhaps its most outrageous, claiming that legislation ''is intended to be consistent with the Congressional intent in enacting the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.'' But of course that claim is absurd on its face. Congress expressed its purpose in enacting RFRA in the text of that statute, including RFRA's finding that its legal standard applies ''in all cases where the free exercise of religion is substantially burdened.'' RFRA's most prominent backers in Congress also expressed its intent. Over in the House, for example, then-Representative CHARLES SCHUMER said that RFRA would restore the American tradition of ''allowing maximum religious freedom''—spoke about this bill, spoke glowingly about what it means on both sides of the floor.

The bill before us today does the opposite, requiring employers to provide insurance coverage ''notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law,'' including specifically the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. If a bill prohibiting consideration of religious exercise is consistent with the law requiring consideration of religious exercise, such as RFRA, then words have no meaning whatsoever.

We are also told that S. 2578 simply responds to the Supreme Court's recent decision in Hobby Lobby, but in reality

it goes much further. The Supreme Court's decision involved only the Affordable Care Act and the HHS birth control mandate, but this bill prohibits consideration of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act regarding insurance coverage of any health care item or service required by any Federal law or regulation. The Affordable Care Act and the HHS birth control mandate apply to employers with at least 50 employees, but this bill's much broader mandate applies to any employer regardless of size. The Hobby Lobby case involved a for-profit corporation, but this bill applies to any employer. This bill appears to be not so much a response to the Supreme Court's decision in Hobby Lobby as the attempt to broaden and extend the Affordable Care Act and the HHS birth control mandate.

The bill's mandate that health insurance coverage for any health care item or service under any Federal law or regulation be provided notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law seems to reach beyond the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. Does it include, for example, the Hyde-Weldon amendment or other laws that have for more than 40 years protected health care providers and facilities from being forced to participate in abortion? Before you answer no, remember that no one thought RFRA's protections for religious freedom would ever be attacked as they are today.

Under S. 2578, the lone protections for the fundamental right of religious exercise would be the narrow statutory exemption for churches and houses of worship and the weak administrative accommodation for religious nonprofits that could be revoked at any time. Even worse, the bill would allow for a future reduction or elimination of this so-called accommodation but not for its expansion. Not only would religious freedom be diminished immediately but what is left would be subject to a one-way ratchet toward elimination.

Earlier this summer I spoke here on the Senate floor about how religious freedom in America has three key dimensions: It includes religious behavior as well as belief. It applies collectively as well as individually. It is public as well as private in scope.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act represents the full understanding of religious freedom. It requires that when Congress considers legislation or executive branch agencies consider regulations, they must take this fundamental freedom into account and give it the respect it deserves. S. 2578 would be the first bill to create an exemption from RFRA and the first bill explicitly to prohibit consideration of the fundamental right of religious exercise.

Five years after enacting the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, Congress enacted the International Religious Freedom Act, which established the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. That legislation declared that the ''right to freedom of religion undergirds the very origin and existence of the United States.'' The Senate passed that legislation by a vote of 98 to 0, including 10 Democrats who have today cosponsored the bill before us that would disregard freedom of religion. Those Democrats include the majority leader and the sponsor of S. 2578. They cannot have it both ways.

Like his predecessors, President Obama designated January 16 as Religious Freedom Day. In his proclamation, the President declared that ''my administration will remain committed to promoting religious freedom both at home and across the globe. We urge every country to recognize religious freedom as both a religious right and a key to a stable, prosperous and peaceful future.'' Actions speak louder than words. Either religious freedom undergirds the origin and existence of America or it does not. Religious freedom is either a universal right or it is not. Religious freedom is either a key to a stable and prosperous future or it is not.

If America is about allowing maximum religious freedoms, as my colleague the senior Senator from New York once said, then it should continue to do so.

It is time for this body to choose whether it will protect religious liberty or whether it will seek to destroy it.

In 1993, Congress stood up to defend the free exercise of religion after a Supreme Court decision undermined it. The bill before us today would undermine the free exercise of religion after a Supreme Court decision defended it.

In 1993, the free exercise of religion was offered as a solution. The bill before us today targets religious freedom as the problem. It treats certain religious beliefs as simply unworthy of recognition and religious exercise in general as a second- or even a third-rate value. I believe we can both uphold fundamental rights and find solutions to public policy issues.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, even though we have differences about policy, will once again join together for the common good by recommitting ourselves and our Nation to the fundamental right of religious freedom. We have to do this. It is the first freedom mentioned in the Bill of Rights. One would think everybody here would be absolutely on the side of upholding it.

This bill is anything but that, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle start to realize how important this is and vote against this terrible bill that has been slapped together for political purposes.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, Republicans are on the attack once again, trying to put women's fundamental rights on the chopping block. I stand with my colleagues to fight back. Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington, Senator MARK UDALL of Colorado, and 40 other Senators have stood to sponsor new legislation to reverse the Supreme Court's shocking decision in Hobby Lobby, where the Court gave corporations the power to deny their employees access to birth control. We will vote on this legislation tomorrow morning, and I urge my colleagues to pass it without delay.

Right now, with millions of Americans still out of work and struggling to recover from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, with 40 million Americans dealing with student loans, with millions of people working full time at minimum wage and still living in poverty, with the big banks getting bigger, workers getting poorer, and seniors struggling to make ends meet, Republicans in Washington have decided that the most important thing for them to focus on is how to deny women access to birth control.

I will be honest: I cannot believe we are even having a debate about whether employers can deny women access to birth control. Guys, this is 2014, not 1914. Most Americans thought this was settled long, long ago. But for some reason Republicans keep dragging us back here over and over again.

After all, the Hobby Lobby case is just the most recent battle in an all-out Republican assault on women's access to basic health care. In 2012 the Republicans tried to pass the Blunt amendment, a proposal that would have allowed employers and insurance companies to deny women access to health care services based on any vague moral objection. Democrats said no, the President said no, and the American people said no to this offensive idea.

But instead of listening to the American people, Republicans in Washington doubled down. Remember last year's government shutdown that nearly tanked our economy? That fight started with a GOP effort to hold the whole operation of the Federal Government hostage in order to try to force Democrats and the President to let employers deny their workers access to birth control. Well, we rejected the hostage taking. Democrats said no, the President said no, and the American people said no to this offensive idea.

But instead of listening to the American people, Republicans turned to their rightwing friends on the Supreme Court, and those Justices did what Congress would not do, what the President would not do, and what the American people would not do. Those Justices decided that corporations have the right to ignore the law and determine for themselves whether their employees can access basic health care coverage.

The Hobby Lobby decision is a stunning case. As Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg noted in her dissent, the result of this case could be to deny ''legions of women who do not hold their employers' beliefs access to contraceptive coverage that the ACA would otherwise secure.''

The case is the first step on a slippery slope that could eventually allow corporations to deny health care coverage to employees for other medical care including immunizations that protect our children from deadly disease, HIV treatment that saves lives or blood transfusions needed in surgeries.

The Hobby Lobby case is stunning, but not entirely surprising. Giant corporations and their rightwing allies fight every day in Congress to protect their own privileges and to bend the laws to benefit themselves. They devote enormous resources to the task. Sometimes we beat them anyway. We beat them when they tried to pass the Blunt amendment, and we beat them when they tried to shut down the government over birth control. But when corporations lose in Congress, they don't just give up. They know they can often turn defeat into victory if they can get a favorable court decision. So while they push hard on Congress, they also devote enormous resources to influencing the courts, trying to transform our judiciary from a neutral, fair and impartial forum into just one more rigged Washington game. Nowhere has the success of this strategy to rig the courts been more obvious than with the U.S. Supreme Court. Three well-respected legal scholars recently examined 20,000 Supreme Court cases from the last 65 years, and they listed the top 10 most procorporate Justices in that entire time. The results? The five conservative Justices sitting on the Court today were all in the top 10, and Justices Alito and Roberts are numbers 1 and 2.

So it is no surprise that those five Justices banded together in the Hobby Lobby case to decide that corporations have more rights than the women who work for them. They decided that corporations are people who matter more than real living men and women who work hard everyday and who are entitled to the protection of our laws.

Now we can fight back against this decision and against the corporate capture of our Federal courts. We can fight back by appointing judges who are fair, judges who are impartial, judges who won't show up on any ''top 10'' list for putting a thumb on the scales in favor of big business. We can fight back tomorrow by passing legislation to overturn this terrible Supreme Court decision.

The proposed law, called the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act is simple. It does not require any person, any church, any house of worship, any faith or any religious nonprofit to endorse or provide insurance coverage for contraception. It does just one thing: It prevents ordinary for-profit corporations from ignoring the law and imposing their own religious beliefs on their employees by refusing to provide basic health benefits that are legally required. That was the law before Hobby Lobby, and it should be the law again.

Senators will have a chance to vote tomorrow, and I urge every Senator to do the right thing. But whatever happens, we have won this fight many times before, and I am confident that sooner or later we will win it again, because no matter how many resources the other side pours into this battle, they will never convince Americans that their bosses should be in charge of their most intimate health care decisions, and they will never convince Americans that corporations are people whose imagined rights are somehow more important than the health of real living, breathing people.

I have a daughter, I have granddaughters, and I will never stop fighting the efforts of backward-looking ideologues who want to cut women's access to birth control. We have lived in that world, and we are not going back—not ever.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, according to the Border Patrol, more than 57,000 unaccompanied children have entered the United States illegally this year. That number is expected to grow to 90,000 by the end of the year and 140,000 by the end of next year. These startling facts speak for themselves. Swift and dramatic action, both on the part of Congress and the administration is needed.

We know why most children are coming. America offers more opportunity than the country from which they are fleeing. Most of these children hope to be reunited with a parent or a relative. Many just hope to blend into the United States and to stay for an indefinite period of time. I understand that.

I understand the incentive to be in the United States, but we cannot simply allow this to continue. According to reports about a recent White House meeting the President had with some people concerned about this wave of people coming from Central America, the President said that sometimes there is an inherent injustice in where you are born, and no President can solve that. He reportedly said that Presidents must send the message that you just cannot show up at the border, plead for asylum or refugee status and hope to get it.

The President is quoted as saying:

> . . . then anyone can come in, and it means that, effectively, we don't have any kind of system. We are a Nation with borders that must be enforced.

The President is right. If the reckless journey from Central America or Mexico or any other country to the United States is met with, at worst, long stays in the United States and, at best, long stays coupled with family reunification, these crossings will continue. It is just human nature. Even if every child and every adult is ultimately deported 6 months or a year from now, it will be too late, for in the intervening months the message is: Make it to the United States and you can stay.

The incentives must change. When planes full of those who crossed are returned, people in those countries will stop paying smugglers thousands of dollars to take their children north. Incentives work, and in this case it may be the only way.

So what are we to do? At one point the President asked Congress for some legal authority. Congress should give it to him. In addition, Senator MCCAIN and I will offer a bill that will hinge U.S. foreign aid to Central American countries on their response to this situation, providing for refugee processing in those countries. They will heighten penalties for human trafficking and it will expedite the removal of those who are here without a legitimate claim.

The President did ask for funds to deal with the crisis, although he asked for those funds without reforms. I am pleased to say that there appears to be a growing consensus that any funding request in a supplemental bill should include substantive reforms that deal with the existing circumstances that we are in as well as heading off future impacts. In the meantime the administration has at its discretion the ability to dramatically stem this wave of crossings.

I will talk about a few of the options that the President clearly has right now. First and foremost, the Department of Homeland Security is not required to release unaccompanied children after they have been apprehended. While requiring DHS to transfer them to Health and Human Services within 72 hours, the 2008 trafficking law provides flexibility in ''exceptional circumstances.''

Second, the administration has at its discretion the ability to expedite or trim the timelines of hearings for unaccompanied children. For example, the President can direct the Department of Justice to not agree to continuances for these hearings. He should do that as well.

Third, for children already released to HHS, the President can direct HHS to not place children automatically with their parents or family members. The 2008 trafficking protection law requires the administration to place children in the ''least restrictive setting'' in their best interest. The administration has discretion as to what constitutes least restrictive setting. If we acknowledge, as the President has, that most of these children will not be able to stay in the United States, why would we place them with a parent or a guardian only to take them from that parent or guardian months or years later? That, I would submit, is not in their best interest.

I am certain that there are those who will object to these actions if taken by the President, but I will submit that we should do everything we can to ensure that another 30,000 or 60,000 or 100,000 children do not stream north on this dangerous journey. The real question is, What wouldn't we do to prevent that from happening? The current situation is not humane at all. It is not humane to allow these children to come forward this way.

Let me be clear. For those seeking asylum, there will be many who will have a legitimate claim of persecution. Nobody is talking about shutting down the avenues to submit or to have such a claim. There will still be protections for genuine asylum seekers. It is best for those who seek refuge to do so in their own home country at an American embassy or consulate. That should, at best, be done in their own country. The legislation we will put forward will provide more resources for that to happen.

Earlier this month the President's spokesman indicated that ''it's unlikely that most of the kids who go through this process will qualify for humanitarian relief, which is to say that most of them will not have a legal basis . . . to remain in the country.''

Cecilia Munoz, the Director of the White House Domestic Policy Council, made it clear: ''If you look at the history of these kinds of cases and apply them to the situation, it seems very unlikely that the majority of these children are going to have the ability to stay in the United States.''

Here is my primary concern: Despite discretion to do otherwise, the administration continues to provide precisely the goal of those crossing illegally—being allowed to enter the United States, reuniting with their families, and staying for an extended period of time. They are allowing these incentives to continue. Despite firm quotes and statements otherwise, the administration's response to the crisis is a case study in sending the wrong message.

In his July 8 request for $3.7 billion in supplemental spending related to this crisis, the President stated that his administration would work with Congress to ''ensure that [they] have the legal authority'' they need, including ''providing the Secretary of Homeland Security additional authority to exercise discretion in processing the return and removal of unaccompanied children from these Central American countries.'' More than a week later, with the wave of children crossing illegally every day and increased anger pointed at the issue, it remains anyone's guess as to what the President is actually seeking. He didn't ask for any new authority in the funding request that was just sent up. In the days after the supplemental request was made, it became clear that nearly $2 billion of the funding request is for the Department of Health and Human Services—a department that plays no role in deportation and a department that the administration permits to place those who cross illegally with families inside the United States.

Congress needs to do what it can to provide the statutory tools to address this crisis. As I mentioned earlier, the senior Senator from Arizona and I will offer a bill in the coming days to do that. In the meantime, the President has the discretion and the authority to act within the law, follow the law, and offer the right incentives so we don't have this situation continuing as it is today. I encourage the President to do so.

With that, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The senior Senator from New Jersey.

IRAN NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come again to the floor to speak about one of our greatest national security challenges, which is a nuclear-armed Iran and the latest conflicting remarks coming from Iran's leaders.

I will say at the outset, as I have said in the past, I support the administration's diplomatic efforts. I have always supported a bipartisan, two-track policy of diplomacy and sanctions. At the same time, I am convinced that we should only relieve pressure on Iran in exchange for very verifiable concessions that will fundamentally dismantle Iran's illicit nuclear program and that any deal be structured in such a way that alarm bells will sound from Vienna to Washington to Moscow and Beijing should Iran restart its program anytime in the next 20 or 30 years.

I am gravely concerned by the recent remarks of Iran's Supreme Leader, the Ayatollah, whose views about what Iran is willing to give up in a deal seem to deliberately undermine the positions of Iran's negotiators in Vienna and clearly curtail their flexibility as we enter into a critical stage of the talks.

Yesterday, Foreign Minister Zarif gave an interview that went public with Iran's negotiating position. Let's break down exactly what it is he offered. He said Iran will freeze its nuclear fuel program for several years in exchange for being treated like other peaceful nuclear nations and for sanctions relief. Let's be clear. This will leave 19,000 centrifuges spinning in Iran. It would not, from what I can tell, require Iran to dismantle anything. In my view, that is not a starting place for an end game. It is the same obfuscation and the same Iranian tactics we have seen for years and decades. Iran puts offers on the table that appear to be concessions but in reality are designed to preserve Iranian illicit nuclear infrastructure and enrichment so that the capacity to break out and rush toward a nuclear weapon is still very much within reach. That is not an end game; it is a nonstarter.

Essentially what Zarif is offering is the same concessions as what Iran made for the interim agreement over 6 months ago. In exchange, Iran gets sanction relief—except we know Iran is not like any other nation, and its history of cheating, lying, and evading inspections proves it.

One commentator said this morning: ''So it seems that Iran is trying to protect its nuclear breakout capacity while trying to appear moderate.''

Zarif's proposal last night is nothing more than smoke and mirrors. It is more moderate than the Ayatollah's outlandish demand for 190,000 centrifuges last week, but at its core it is an offer to not give anything in terms of enrichment capacity and in exchange receive sanctions relief, and that is unacceptable.

The Zarif proposal will extend the joint plan of action, allowing Iran's nuclear program to run in place subject to inspections but will not make a single concession—none—that would demonstrably set back Iran's nuclear ambitions in the long term, including no concessions on the number of centrifuges in the secret Fordow enrichment facility. Iran would get the relief it wants while retaining the infrastructure to quickly rebuild its stockpile of highly enriched uranium. That is straight out of the North Korea handbook—freeze and preserve your ability for a future date.

I remind my colleagues in the Senate that in October of 1994, the United States and North Korea signed an agreed framework which the international community hoped would end the ongoing crisis over North Korea's nuclear program. The agreement froze the operation and construction of North Korea's nuclear reactors which were part of its covert nuclear weapons program. In exchange, the United States agreed to provide two proliferation-resistant nuclear power reactors. There were high hopes for the agreement. Many called it a first step in the full normalization of political and economic relations with North Korea.

While North Korea carried out some of the measures in the agreement, it simultaneously continued its ballistic missile program by improving the range and accuracy of its missiles, and it secretly began to pursue a clandestine program to enrich uranium for nuclear weapons separate from the plutonium program which the agreement had frozen.

Once again, international tensions came to a head in January of 2003 when North Korea withdrew from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and following its withdrawal from the NPT, North Korea kicked out IAEA inspectors, restarted the nuclear reactor that had been frozen under the 1994 agreed framework, and began moving spent fuel rods to a reprocessing center that could produce plutonium.

At the time of its withdrawal, North Korea, like Iran, said it ''had no intention of making nuclear weapons'' and that its nuclear activities ''would be confined only to power production and other peaceful purposes.'' Of course, as

we know now, North Korea would conduct a nuclear test establishing its potential to build nuclear weapons.

This history should serve as a warning about what could happen if we allow Iran to maintain a robust nuclear infrastructure.

The fact is that Iran is simply agreeing to freeze and to temporarily lock the door on its nuclear weapons program as is and walk away. Should they later walk away from the deal, as they have in the past, they can simply unlock the door and continue their nuclear weapons program from where they are today. That is exactly what the talks—in my mind—were intended to avoid.

As I stand here, there is a rush for our negotiators in Vienna and Secretary Kerry to go and try to save the essence of what seems to be a significant distance between the parties. I know our side is working in good faith to reach an agreement. Our terms have been on the table for months, and now, at the critical hour, the Supreme Leader throws a monkey wrench into the negotiations and even surprises his own negotiating team by demanding that 190,000 centrifuges remain for any final deal.

At this point it is our obligation to ask some very pointed questions. Are Zarif and President Ruhani truly empowered to make this deal? Even though Zarif and Ruhani's intentions seem sincere, can we say the same about the ultimate decisionmaker in Tehran, Supreme Leader Khamenei? Does the Supreme Leader truly want a deal or are his redlines an attempt to undermine the negotiations?

Secretary Kerry said this morning that ''the U.S. believes Iran has the right to a peaceful nuclear program under the NPT.''

Let's remind ourselves of first principles. No country has a right to enrichment. They may have the ability to enrichment or a desire to enrich, but they do not have the right to enrich, and certainly not Iran given its past behavior.

Let's remember how we reached this point. Over a period of decades, Iran has deceived the international community about its nuclear program, breaching its international commitment in what everyone agrees was an attempt to make Iran a nuclear weapons state or at least a threshold state. Experts such as those at the Institute for Science and International Security believe that Iran began building a secret uranium enrichment centrifuge facility underground at Fordow in 2006—3 years—3 years—before it was declared to the International Atomic Energy Administration. Now Iran is seeking to turn the tables on the negotiation to again convince the international community—through words rather than deeds—that it seeks a peaceful nuclear energy program. The Supreme Leader called the idea of closing Fordow ''laughable.'' For my colleagues, this is a facility built under a mountain, declared only after Iran was caught cheating, and designed to withstand a military strike. It does not take a nuclear expert to draw the obvious conclusion about Iran's intentions.

If Iran can't even agree to close the facility that is at the heart of its covert enrichment program, what concessions can it possibly make that would address international concerns? Are we supposed to take Iran at its word when its actions have demonstrated over years that it is not a good-faith actor? Are we supposed to believe that Iran wants 190,000 centrifuges—about 171,000 more than it has right now—for peaceful purposes? That is truly laughable.

Even for a country that doesn't have the world's third largest oil reserves—which Iran does—that would be an absurd position. Iran can—and in fact already does—get cheaper and better nuclear fuel for the Bushehr reactor from Russia than it could make at home. Let me repeat that. It gets cheaper and better fuel from Russia for its nuclear reactor at the Bushehr facility than what it can make at home.

Experts agree that centrifuges must be a part of the deal. David Albright, a respected former International Atomic Energy Administration inspector, has said for Iran's move from an interim to a final agreement, it would have to close the Fordow facility and remove between 15,000 and 16,000 of its existing 20,000 centrifuges. Even then, we are looking at a breakout time of about 6 to 8 months, depending on whether Iran has access to uranium enriched to just 3.5 percent or access to 20-percent enriched uranium.

Dennis Ross, one of America's preeminent diplomats and foreign policy analysts, who has served under both Democratic and Republican Presidents, has said Iran should retain no more than 10 percent of its centrifuges. That is no more than 2,000.

So maybe the comments we have heard from the Supreme Leader were, as some analysts have suggested, an effort by the Supreme Leader to superimpose limitations on the negotiating team so at some point they would be free to say these issues are out of their hands, in the hope of somehow forcing a better deal this week in Vienna. So I suggest that we are either seeing a not so clever game of good cop-bad cop or Iran's negotiators in Vienna have done a poor job of communicating what their boss believes is the bottom line at the negotiating table or maybe we just haven't been listening to what we don't want to hear. From the onset of the talks, Iran's Foreign Minister Zarif and President Rouhani have said they would not dismantle any centrifuges. President Rouhani was adamant in an interview on CNN that Iran would not be dismantling its centrifuges.

Let me quote from that interview with Mr. Zakaria.

President Rouhani:

> We are determined to provide for the nuclear fuel of such plants inside the country, at the hands of local Iranian scientists. We are going to follow on this path.

Zakaria said:

> So there will be no destruction of centrifuges, of existing centrifuges?

President Rouhani said:

> No, no, not at all.

Let's remember that the onus in these talks is on Iran, not the P5+1. Iran is the party at fault. Iran is the party that came to these talks with unclean hands. Iran is the party that has been consistently and overwhelmingly rebuffed by the United Nations and the international community for its nuclear ambitions and support for terrorism, the subject of six U.N. Security Council resolutions and a multitude of sanctions regimes.

Just last week the U.S. courts agreed to a landmark payment of $1.7 billion to the families of Iranian terror victims, including families of the 241 servicemembers who died in the bombing of the Marine Corps barracks bombing in Lebanon in 1983—31 years ago—and 19 who died in the Khobar Towers bombing in eastern Saudi Arabia in 1996—both bombings perpetrated by Iran. Iran's duplicity has been going on for decades.

So who is the bad guy here? Now commentators may choose to see the U.S. Congress as the antagonist here, but I suggest they look across the table and decide whether they want to take a deal with Iran on a nod and a handshake. In my view, through its history, through its actions, through its false words and deeds for decades, Iran has forgone the ability for us to shake on a deal that freezes their program. The only option on the table can be a long-term deal that dismantles Iran's illicit nuclear weapons program—a deal that clearly provides for a long-term verification, inspection, and enforcement regime, and incentives for compliance in the form of sanctions relief—based on Iranian actions that are verifiable, not on what Iran claims to be the truth.

The fact is, from my perspective, there is no sanctions relief signing bonus. If Iran wants relief from sanctions, then it needs to tangibly demonstrate to the world it is giving up its quest for nuclear weapons—period.

Let's remember that, although none of us in this Chamber are at the negotiating table, we have a tremendous stake in the outcome. Without Congress's bipartisan action on a clear sanctions regime, there would have been no talks and we would not even have had the hope of ending Iran's nuclear weapons ambitions. As a separate and coequal branch of government representing the American people, Congress has an obligation to provide oversight and a duty to express our views of what a comprehensive deal should look like. I will continue to come to this floor to express my views and my concerns given what we have heard and seen in the past from Iran.

Iran has a history of duplicity with respect to its nuclear program, using past negotiations to cover advances in its nuclear program. And let's not forget that President Rouhani, as the

former negotiator for Iran, said, in no uncertain terms:

> The day that we invited the three European ministers to the talks, only 10 centrifuges were spinning at Natanz. We could not produce one gram of U4 or U6. We did not have the heavy water production. We could not produce yellowcake. Our total production of centrifuges inside the country was 150. We wanted to complete all of these. We needed time. We did not stop. We completed the program.

That is his quote.

The simple truth is he admitted to deceiving the West.

Everyone knows my history on this issue. Everyone knows where I stand. It is the same place I have always stood. For 20 years I have worked on Iran's nuclear issues, starting when I was a junior Member of the House, pressing for sanctions to prevent Iran from building the Bushehr nuclear powerplant and to halt IAEA support for Iranian mining and enrichment programs. For a decade I was told that my concern had no basis, that Iran would never be able to bring the Bushehr plant on line, and that Iran's activities were not a concern.

Well, history has shown those assessments about Iran's abilities and intentions were simply wrong. The fact is Iran's nuclear aspirations have been a long and deliberate process. They did not materialize overnight, and they will not end simply with a good word and a handshake. We need verification.

If Iran's nuclear weapons capability is frozen rather than largely dismantled, they will remain at the threshold of becoming a declared nuclear State should they choose to start again, because nothing will have changed if nothing is dismantled.

Make no mistake. Iran views developing a nuclear capability as fundamental to its existence. It has seen the development of nuclear weapons as part of a regional hegemonic strategy to make Tehran the center of power throughout the region. That is why our allies and partners in the region—not just Israelis, but the Emiratis and the Saudis—are so skeptical and so concerned about having a leak-proof deal. Quite simply, our allies and partners do not trust Iranian leaders, nor do they believe that Iran has any intention of verifiably ending its nuclear weapons program.

So while I welcome diplomatic efforts as what we have worked toward and I share the hope that the administration can achieve a final comprehensive agreement that eliminates this threat to global peace and security, for the U.S. Congress to support the relief that Iran is looking for, we will need a deal that doesn't just freeze Iran's nuclear weapons program, but a deal—demonstrated through verifiable action by Iran over years—that in fact turns back the clock and makes the world a safer place.

Let me say the fact is there are those who have created a false narrative over the last 6 months that now seems to be self-perpetuating, that anyone who expresses an opinion different than the desire to have a deal—almost a deal at any cost—is a warmonger. For those who now say, Well, if we don't have a deal, then what? I would remind them of what the administration has said time and time again: No deal is better than a bad deal. I agree with that sentiment. But I am concerned that there are forces that would accept a deal even if it is a bad deal. This doesn't serve the interests of the negotiators at the table in Vienna, and it doesn't serve the interests of the American people who want to ensure that Iran doesn't get a nuclear weapon, and that any deal permanently eliminates the possibility that Iran could develop a nuclear weapon that threatens the international order. One mistake is all it takes.

At the end of the day, keeping the pressure on Iran to completely satisfy the United Nations and the international community's demands to halt and reverse its illicit nuclear activities is the best way to avoid war in the first place.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I wish to commend the senior Senator from New Jersey for the powerful remarks he has just given about the threat posed both to the United States and to the world of Iran acquiring nuclear weapons capabilities. I wish to commend the Senator from New Jersey for his leadership, along with Senator MARK KIRK, on Iran sanctions legislation—legislation that enjoys wide bipartisan support—and indeed that would have passed into law months ago were it not for the majority leader of this Chamber refusing to allow a vote on it. Even to this day, we should vote on Kirk-Menendez, because a substantial majority of Members of this body and of the House of Representatives would pass this legislation to make clear what the senior Senator from New Jersey just made clear: that no deal is not nearly as bad as a bad deal, which all of us fear we are on the verge of entering into in Vienna.

ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

I rise today to address the misguided foreign policy of the Obama administration, which is wreaking catastrophic consequences across the globe. The Obama-Clinton-Kerry foreign policy has profoundly undermined our national security, along with that of our friend and ally, the Nation of Israel.

Just last week the White House coordinator for the Middle East, Phillip Gordon, gave an astonishing speech at an international conference from Tel Aviv to try yet again to revive the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. In his remarks, Mr. Gordon criticized Israel for the failure of the most recent round of attacks, urging yet further concessions to the Palestinians. He asserted that the United States, as Israel's ''greatest defender and closest friend,'' had the obligation to ask ''fundamental questions'' about Israel's very viability as a democratic Jewish State after the breakdown of negotiations.

I am not sure about the role Mr. Gordon suggests friends should play, but undermining our allies is not one of them.

Mr. Gordon threatened that America would not be able to prevent the international isolation of Israel—what Secretary of State John Kerry shockingly recently referred to as Israel becoming an ''apartheid'' state—if Israel did not return to the table on terms he found acceptable.

Mr. Gordon warned that the clock is ticking and that Israel should not take for granted the Palestinian Authority's willingness to negotiate. He claimed that the administration's negotiations with Iran had halted that country's nuclear program and made Israel safer.

Mr. Gordon's comments are belied by the facts given that, No. 1, this conference took place under the direct threat of rocket attack from the Palestinian-sanctioned terrorist group Hamas—indeed, delegates literally had to, at one point, scatter for shelter—given that, No. 2, these rockets were fired by the very same terrorist actors who abducted and then brutally murdered three Jewish boys 3 weeks ago near Hebron, and given that, No. 3, Hamas spokesman Osama Hamdan announced just days later that it was working closely with Iran in its attacks on Israel, declaring Hamas's ''connection with Hezbollah and Iran is much stronger today than what people tend to think.''

Given these facts, Mr. Gordon's remarks seem utterly detached from reality.

Even more disturbing, the speech did not take place in a vacuum but, rather, was part of a coordinated messaging effort. It was accompanied by an op-ed by President Obama in Ha'aretz, which sponsored the conference, repeating Mr. Gordon's main themes. Taken as a whole, these statements demonstrate that the administration's longstanding policy of pressuring Israel into a peace deal with the Palestinians remains unchanged by the harsh reality in which Israel finds herself.

In the hopes of demonstrating that there are some in the U.S. Government who do not share this policy, I would like to offer an alternative approach.

As Israel's greatest partner and ally, the United States has weathered with Israel relentless attacks from terrorist organizations like Hamas and Hezbollah, belligerents from rogue nations like Iran, and unremitting hostility from international organizations like the United Nations.

As such, we are veritable brothers in arms—and who better than a brother to tell the truth about you?

The truth is that Israel is the one country in the Middle East that fully shares America's fundamental values and interests.

The truth is that Israel is a vibrant, inclusive democracy that respects the

rights of its citizens—Jewish and Arab alike.

The truth is that Israel has for more than six decades wanted nothing more than peace and has repeatedly made significant concessions to achieve it.

The truth is that Israel can never be isolated on the international stage because the United States, with or without the President, will continue to stand with Israel.

And the truth is that for the United States to abandon Israel would be to abandon the very moral principles that have made our Nation exceptional.

These basic truths should inform any discussion of the current conflict taking place between Israel and the Palestinians.

We also need to recognize that the circumstances leading to the 2012 cease-fire between Hamas and Israel are not the circumstances in which we find ourselves today, and that the terms of that agreement have proven inadequate to the current reality. Both Israel and the United States had hoped that the relative calm following the 2012 cease-fire would lead to peace and that the increasing prosperity of the West Bank would lead the Palestinians to renounce war. Sadly, those hopes proved illusory. That cease-fire did not change the fact that the Palestinians have remained implacably hostile and, indeed, their government is actively indoctrinating yet another generation in vicious genocidal hatred toward Israel and the West.

That simmering hatred burst into flame last month when three innocent teenagers—Naftali Fraenkel, Gilad Shaar, and Eyal Yifrah—were kidnapped and murdered by Hamas agents. In a stark reminder of how intertwined our nations are, Naftali was a duel Israel-American citizen. This was a vicious attack against innocent Jews, regardless of their nationality, and Americans as well as Israelis were considered legitimate targets.

There is a temptation to refer to the murder of three teenagers as a senseless tragedy that should be handled by law enforcement. But this attack was nothing of the sort. It was a terrorist atrocity coldly plotted and executed by vicious killers whose only motivation was to murder teenage Jews regardless of their citizenship, and whose larger mission is the annihilation first of Israel and then of the United States.

It was therefore my privilege last week to file S. 2577, a bill that would direct the Secretary of State to offer a reward of up to $5 million for the capture or killing of Naftali's killers—and by extension those of Gilad and Eyal as well.

No one doubts Israel's ability to handle this matter on her own, but the Hamas terrorists need to be perfectly clear that the United States understands that kidnapping and murdering a U.S. citizen is an attack on us as well and we will actively support Israel's response to this atrocity.

I am gratified by the support this bill has gotten in the Senate from both sides of the aisle and, in particular, I am gratified that this bill is cosponsored by the senior Senator from New Jersey, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I look forward to that committee's markup of the bill this week and then, hopefully, to its passage through both Houses of Congress. There is also a bipartisan version of this bill in the House of Representatives led by Representative DOUG LAMBORN of Colorado and Representative BRAD SHERMAN of California.

Following the discovery of the murdered teens, the Israeli Government has moved decisively against Hamas in a just and appropriate action to both bring the terrorists responsible to justice and to degrade Hamas's capability to launch further attacks.

Now is not the moment to suggest that Israel open itself to further terrorist attack by, for example, withdrawing from the West Bank.

Now is not the moment to urge restraint or to try to broker yet another temporary cease-fire that does not stop the threat of Hamas murdering innocent civilians. Now is the moment to support Israel in the effort to eliminate the intolerable threat of Hamas, and given Hamas's commitment to terrorist violence, the Israeli response is by necessity military and it must be decisive.

This conflict is not of Israel's choice; it is Hamas's choice, and to argue that there is some sort of viable diplomatic alternative, as Mr. Gordon and President Obama did last week, is denying the truth.

In addition to the current military offensive, there are a number of important long-term steps that the Government of Israel has taken to reduce the threat of terrorist attacks and so to secure the civilian population. One is the security barrier in the West Bank initiated by Prime Minister Ariel Sharon during the second intifada. Necessitated by waves of Palestinian suicide bombers targeting Israel, this fence was immediately decried as an abuse of the Palestinian people and, indeed, declared illegal by the International Court of Justice. But since the fencing began, attacks have declined by 90 percent—90 percent. No apology should be required for securing a nation's border and for saving innocent civilian lives.

The Israeli missile defense system that protects against short-range rockets coming out of Gaza is an equally remarkable success story. In partnership with the United States, Israel has conceived, designed, and implemented Iron Dome, which enjoyed a remarkable 87 percent success rate during the 2012 operation Pillar of Defense and to all appearances is exceeding that performance in this most recent action. Iron Dome has dramatically changed Israel's ability to determine the future on its own terms, not because the Palestinians have in any way modified their eagerness to fire rockets at their neighbors in an attempt to murder innocent civilians but, rather, because the Israelis now have a system capable of neutralizing the vast majority of those rockets and protecting the hospitals and schools and homes that the Palestinians seek to destroy.

President Obama wrote in his Ha'aretz op-ed that ''[w]hile walls and missile defense systems can help protect against some threats, true safety will only come with a comprehensive negotiated settlement.'' But that can only be true when both sides genuinely seek peaceful coexistence, which at this time, sadly, the Palestinians do not. Projects like the security barrier and Iron Dome may well be, both practically and philosophically, Israel's only real option. That the Israel response to hostility out of the territories has been primarily defensive is an important illustration of their preferred approach to this problem, which is not to attack or destroy but, rather, to protect and defend.

This posture illustrates the fundamental difference between the Israelis, who have pledged they will stop fighting when the Palestinians stop fighting, and the Palestinians who swear they will stop fighting only when Israel ceases to exist. As Prime Minister Netanyahu recently said: Israel uses missiles to protect its citizens; whereas Hamas uses its citizens to protect its missiles.

We must reject any assertion of moral equivalence between the Palestinians who seek to attack Israel and the Israelis who are trying to defend themselves from terrorist attack.

Nowhere was the contrast between these two sides more clear than in the two investigations that are taking place into the murders that occurred in Israel in recent weeks. After the bodies of Naftali, Gilad, and Eyal were discovered, an Arab teen, Mohammed Abu Khdeir, was tragically, savagely murdered by Jewish extremists in a perverted attempt at retribution. Prime Minister Netanyahu rightly, quickly, and emphatically condemned this act and he called the victim's father personally to offer condolences. Naftali's mother Rachael stated her sympathy publicly saying:

> No mother or father [should] go through what we are going through now. We share the pain of the parents of Muhammad Abu Khdeir. . . . Even in the depth of the mourning over our son, it is hard for me to describe how distressed we were over the outrage that happened in Jerusalem—the shedding of innocent blood is against morality, it is against the Torah and Judaism, it is against the basis of our life in this country. The murderers of our children, who ever sent them, who ever helped them and who ever incited toward that murder—will all be brought to justice, but it will be them, and no innocent people, it will be done [by] the government, the police, the justice department and not by vigilantes.

Contrast Racheal Fraenkel's powerful statement with that of the mother of one of the Hamas suspects in Naftali's abduction and murder, who while the boys were still missing and before their executed bodies had been

discovered, publicly announced: ''They're throwing the guilt on him by accusing him of kidnapping. If he truly did it—I'll be proud of him until my final day . . . If he did the kidnapping, I'll be proud of him. I raised my children on the knees of the religion, they are religious guys, honest and clean-handed, and their goal is to bring the victory of Islam.''

Contrast those two statements. One is serious law enforcement responding to the wrongful murder of a teenager. The other is a society that celebrates, that glorifies, that lionizes vicious criminals who kidnap and murder innocent teenagers. Further highlighting the contrast is the fact that the murderers of Mohammed Abu Khdeir were apprehended in less than a week. The Israeli police moved and moved expeditiously.

Almost a month after the abduction of Naftali, Gilad and Eyal, their Hamas murderers are still at large because they are being protected by those who consider them heroes rather than terrorists. When Mr. Gordon asserted in his speech that Israel's ''military control of another people,'' for ''recurring instability,'' and for ''embolden[ing] extremists'' were to blame for the regions problems, he ignored the facts that the Palestinian Authority bears the real responsibility for the crisis by including Hamas in their so-called ''unity government,'' and then urging the international community to officially sanction this deal with the devil.

This should not be surprising as the PA is headed by Mahmoud Abbas, a Holocaust denier who was Yasser Arafat's right-hand man for 3 decades. Ever since Arafat and Abbas were given autonomy to run the Palestinian territories 20 years ago through the Oslo Accords, they have used that power to radicalize their population and to harden opposition to the very idea of peaceful existence with the Jewish State of Israel.

Palestinian children are bombarded with heavy-handed propaganda praising the virtues of suicide bombers and other mass murderers. Sesame Street-style puppets and cartoon characters are horrifically used to encourage children to grow up to become terrorists. Yet President Obama hails President Abbas as a man who can help broker a peace deal. Phillip Gordon called him in his speech last week a ''reliable partner'' for peace. Holocaust deniers are not reliable partners. Leaders who incite hatred and bigotry and the murder of innocent children are not reliable partners.

Just 2 months ago I was back in the nation of Israel. I traveled to the north of Israel, to the Ziv hospital, a hospital in the north of Israel that has treated over 1,000 Syrians wounded in the horrific civil war waging in that country. I met with those Israeli physicians and nurses as they described how they have given over $8 million in free medical care, uncompensated.

One person in particular I spoke with there was a social worker who described the shock and trauma of young children. Imagine, you are a little boy, you are a little girl in Syria. You go to bed in your bedroom. A bomb, a missile, a mortar comes through the ceiling and explodes. When you awake, you have been horrifically wounded. You find yourself in the nation of Israel in a hospital surrounded by Israeli doctors and nurses.

What this social worker told us was that as horrifying as being the victim of terrorism, as horrifying as some of these little boys or girls discovering limbs of their body had been blown off, that consistently the greatest terror of these children was finding themselves in Israel because their entire time they had been told that Israel was the devil. This social worker who is fluent in Arabic would spend time talking and reassuring these children and comforting them, because they were sure horrible things would happen to them.

Why were they sure of this? Because they had been taught those lies from the moment they could learn. One Israeli physician described to me a comment that a Syrian woman made to her. She said: My entire life the Army that I had been told was there to protect me—now they are trying to kill me. My entire life the Army I had been told wanted to kill me—now they are the only people protecting me and my family.

We will not see peace between Israel and the Palestinians until the Palestinian Government stops incitement, stops systematically training its children to hate and to kill. Neither Hamas nor its partner, the Palestinian Authority, has displayed any interest in peace. The so-called Hamas-affiliated technocrats that Abbas has embraced have done nothing to curb Hamas's violence, as missiles continue to rain down on innocent civilians in Israel or even to express sympathy for the murdered Jewish teenagers. Even that is a bridge too far given the hatred that the Palestinian Government promotes.

The incessant campaign of incitement carried but out by the PA lays bear the myth that Abbas is in any way a moderate or possesses any real desire for peace with the Jewish state. In his speech, Mr. Gordon asserted that ''Israel should not take for granted the opportunity to negotiate peace with President Abbas, who has shown time and again that he is committed to nonviolence and coexistence with Israel.'' How can any rational sentient person utter that sentence—that Mr. Abbas has shown time and again that he is committed to nonviolence and coexistence with Israel, while he partners with Hamas, a terrorist organization that is raining rockets on Israel as we speak, when he is directly responsible for a pattern of incitement that is training young Palestinians in vicious, racial bigotry and hatred, that is celebrating murderers and kidnappers as heroes and martyrs?

Anyone who utters a statement like Mr. Gordon uttered is being willfully blind to the facts on the ground. Given that it was Mr. Abbas, not Israel, who accepted Hamas into the PA's Government, the burden should be on the PA, not Israel, to unequivocally condemn not only Hamas but also their fellow terrorist groups, the Islamic Jihad and Abbas' own Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade.

The PA should not take for granted the limitless patience, not only of Israel but also the United States, and, indeed, any responsible members of the civilized world for the legitimization of these terrorist groups.

While the PA harbors Hamas, Islamic Jihad, the Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade or any other terrorist group and supports their vicious activity, it should forfeit its position as a legitimate negotiating partner with Israel. It is the height of delusion to suggest that Israel should accommodate the Palestinian Authority with any further security concessions until this activity stops.

While the PA harbors Hamas, Islamic Jihad, the Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade or any other terrorist groups, and supports their vicious activity, it should forfeit any and all material support from the taxpayers of the United States—not one penny. Only when the PA takes significant and affirmative steps to stop the incitement, eradicate terrorism, and demonstrate its leadership ability to honor their pledged commitments in the past, including the Oslo Accords, and affirms Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state should this aid be reconsidered.

It must also be recognized that Hamas is not acting alone in the current crisis. In an alarming escalation of the rocket attacks out of Gaza, Hamas militants recently fired an M–302 type rocket an unprecedented 70 miles north, some 30 miles north of Tel Aviv, meaning that now 6 million Israelis are vulnerable to the rocket attacks.

Israel has intercepted a shipment of these weapons bound for Gaza from Iran earlier this year. It now appears that some of them have gotten through by other means. As Osama Hamdan's celebrating their close collaboration demonstrates, neither Hamas nor Iran is even trying to hide the connection. In the face of this blatant hostility from the Islamic Republic of Iran, it seems the height of foolishness for the United States to be participating in nuclear negotiations with Tehran at this time. Iran's leaders are actively engaged in inciting and supplying violent terrorists. Indeed, Iran is the chief state sponsor of terrorism on the globe today.

Our focus should be on thwarting Iran's behavior in Gaza and across the world, not in engaging in diplomatic niceties over Chardonnay in Vienna. Given Iran's ongoing pattern of arming Hamas with increasingly sophisticated weapons, it is simply unacceptable to risk their achieving nuclear capability by exploiting the eagerness—the utterly unexplainable eagerness—of the Obama administration to get a deal—

any deal—any deal at all it seems—by the July 20, 2014, deadline.

We need to recognize that the arbitrary decision to relax sanctions and to engage in 6 months of negotiations under the joint plan of action last year was a historic mistake. We need to dramatically reverse course, and we should immediately reimpose sanctions until Iran makes fundamental concessions by ceasing all uranium enrichment, handing over its stockpiles of enriched uranium, and destroying its 19,000 centrifuges.

The Obama, Clinton, Kerry foreign policy is setting the stage for Iran to acquire nuclear weapon capability. If Iran acquires that capability, it will pose a grave if not mortal threat to the nation of Israel and to the United States. The strategy of the Obama administration—relaxing sanctions first and then hoping to get some concessions later—is putting the proverbial cart before the horse.

You do not negotiate with bullies and tyrants by conceding everything at the outset and then hoping for good faith. Instead, we should reimpose those sanctions and additionally, as a further condition, we should demand that Iran stop its state sponsorship of terrorist attacks against our allies. Only then should Iran see a relaxation of sanctions.

In the coming days, I will be filing legislation which will do exactly that: reimpose strong sanctions on Iran immediately, strengthen those sanctions, include an enforcement mechanism to ensure that these measures are implemented, and call for the dismantling of Iran's nuclear program, which should be the only path to relaxing sanctions in the future.

This legislation will lay out a clear path that Iran can follow to evade the sanctions: Simply behave in good faith and stop its relentless march towards acquiring nuclear weapons capability.

The connection between Hamas and Iran is a sobering reminder of a larger context in which the events of the past month have taken place. They are not an isolated local issue that could be managed if only Israel would act with restraint. Both the United States and Israel want the Palestinian people to have a secure and prosperous future free from the corrosive hatred that has so far prevented them from thriving. But as has been demonstrated time and time again, the simple truth is that concessions from Israel are not going to alleviate that hatred. The truth is that aid from the United States is not going to alleviate that hatred. The truth is that even the establishment of a Palestinian State would not alleviate that hatred while the avowed policy of the Palestinian Government is the destruction of Israel.

Only when the Palestinians take it upon themselves to embrace their neighbors and to eradicate terrorist violence from their society can a real and just peace be possible. Until then, there should be no question of the firm solidarity of the United States with Israel in the mutual defense of our fundamental values and interests. This is nothing less than the defense of our very exceptionalism as a nation—that same exceptionalism fueled by those God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to which Israel aspires.

Writing in the New York Times last September, Russian President Vladimir Putin warned that it is ''extremely dangerous to encourage people to see themselves as exceptional.''

In a very odd echo of President Putin's sentiment, Secretary Kerry said just today, in Vienna, that hearing politicians talk about American exceptionalism makes him quite uptight because it is ''in-your-face'' and so might offend other nations. Secretary Kerry should know, as President Putin clearly fears, it is indeed discomforting for bullies and tyrants such as Hamas and their Iranian sponsors to see free people boldly assert their exceptionalism. Indeed, in modern history it has been dangerous for totalitarian despots when the American people rise and defend our exceptionalism.

I would encourage Secretary Kerry to unambiguously explain American exceptionalism to his colleagues across the negotiating table. They might benefit from hearing that one of the most exceptional things about America is that we will robustly support our allies when they are engaged with the radical terrorist enemy that targets us both.

It is not enough, as Mr. Gordon seems to think sufficient, to ''fight for it [Israel] every day in the United Nations.'' We shouldn't just ''have Israel's back.'' We should be proud to stand beside Israel, to make sure that both Hamas and Iran know that the United States is ready to provide whatever moral support or military resupply Israel might need.

It is true we might risk a little of the criticism from the international community that seems to be of such concern to Mr. Gordon and to President Obama, but the United Nations should be the least of our worries at this point.

In any event, threats of Israel finding herself isolated—threats sadly emanating, in part, from the administration of this government—appear empty, as many of our closest friends, including Canada, Great Britain, France, and Germany, have spoken out in the strongest of terms supporting Israel's right to self-defense.

I add my voice to theirs and urge President Obama to reconsider the counterproductive policies laid out by Mr. Gordon last week. The White House should explicitly disavow Mr. Gordon's misguided speech, haranguing, and attacking our friend and ally in the nation of Israel.

A negotiated settlement is not an absolute prerequisite to Israel's security, as the administration has claimed but, rather, establishing Israel's security may be the only way to eventually reach any such settlement. Israel's fight against radical Islamic terrorism and by extension the radical Iranian regime that supports it is our fight as well.

There is a reason they call Israel the little Satan and America the great Satan. This menace does not discriminate between Israelis and Americans, and it cannot be placated or appeased even by the deftist diplomacy. It must be diligently defended against and at times, when necessary, it must be directly confronted.

This is difficult, dangerous work that Israel's Government and the brave men and women who serve in its Armed Forces are doing right now for the sake of both nations. I hope and I pray for their continuing success as America stands, unashamedly, alongside the nation of Israel.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. I rise to describe my concerns with the recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling of the Hobby Lobby case and also to describe my support for the Murray-Udall legislation which I am cosponsoring and which we will act on later this week.

First, just a word about one item in the case that is not my main concern but is worthy of a passing comment; that is, whether a corporation can have religious rights.

Of course, individuals can have religious rights. Churches can have religious rights. Religiously affiliated organizations have religious rights. That has been recognized often. But do corporations have religious rights?

I would argue that the Supreme Court's decision in Hobby Lobby that they do is sort of fundamentally at odds with what notion a corporation is. Corporations exist for many reasons, but fundamentally the core of a corporation is the creation of a fictional entity that is supposed to stand apart from the individual owners. That fictional entity has rights and responsibilities that are different than the rights and responsibilities of the owners. In fact, we create the corporate forum to protect the individual owners. The individual owners, once a corporate forum is created, as you know, are generally protected against legal liability. A corporation's actions, if they are illegal, can only be held against the corporation and except in very rare instances the individuals who own the corporation are free from the liability that might flow from a corporation's acts.

So the basic question is, if individuals decide to form a corporation to distance themselves and to protect themselves from liability for a cooperation's acts, how can they also presume to exercise their religious viewpoints—their personal, intimate, religious viewpoints—through the very form of the corporation? It is allowing the owners to have it both ways—complete protection from legal liability

but continued ability to exercise their personal and intimate religious viewpoints through the corporate forum.

I think the notion of corporate religious freedom is almost an oxymoron. The statute at question in the Supreme Court case, the RFRA statute, refers to the sincerely held religious beliefs of a person.

What are the sincerely held religious beliefs of a person of the corporation under the corporate charter that would be granted by the States? In order to determine that, should we inquire in this instance, for example, whether the families of the owners ever use contraception? If in fact they did, would that undermine a claim that they have a sincerely held religious belief against contraception?

What if it could be shown that the owners invested in stocks in companies that produced contraception, would that undermine the claim that a corporation has a sincerely held religious belief against contraception? I don't know the answers to these questions, but I think the mere raising of the questions demonstrates again that the notion of a corporation exercising religious beliefs is highly suspect.

But I don't think the Hobby Lobby case was about religious freedom. I read the opinion. I practiced law, including constitutional law for 17 years. I have read the opinion. I don't think this is a case about religious freedom.

I think the opinion in the Hobby Lobby case is, instead, part of an anticontraception movement where the political goal is not just to encourage women or families to not use contraception but instead it is geared toward the reduction of social access to contraception for all.

This isn't a case about religious freedom. It is a case that is very focused on attempts to reduce access to contraception throughout American society.

The Court does something in the opinion that is fascinating. There is a phrase—I am not a poker player, but there is a phrase that if you play a lot of poker, a poker player should watch for their tell. If they reveal by knocking on the table or something that, oh, well, they are bluffing now, you watch for the tell. I think the Hobby Lobby majority opinion has a tell that tells us this case is not about religious freedom.

In response to a notion raised in the dissent: Well, hold on a second. If you allow this corporation to deny coverage for contraception because it has a sincerely held religious belief against contraception, there are other religions and other corporations that might have a sincerely held religious belief against transfusion. That is a sincere belief of certain religions commonly practiced in America; against vaccination, that is a sincerely held religious belief in certain religions in America. There are other sincerely held religious beliefs, but the majority in this opinion says: Oh, don't worry. This is just about contraception. You don't need to worry that the rationale in this case would be used to allow an employer to exclude vaccination or to exclude transfusions.

If those are religious beliefs every bit as sincere as some who think contraception is bad, why wouldn't this ruling apply to those kinds of coverage?

The fact that the Supreme Court took such care in the majority opinion to say: Don't worry. It is not going to apply to that, tells me this is not a case about religious freedom. Because if it were a case about religious freedom, a sincerely held religious belief about transfusions or vaccinations would be equally implicated by this case. The Court instead is very clearly telling people: Don't worry. You don't need to worry about this stuff.

So it is not about religious freedom. I read this case as a very candid admission that what the case is truly about is contraception access.

There is an unfortunate legal movement in this country—that is kind of surprising—where the focus is to deny women access to contraception, even though access to contraception has been constitutionally protected in this country since 1967, nearly 50 years.

I am stunned. I am reluctant as a lawyer to criticize court opinions. Lawyers always have different points of view. You always have to give some latitude that the court might decide something in a different way than you think. But I am stunned to see in the rationale expressed by the majority that the Court is joining an ideological, anti-access movement.

Contraception access is important to women, it is important to families, and it is important to society. For women, contraception is important not only surrounding the planning of pregnancy but the hormones in contraception are often prescribed for all manner of other conditions, some related to pregnancy and reproduction and some unconnected to pregnancy and reproduction. The access to contraception is critically important, and that is why the panel that looked at implementing the Affordable Care Act found that contraception was an important active goal of prevention. Prevention is good. Contraception is part of prevention.

Contraception is also costly. So when a company strips that coverage from employees and says, ''You can just buy it yourself if you want,'' let's be clear. That is not a minor expense, especially in a time where wages have been stagnant. It is a significant expense, and the notion that coverage would be stripped away from thousands and thousands of employees is not a minor burden at all, it is a significant burden on their lives.

Contraception is not only important for women, it is important for society. Contraception and the access to contraception are achieving important social goals. From 2008 to 2011, in 3 years, the number of abortions in the United States fell by 13 percent, and teen pregnancy in this Nation has been falling steadily since 1991. Why are both of these things happening? Those who study these laudable trends conclude that access to contraception is one of the main reasons abortion is falling and that teen pregnancy is falling.

It would seem those are laudable trends that we would want to continue and that access to contraception therefore is very important, but the Court instead finds otherwise.

I want to conclude and say I don't think this is a case about religious freedom. I think the Court has strangely joined an anticontraception ideological crusade. But I want to say a word about religious freedom. It is critically important. I am a lifelong Catholic. I served as a missionary with Jesuit missionaries in 1981. I am a Virginian, and it was a Virginian, James Madison, who wrote the draft of the Constitution, including the First Amendment, the Bill of Rights that protects our rights to religious freedom.

Gary Wills, the great American historian, said, ''Every wonderful idea in the American Constitution was already part of somebody else's Constitution or laws.'' Our drafters did a great job of finding the best and putting it in. But there was only one unique provision in the American Constitution that wasn't part of any organic law before us and that was freedom of religion. Jefferson wrote it into Virginia law, the Statute of Religious Freedom, in 1780. The basic idea was no one can be punished or preferred for their choice of worship or for their choice not to worship. That has been a critical component of American life for a very long time. So religious freedom is incredibly important.

There was nothing about the bill we will take up on the floor tomorrow that impinges upon religious freedom because, as you know, if a church or a religiously affiliated institution or an individual or even a corporation has as their view that contraception is wrong, they can take to the airways. They can run a newspaper ad. They can go stand on a street corner. They can encourage anyone they want by explaining the merits of their view and hoping to persuade someone that they are right, and they are protected in doing that. They are protected in their religious liberty to try to encourage people to follow their points of view. But when these entities try to go beyond that, and in this case corporations, and use legal mechanisms not just to encourage people but whether it is lawsuits or personhood amendments or other things that we see popping up in States and here in this body, not just to discourage use of contraception but instead to reduce access to contraception for women—even women who do not share their moral point of view, who do not share their particular religion—then I view that as extremely troubling and actually contrary to the notion of religious freedom that is established in the First Amendment. Advocate your moral position, but don't force it onto people who have a different moral viewpoint.

In conclusion, I support the bill we will debate tomorrow because it will protect the access to contraception. Whether people choose to use contraception or not will be up to them and to their own medical and their own moral calculation, and that is as it should be in a society that is supposed to protect the rights of all.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, thank you.

Before I get into the business I have come to address, let me thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia for his remarks. I was a lawyer at a time when the previous case on this subject came out of the Supreme Court that said something very different. It said if you were a Native American and if as a Native American you had a sincerely held religious belief that peyote was actually a part of your religion's sacrament, that in pursuing that ritual and that tradition you could utilize peyote notwithstanding the laws of the State to the contrary. That was the argument they made. It was protected by the free exercise of religion. The Supreme Court said absolutely not. No way. If you are a Native American, your sincerely held belief that peyote is an appropriate part of your religious sacrament is overruled because of society's interest in enforcing the law generally.

Now if you are a corporate CEO, a completely different set of rules applies. Remember, in the case of the Native Americans the question was whether that individual could ingest the peyote themselves and they were told no, the interest of the State prevailed. In this case, if you are a corporate CEO, you are being told that you are free to exercise a right to control what other people do. And in this case the Supreme Court completely reversed itself and said no, the State has to back off if you are a corporate CEO telling other people what they have to do. But if you are a Native American seeking to honor your own tradition, well, there the State can butt in and move around.

So in addition to the distinctions the Senator so eloquently and properly described, certain of this might have been influential with the Court in the fact that these were corporate CEOs, and there is very little the corporate CEO can do that the five activists on the conservative side of this Court won't encourage them to do and let them do.

I will reserve for another day statistics of how this Court has over and over again turned itself over to corporate interests and over and over again ruled in favor of corporate interests and over and over again reversed precedent to give precedence to corporate interests in this country.

I thank the Senator.

CLIMATE CHANGE

My original topic of being here before I got into the subject is this is my 74th visit to the floor to urge my colleagues that it is truly time to wake up to the threats of climate change.

The reports keep rolling in. The latest one for coastal States such as ours is a study called ''Risky Business'' that was commissioned by former New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg, who knows something about coastal issues, having been flooded by Sandy, former George W. Bush Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson, and former hedge fund manager Tom Steyer. This report calculated the economic effects of climate change throughout the United States and it found that along our coast between $66 billion and $106 billion worth of existing property—property that Americans own right now—will likely be below sea level by 2050. By 2100, $238 billion to $507 billion worth of Americans' hard-earned property will be underwater.

Now, everything doesn't happen just as you guess. Sometimes you get bad news that there are long odds and you need to be prepared for those long odds. The report found there are 1 in 20 odds that by 2100, the end of this century, there would be around $700 billion of infrastructure below sea level and nearly $730 billion more of infrastructure that would be potentially in trouble during high tides. So our landlocked colleagues may laugh this off, but if a similar threat were looming at their State's door, they would, I submit, be paying attention. For coastal States such as ours, this is deadly serious. The Atlantic coast, including Rhode Island—a coastal State named the Ocean State, the second most heavily populated State in terms of population density in the country—we have a lot of people living along that coastline. Our coast will see the worst of it.

Climate change, unfortunately, has become, mostly since Citizens United for reasons I have elaborated on before, a taboo subject now for Republicans in Congress. So the discussion here of climate change is somewhat one-sided, but Americans who are witnessing climate change's effects firsthand in every State around the country know—and if they don't know they are learning—that climate change is a real problem.

I have discussed my travels to Florida, to Iowa, to North and South Carolina, to Georgia, to New Hampshire, and of the actions these people are taking in their home States to stave off the worst effects of their changing oceans and climate. But at the local level folks truly aren't denying climate change. That is something that is unique to Congress and the peculiar world we inhabit. They are not denying, they are paying attention. And it is not just in coastal States that people are paying attention.

This week I am going to look at Utah. Utah is right here on this section of the map of the southwest corridor of our country. This is a map of temperature trends. Temperature is not complicated. It is not some difficult theory that people have to try to get their minds around. We measure it with thermometers. It is pretty straightforward stuff.

On this chart we see that average temperatures over the last 13 years compared to the long-term average over a century show there has been an increase in temperature across the entire State of Utah. Down here, this region, the average has increased 2 full degrees Fahrenheit. In the southeastern part of the State there are actually spots where the temperature has risen as much as 4.5 degrees Fahrenheit.

Southern Utah is home to iconic national parks including Zion, Bryce Canyon, and Arches National Park. In Utah, park officials aren't denying climate change. Just last week the Park Service released a report called ''Climate Exposure of U.S. National Parks in a New Era of Change.'' This report studied dozens of climate variables in 289 national parks. In Bryce, Zion, and Arches, the report shows higher year-round temperatures, hotter summers and warmer winters. Such significant shifts in temperature can mean less snowpack, worse wildfire seasons, and abnormal conditions for the plants and animals that reside in those parks.

Utah is getting warmer and it is getting drier. The U.S. Geological Survey shows a significant drop in the size and scope of floods in rivers and streams all across the Southwest in this area from 1920 to 2008, and that of course includes southern Utah.

Indeed, here are the symbols for the negative trends, and the biggest symbol for a negative trend in river and stream flooding is this one. If you cannot see the map very clearly, that is southern Utah. Here is the State of Utah right here and there is the location where the highest drying trend in streams is taking place—again, not complicated. This isn't a theory, this is based on simple rainfall measurements and simple flooding measurement.

If you look at it, you will see another place that is going up a lot. We New Englanders are seeing an increase, although in the Southwest they are seeing a substantial decrease. So when those characters come into our hearings and give testimony saying, oh, you don't have to worry about this because there isn't an overall increase in flooding or anything, yeah, because they offset each other—but go to Utah and you see a very distinct trend and it is drier. Other factors, such as population growth and water management policies, play a role, but Lake Powell in Utah is about half full right now. Lake Mead, farther down the Colorado River in Nevada, has drained down to just 39 percent of its capacity. That is the lowest level Lake Mead has ever been since it was first filled behind the Hoover Dam. Scientists at Colorado State University, at Princeton, and at the U.S. Forest Service predict that unless we take major action climate change may lead to water shortages so

severe that Lake Powell and Lake Mead dry up completely.

The drying of the Western United States and of southern Utah means less water for drinking, fighting fires, farming, wildlife, and recreation. Salt Lake City gets 80 percent of its water supply from snowpack in the Uinta and Wasatch Mountains. If predictions hold true, local water managers in Utah will no longer be able to depend on historical data to predict and manage how much water the mountains will yield. Utah will be in a brave new world—a dry new world.

The prolonged drought conditions in the Western United States, compared to the last century, make it ripe for forest fires, and indeed a recent study of western wildfire trends—led by Dr. Philip Dennison of the University of Utah—from 1984 to 2011, fires have become larger and more frequent. The total area burned by these fires is increasing over this time period at roughly 90,000 acres burned per year. That is the rate of increase.

The recent National Climate Assessment similarly shows that ''between 1970 and 2003, warmer and drier conditions increased burned area in western U.S. mid-elevation conifer forests by 650 percent.'' That report is quite clear about the link between climate change and these forest fires in the region, noting that ''climate outweighed other factors in determining burned area in the western U.S.''

These changes in temperature and precipitation are putting Utah's iconic desert sagebrush at risk, according to Peter Alder, an ecologist at Utah State University. Sagebrush is grazed by livestock, and it is important to Utah's ranching industry. Dr. Alder is working with faculty and students from seven area universities to better understand the vulnerability of sagebrush ecosystems to climate change.

These Utah scientists are not denying climate change, and neither is, for instance, Utah State University. Utah State has entire new courses of study to train the next generation of students to predict and combat climate change. Utah State has its own climate action plan. Utah State has an active climate center, and it is not the only one. The University of Utah has an active sustainability center and an army of students and researchers working on addressing climate change. Each year, the University of Utah publishes an annual report on climate change.

Members of Utah's delegation may be pretending climate change is not real, but Utah's universities are not. They are not denying. They are acting. Utah's capital city is not denying climate change.

There may be a barricade of polluter influence around Congress, but mayors all across the country are taking action, including in Utah, as we saw with the unanimous resolution of the Conference of Mayors recently. The United States Conference of Mayors ranked Salt Lake City, UT, and its mayor Ralph Becker first place in the Mayors Climate Protection Center rankings because of the impressive work being done in Salt Lake City. For example, the Salt Lake City Public Safety Building will be the first public safety building in the Nation to achieve a net zero rating, which means it generates as much electricity as it uses.

Utah also has energy investors who are wide awake, building a growing number of solar installations. Community Solar has a pilot project in Salt Lake that allows homeowner groups to purchase solar energy. It is estimated that over its 25-year lifetime, this installation will avoid 5,500 tons of carbon dioxide pollution.

Renewable energy is integral in Utah's energy portfolio moving forward. In this chart, we can see this display showing that by 2050, Utah will rely mostly on wind, solar, geothermal, and natural gas to achieve carbon dioxide emission reductions of 80 percent compared to 1990 levels. As we can see, the yellow is solar. Solar is projected to account for more than half of this shift.

Utah-based businesses, such as EBay, are enhancing renewable energy. EBay built a data center in South Jordan, UT, and wanted to make sure it used only clean energy to run that facility. To accomplish this, EBay worked with GOP State senator Mark Madsen, Rocky Mountain Power—the State's largest electric utility—and a local renewable energy generator on legislation to make renewable energy available to Utah electricity consumers. None of them were denying climate change. The renewable energy bill was unanimously passed by the Utah State Senate and House of Representatives and signed into law by Republican Governor Gary Herbert. EBay employs 1,500 people in Utah, including its 400-member group in Salt Lake City known as the Green Team, dedicated to making the company environmentally responsible. They are not denying climate change in Utah. EBay is actually looking to add another data facility and more jobs using that same clean energy framework.

The faith community in Utah is taking action as well. Utah Interfaith Power and Light is a network of nearly 30 Christian, Jewish, and nondenominational congregations, representing thousands of Utahans seeking ''to promote earth stewardship, clean energy, and climate justice.'' In addition to conducting free energy audits for new-member churches and offering plans to increase energy efficiency in their buildings, Utah Interfaith Power and Light also works to educate its members about climate change and advocates at the local and State level for moral and responsible climate policy.

Then, of course, there is the famous Utah ski industry. The operators of Utah's great ski resorts have been outspoken about the threat climate change poses to their business. Five of them—Alta Ski Area, Canyons Resort, Deer Crest Private Trails, Deer Valley, and Park City Mountain Resort—signed the BICEP coalition's Climate Declaration in support of national action on climate change. They are not denying climate change.

Indeed, the Park City Foundation in Utah issued a report explaining that as drought and increasing temperatures reduced the snowpack in the Cascade Range and the Rocky Mountains, the future of skiing and snowboarding in those ranges is at risk. This Utah report predicts a local temperature increase of 6.8 degrees Fahrenheit by 2075, which could cause a total loss of snowpack in the lower Park City resort area. Beyond the loss to the skiing tradition in Park City, this will result in thousands of lost jobs, tens of millions in lost earnings, and hundreds of millions in lost economic output, and that is according this Utah report.

In Utah as in other States there is a groundswell coming from local communities asking for action on climate change. There are scientists, public health advocates, business owners and corporate leaders, outdoorsmen, faith leaders, State and local officials, and countless others demanding action on climate change and leading the charge.

David Folland is a retired pediatrician, and he is the co-leader of the Salt Lake City Citizens Climate Lobby, which recently joined 7 other Utahans and 600 volunteers from around the country to come to Congress to push us for swift passage of a proper carbon fee. In a Salt Lake City Tribune op-ed last week, Dr. Folland wrote: ''[p]lacing a fee on carbon sources and returning the proceeds to households would create jobs, build the economy, improve public health, and help stabilize the climate.''

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Folland's op-ed printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Outside these walls, climate change is an issue Republicans can actually discuss. Outside these walls, 2012 Republican Presidential candidate John Huntsman, who won reelection as Utah's Republican Governor in 2008 with almost 80 percent of the vote—this is a popular guy in Utah—wrote a New York Times op-ed this year entitled ''The G.O.P. Can't Ignore Climate Change.'' That is the title of Governor Huntsman's article.

He wrote:

> While there is room for some skepticism given the uncertainty about the magnitude of climate change, the fact is that the planet is warming, and failing to deal with this reality will leave us vulnerable—and possibly worse. Hedging against risk is an enduring theme of conservative thought. It is also a concept diverse groups can embrace.

That is from Utah's former Governor.

By the way, when he ran for reelection and won by that near 80-percent margin, he was running on a pretty good environmental platform. He was

not denying. But in Congress there is silence from the Republican Party—except those who come and say that climate change is just a big old hoax. It would have to be the most complicated hoax in the world, with most of our corporations, the Conference of Catholic Bishops, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NOAA—and innumerable other groups involved in it, and it would be pretty impressive to actually raise the level of the seas 8 to 10 inches as a part of that complicated hoax, but I guess that is their notion of why that is happening.

Here, other than that hoax argument, there is silence. No Republican comes to the floor to say: You are right. This is a problem. We should do something about it. Let's work together. We may not agree on the solution right now, but let's at least work on it as a serious problem.

They won't do that. The Republican Party has taken the position and followed the direction of the polluters. It is as simple as that. I, for one, believe they will be judged very harshly for that choice because Americans know better. Utahns know better. More and more people across America see what is happening before them, and they are no longer fooled by the phony campaign of denial.

I hope this Congress will listen to the people in our home States and the people across this country and wake up to what has now become a clear and present danger. We need to do what the people who elected us sent us here to do, which is face reality, make sensible choices, work together, and solve problems, not stick our heads in the sand and pretend problems don't exist.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Salt Lake Tribune, July 11, 2014]

OP-ED: CARBON TAX PROVIDES MARKET-BASED SOLUTION TO CLIMATE CHANGE

(By David Folland)

Imagine receiving a check for $390 each month, deposited directly into your checking account, through no effort of yours except that you had previously voted for visionary members of Congress. Indeed that is what a family of 4 would receive if carbon fee and dividend legislation were to be enacted by the Congress, according to a new study by the highly-respected economic analysis firm REMI (Regional Economic Models, Inc.). The study was commissioned by Citizens' Climate Lobby (CCL).

Last week I joined 7 other CCL volunteers from Utah in Washington, D.C., to ask our federal elected officials to support such a carbon fee and dividend (F&D) policy. We were among 600 other volunteers who together visited over 500 members of Congress or their aides. Our visits were all part of actions by the non-partisan, non-profit Citizens Climate Lobby, a rapidly growing organization of committed volunteers who are creating the political will for a stable climate. We are taking democracy into our own hands and not leaving our future to the paid lobbyists and special interest groups.

The REMI study modeled the effect of a fee and dividend policy. In this plan, a fee would be charged on the carbon-based fuels (coal, oil, and natural gas) at the point they enter the economy (the mine well head, or port of entry) based on the amount of carbon dioxide they produce when burned. The fee would increase by a defined amount yearly for 20 years. The revenues would be distributed to households equally.

The results after 20 years are striking: 2.8 million jobs would be created; the economy would grow by $1.375 trillion more than the economy with no carbon fee; 227,000 lives would be spared due to reduced air pollution; and carbon dioxide emissions would be reduced by 52 percent.

Sound too good to be true? Not really. By returning all revenues to households, consumers would spend their dividend, adding to demand for goods and services. And energy prices actually decrease after the uth year, as less-expensive energy sources come on line. Americans would enjoy better health as coal-fired power plants and other dirty energy sources are phased out and their toxic fumes eliminated.

This market-based solution contrasts quite markedly to the EPA regulations proposed by President Obama. The EPA regulations pertain only to coal-fired power plants. By contrast, F&D's effects would ripple through the entire economy. Also, the elevated cost of electricity from EPA regulations would affect the poorest citizens most severely. By returning the dividend to households, two thirds of people would receive more in their dividend checks than they would pay for the increased cost of energy and goods, and that would include the poorest among us. Also our proposal would not grow government, thus could appeal to both political parties.

After a long day of lobbying, Rhode Island Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse addressed the CCL volunteers. He suggested that the tipping point that will lead to action and policy on global warming is probably closer than most people think Many who attended the conference have the same feeling. Our members of Congress and/or their aides listened carefully and responded thoughtfully to our proposal.

There is ample reason for our elected federal officials to support carbon fee and dividend legislation whether or not they are concerned about the threats of global warming. Placing a fee on carbon sources and returning the proceeds to households would create jobs, build the economy, improve public health, and help stabilize the climate.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I yield the floor, and I note the absence after quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION CRISIS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, yesterday I went to Chicago to a residential neighborhood, and I went into a building and saw a piece of American history and an American humanitarian challenge, the likes of which we have seldom seen. In this building were 70 children. They were children who just hours and days ago were at the border of the United States in Mexico. They had turned themselves in to the border officials and they were being processed. Our law says that within 72 hours they need to be moved from the law enforcement world to the world of protection or at least a secure environment. That is the right thing to do. It was a law passed years ago when President Bush was in the White House, signed by him, and I believe unanimously passed by at least one of the Chambers, so it was not controversial at the time. It was thoughtful. It basically said if it is an unaccompanied child at the border, within 72 hours put them in a safe place.

This is one of the safe places across America. It is a shelter in the city of Chicago. It is not the only one. It is protected from the public. If someone went by it in a car, they wouldn't even know it was a shelter with 70 children inside, in a residential neighborhood where for 19 years the shelter has been welcome, because it is clear, secure—no problems.

But now we face a challenge because the number of children unaccompanied coming into the United States is reaching recordbreaking proportions.

America, primarily because of location and other circumstances, seldom has faced anything like a refugee crisis. We can remember efforts by the Haitians or the Cubans, maybe the Vietnamese, the Hmong people, to come to the United States, but our experience pales in comparison to countries such as Jordan. Ten percent of the population of Jordan today is refugees who come to that country from all over the Middle East. With Syria collapsed under the weight of war and all of the horrors that it brought, 2.3 million, maybe 3 million left Syria for countries such as Jordan and Turkey and Lebanon. For these countries, refugees are part of their daily lives. For the United States, it is rare. It is rare to see one. It is rare to speak to one.

That is why yesterday's experience for me was so important. I had heard all of these stories about these children and a lot of speculation about why they are here and what we should do with them, and I wanted to see them firsthand.

Let me tell my colleagues, of the 70 children, there were some who were newborns, babies being held by their mothers. I have reached a point where it is hard for me to guess anyone's age, particularly young people. It is harder still when they are from countries in Central America because they are smaller in stature, many of them malnourished, and they are usually a little older than one might think. They look younger. But five women walked into this dining hall carrying their babies, and I don't believe a single one of them was 15 years old. They had brought these babies, many of them on buses, for 8 days to the border of the United States to try to escape. Cases of rape and assault had led to these pregnancies and these babies, and they were trying to get away from drug gangs and threats on their lives. And here they were, in this neighborhood in Chicago, in a safe place, with others just like them.

Then I went among the children—90 percent of them from Central America;

some from Africa, some from China; 90 percent of them from Central America—and I would speak to them and hear their stories. For many of them, there was a relative in the United States they were hoping to find so they could finally find a safe place. This situation is a terrible humanitarian crisis involving vulnerable children.

The United States is about to be tested. We are going to be tested as a people—our generation—as to how we respond. I hope we pass that test.

Remember, our country—the United States—issues a report card every year. The State Department issues a human rights report card on the world. The United States stands in judgment of the world and their record on human rights, and we take into consideration the way they treat women, how other countries treat children, how they treat refugees, and we grade them. That is a pretty bold position for us to stand in judgment of other countries, but we do, hoping we can set a standard they will follow and hoping we can hold them to those standards. Now we are going to be graded. The United States will be graded as to how we respond to this crisis.

The President has sent a bill to Congress. He is asking for a substantial sum of money so we can not only deal with this issue at the border but beyond, in places such as the shelter I visited in Chicago.

There is a lot of speculation among Senators and Congressmen about how our laws are going to deal with this current flood of children coming into the United States. We know why they are coming. Many are being pushed out of their country by drug gangs and violence—girls who are threatened with sexual assault if they don't give in to a gang leader and then, if they do, killed and left in plastic bags by the side of the road. Young boys are drafted into these gangs at the point of a gun; they are going to comply or be shot and killed. That is the reality, not to mention the horrible poverty which is endemic to these three countries—Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

So now we have to decide what we will do. There are several things that are obvious. First, I am glad President Obama and Vice President BIDEN are going to Central America and telling these families: Please, do not send any more children. It is just too dangerous. They don't automatically come into the United States and receive citizenship. If people have heard that, it is wrong.

We have told these countries, begged their leaders to help us in discouraging these children from coming. But in many cases desperate parents, desperate families are doing desperate things.

I asked yesterday at the shelter: Is it true that some of the teenage girls who arrive here—and they all go through a physical exam—are on birth control pills? They said: Yes. Before they start the journey, their families will give the girls birth control pills as a protection from pregnancy because they fear they will be assaulted and raped. I can't imagine—I cannot imagine a family situation so desperate where they would make that decision, but it is happening.

I looked too at some of the comments that have been made. There are people who have said we need to flood the border of the United States with National Guard troops. It doesn't make sense because these children are not trying to sneak past border guards; they are turning themselves in as soon as they cross the border because they have a little piece of paper with the name of someone in the United States to contact. So more troops and guards on the border won't change those desperate children.

One of them I saw from Guatemala with his little sister. She is a cute little thing but too shy to say anything to me. He, through a translator, said a few words, and he carried her on his shoulders across the Rio Grande River. That is what his responsibility was, and he was going to get across that river with his little sister. He did. That is why we need to look at this in human terms as well.

Before I came to Congress, I used to be a lawyer in Central Illinois, the small town of Springfield. It is not a big city, I guess, by our State's terms, but we are proud of our population—but not a major city. I practiced law there, and I knew what it was like in a small town to practice law. I also knew this: No one in good conscience with an ethical bone in their body would put a 6-year-old kid in a courtroom and say: Good luck. We never did that. It was inconceivable. If there was a child whose fate was going to be decided in a courtroom, there was a guardian ad litem appointed to represent that child's interests—not the interests of any other party, just that child. There may have been an attorney appointed in addition to represent that child because we realize they cannot make decisions for themselves.

Now we are faced with a suggestion by some that when it comes to these children, within a few days after their arrival in the United States, they will be put in a courtroom. If Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives came to that shelter in Chicago and saw those little children sitting at the table, they would be embarrassed by that suggestion. We can't do that. It isn't fair to them, and it doesn't reflect well on our values if it is even suggested. We have to have a process that is fair and one that reflects our values in the United States.

This is a human tragedy. These children have made it through this death-defying journey. I can tell my colleagues it broke my heart when I heard them tell their stories. A little girl—she was there with her little brother. She was 12; her little brother was 6. He had Down syndrome, and she brought him from Honduras to the United States. She said she came by bus and she was on that bus for 6 or 7 days before she made it to the border. Can my colleagues imagine turning a child loose to catch a bus ride that would last 6 or 7 days to go to a country in the hopes they might be safer and also take their disabled little brother with her? Every time that little boy would get up and scramble around the room, she was right after him. She wasn't going to let him out of her sight. That is what her life is and what it has been, and it is an indication of the kind of children we are now facing and need to deal with.

This is not a political issue, although politics are involved. It is much more. It is humanitarian—testing who we are, what we believe. It is a challenge to us to deal with immigration in the 21st century. It is a challenge to us as well to make sure that at the end of the day, history writes this chapter about the American people and says they were good and caring people, compassionate and caring people.

Today I received a press release that was put out by a religious group, the Evangelical Leaders of America. This is not my religion, but I respect very much what they had to say. I would like to read what one of the ministers said:

> As a former Texan, my heart goes to the border of Texas. As a born-again Christian, the Gospel of Jesus Christ calls me to compassionate action for those who are suffering right now as a result of the immigration crisis, especially the children.

This was written by Ronnie Floyd, president of the Southern Baptist Convention and pastor of the multicampus Cross Church in northwest Arkansas. His Friday Baptist Press op-ed continues:

> This is an emergency situation that requires the best of each of us in America . . . The gospel of Jesus Christ moves me to call on all of us to demonstrate compassionate action toward the immigrant.

As I said, he is not a member of my religion, but I respect very much that he would stand up and speak out and remind people that this really is a test. Regardless of whether one is a Christian or some other denomination or one has no religion, it is a test of who we are and our human values.

When I read the suggestion that these young children need to be placed in a hearing room or a courtroom within a few days with the possibility of someone standing by their side—that is wrong. That is just wrong. We can't let that happen.

Many years ago we signed a refugee convention saying that when it came to refugees, countries in the world should accept and adopt the same humane standards.

Now we are facing our refugee crisis here in the United States. We need to make it clear to these countries that these children are not coming in to be citizens of the United States. That is not in the cards. But we never want to be in a position where these children

are returned to dangerous situations, harmed, and it is on our conscience, on our watch. That is unacceptable.

I want to say one thing in closing. We need to solve this problem, but God forbid that is the end of the conversation. We passed an immigration bill, a comprehensive immigration bill, to clean up this broken immigration system over a year ago on the Senate floor. Democrats and Republicans agreed on it, and we sent it to the House of Representatives. But for over a year they have refused to even call the bill, refused to even debate the bill, refused to even come up with a substitute to the bill. They are ignoring the broken immigration system in America and criticizing this President when the breakdown is obvious.

The President is ready. He has said over and over he will step aside and let them work it out and come up with a congressional answer. But there is no excuse for this. For Congress to refuse to accept its responsibility when it comes to immigration reform is just wrong. I am glad the Senate met its responsibility, and now I call on my colleagues over in the House to do the same.

(Mr. DONNELLY assumed the Chair.)

Mr. President, on June 30, five conservative Justices of the Supreme Court held that certain for-profit corporations—closely held corporations—could refuse to provide their female employees with coverage for health care benefits that are guaranteed by law. This Hobby Lobby decision, some estimates suggest, would apply to as many as 90 percent of American businesses, depending on what the courts define as a ''closely held'' corporation.

This was an activist decision by an activist Supreme Court. Congress never intended for for-profit corporate entities to claim religious beliefs or to use religious objections to deny their employees rights guaranteed by law.

For-profit corporations, for the record, are not people, and they are not created for a religious or charitable purpose. They are created to make a profit while giving their owners protections from liability under the law. I have been to a lot of churches. I have yet to see a corporation in a pew in a church.

Moreover, previous cases ruled on by the Supreme Court have established a tradition of privacy—one that permits women, not the government or their employers, to make their own decisions about birth control and family planning.

The ruling in Hobby Lobby violates that tradition by empowering for-profit corporations to claim religious objections to a law that guarantees access to cost-free contraceptive coverage. As a result of this decision, women across America are at risk of losing access to elements of their health care coverage, including coverage for prescription birth control pills and more.

Birth control is an important part of a woman's health care, and millions—99 percent of child-bearing-age women—rely on these benefits.

The Affordable Care Act and its regulations provide for insurance coverage for birth control, allowing for a woman, her family, and her doctor to decide what is best. As a result, about 30 million women have gained access to cost-free insurance coverage for contraceptive services, including 1.1 million in my State of Illinois—almost 10 percent of the population.

This is coverage that nearly all women use. In 2013 the Centers for Disease Control reported that 99 percent of sexually active women between the ages of 15 and 44 have used birth control at some point in their lives.

So here is the bottom line: No for-profit corporate entity should be allowed to discriminate against women and take away an insurance benefit that a woman is entitled to just because the owner of the company does not agree with it. A woman's personal health choices are none of her boss's business.

Last week my colleagues and I introduced legislation that would ensure that women affected by this decision can continue to get contraceptive coverage they need and that the law provides regardless of who signs their paycheck.

Importantly, this bill being offered by Senators PATTY MURRAY and MARK UDALL prevents any corporation from using the Supreme Court decision to deny women access to services guaranteed to them under Federal law.

Although the Supreme Court ruling focused primarily on contraceptive coverage, it left the door open for future litigation challenging other basic health care benefits—vaccines, blood transfusions. This is unacceptable, and the legislation before us would stop this discrimination once and for all.

This legislation is not about overriding the religious beliefs of any living person or any nonprofit charity. Our legislation respects and accommodates the beliefs of individuals and nonprofits. Remember, the Hobby Lobby case involved for-profit companies which are not human beings but are legal entities that are incorporated for a profit-making purpose.

When people decide to incorporate a for-profit entity, they agree that the entity will be subject to basic laws that protect the rights of their employees, including laws that prevent discrimination and laws that enable women who work for them to access adequate health care.

The decision of the activist Hobby Lobby majority suddenly allows these for-profit corporations to declare themselves exempt from these basic laws and discriminate against women's health care coverage. That is a significant change in the law and, as a result, untold thousands of American women will end up losing access to affordable health care that they had been guaranteed.

This is a problem, and it is a challenge. We need to protect women's access to affordable prescription contraception and prevent corporate entities—for-profit corporations—from interfering with their employees' health care decisions.

This week in the Senate my colleagues and I will have a chance to vote on it. I think it is a critical vote. I might add another element here. Many people want to discuss the issue of birth control in the context of abortion, a hot-button issue, and it has been for years across America. The record is pretty clear. If there are more unplanned pregnancies, there are more likely more abortions. Reducing the number of unplanned pregnancies reduces the number of abortions. It is simple math. There are some who disagree on theological grounds. They cannot disagree on biological grounds. So standing up for family planning and birth control to avoid unplanned and unwanted pregnancies is going to reduce the incidence of abortion in this country—something I hope all of us feel would be a positive development. I certainly do.

So I hope we can stand together this week on a bipartisan basis and tell the Supreme Court they are wrong and pass this new law that takes away the power of bosses to determine the health care of the women who work for them.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. DURBIN. I do. I am sorry; I did not see my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. President.

I am honored to follow those eloquent and powerful remarks by my friend and colleague from Illinois, and I am particularly impressed and moved by his comments on young people coming across the border that deserve better from this Nation—better in the care they receive when they are here, better in the due process and the justice this country gives them once they have arrived. But I am here to talk about the Hobby Lobby decision by the Supreme Court and to second in every single respect the remarks that Senator DURBIN has just made.

I went to the site of a new Hobby Lobby store in the State of Connecticut, being built in Manchester—the second in Connecticut—where its goods and services will be available to consumers in Connecticut. It is an impressive new structure. But it was not a groundbreaking or ribbon cutting. I went there to call on Hobby Lobby to do right for its employees and for its customers in the State of Connecticut.

I went there to make public a letter that I have written to the chief executive of Hobby Lobby, asking that he and his company respect the law, history, and policy of our State and also of the United States.

The U.S. Supreme Court has made its decision interpreting the Religious

Freedom Restoration Act in giving this corporation—a for-profit entity—the right to tell its women employees that they have no access to certain kinds of contraceptive care approved by the FDA. That is a legal decision that cannot be overturned by my speaking on the floor of the Senate or in my writing to the CEO of Hobby Lobby. But it can be overturned by a law that changes that opinion—changes the opinion, in effect, by overruling it.

That is the purpose of the Not My Boss's Business Act, as well as the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act, and that is the reason I am going to vote for it because I feel that women should be making these decisions with their doctors, and that neither politicians nor business executives nor their corporate entities should be interfering and intruding in that decision.

We can debate whether corporations ought to have these rights under the law, whether they are entitled to use the law, in effect, to assert legal claims, whether to the First Amendment or to the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. This decision was a statutory one. We can disagree with it all we want. But the way to overturn it is to legally adopt a new statute here.

That is why I am so strongly supporting this change in the law that I hope will be adopted on a bipartisan basis, because there ought to be nothing partisan about women's health care, about preventing unnecessary abortion, as Senator DURBIN has said so well, and about providing a form of health care that really is in the interests of families as well as women. It is in all of our interests.

I called on Hobby Lobby to put aside the technical distinctions that it can assert and the legal principles that it may invoke because it is a self-funded plan under the law, but simply do the right thing and follow Connecticut's law, policy, and history.

Connecticut has a law. It is a State statute that was adopted in 1999. I vigorously advocated for it. It requires that contraceptive care be covered by insurance plans—any contraceptive method approved by the FDA. That is the law of Connecticut—well established, long accepted, and strongly supported, and Hobby Lobby is flouting it. Maybe in letter it has a leg to stand on, but in spirit it is thumbing its nose at the people of the State of Connecticut. My message to Hobby Lobby is, if you want Connecticut customers, respect Connecticut's law.

Now, this principle of privacy—of women following their conscience and their conviction, making these decisions on their own, one way or the other, to use contraceptives or not, after consulting with their doctor or other medical experts and their family, their clergy, personal advisors—this principle of personal privacy is enshrined not only in Connecticut law but in our history. In fact, Connecticut has led the Nation in asserting and respecting the right of privacy. Griswold v. Connecticut, which struck down a prohibition on the sale of contraceptives, arose in Connecticut, argued by a great renowned Connecticut lawyer Catherine Roraback.

The right of privacy, as one of our Supreme Court Justices said, is essentially and fundamentally the right to be let alone. It is the right to be let alone from unwarranted government interference and intrusion. This interpretation of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act by the Supreme Court contravenes that basic principle embodied and enshrined in Connecticut history as well as law.

I call on Hobby Lobby to respect that law and our policy of respecting that right of privacy that is embedded and respected in the way that law enforcement as well as our statutes and our courts interpret their role in Connecticut, and their authorities and their powers. The fundamental principle here is that religious liberty should be respected.

It is the religious liberty of those executives at Hobby Lobby, its owners and private corporation shareholders, for-profit entity owners. They deserve respect for their religious liberty. But religious liberty is about the right to practice your religion; it is not the right to impose your religion on someone else. This country was founded on that fundamental principle of religious liberty and the right of privacy, the right to be let alone from unnecessary and unwarranted interference. It is the right of privacy and religious liberty that is at stake here in this activist, erroneous Supreme Court decision, which we have the power to overturn here, and to restore religious freedom, truly restore the liberty of conscience and conviction that is so fundamental to American life and American exceptionalism.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING DRESS FOR SUCCESS LEXINGTON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Dress for Success Lexington and its Kentucky co-founders, Analisa Wagoner and Jennifer Monarch. It was my distinct pleasure to help these women secure 501(c)(3) nonprofit status from the IRS for their business, and I am honored to know that I have played a role, albeit a minor one, in all the good that will continue to come of Wagoner and Monarch's venture.

Dress for Success was founded in New York City in 1997. Since then the organization had expanded into 128 cities around the world, including locations in Louisville and Lexington, KY.

As its name suggests, Dress for Success provides gently used, professional clothes to disadvantaged women. This is not, however, the totality of the organization's services. Looking the part is indeed a piece of the equation, but to ensure success they also provide counseling and training as their clients navigate the jobs market and begin work.

Jennifer and Analisa opened the doors to Dress for Success Lexington over a year ago. In the intervening time, they were inundated with enough clothing donations to render their initial location inoperable. Theirs is a business model that does not work unless people are willing to give. Fortunately, helping others in need is second nature for the people of Lexington, KY.

Last September, Dress for Success Lexington moved into a newer, much larger location in the Eastland Shopping Center. And with its newly acquired non-profit status, which makes the organization eligible for certain grants, donations, and a tax-exempt status, the future looks decidedly bright for Dress for Success Lexington.

Dress for Success Lexington is a model for serving the community. They are not just helping people—more importantly they are providing the tools and training for women to help themselves, and in turn do the same for others.

Therefore, I ask that my Senate colleagues join me in paying tribute to these exemplary citizens and Dress for Success Lexington.

Mr. President, the Lexington Herald-Leader recently published an article profiling Analisa Wagoner and Jennifer Monarch, and their work with Dress for Success Lexington. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Lexington Herald-Leader, Aug. 21, 2013]

DRESS FOR SUCCESS LEXINGTON HAS FOUND A HOME, PLANS TO OPEN IN LATE SEPTEMBER

(By Merlene Davis)

I wrote about Analisa Wagoner and Jennifer Monarch in April as they were being overrun by mounds of gently worn clothing.

They had run out of room for the generous donations from Lexington women who were more than willing to help their less fortunate sisters get on their feet.

A bit overwhelmed but definitely not discouraged, Wagoner and Monarch had been approved to start a local affiliate of the

international Dress for Success program which provides professional attire, a support network and career development tools to help women become economically independent.

Now I am writing about them because they have secured a permanent home for Dress for Success Lexington in the Eastland Shopping Center. It will open in late September. The non-profit will be the second such program in Kentucky. Louisville's affiliate was established in 2000.

Wagoner said the new location is getting spruced up and painted, the furnace is being replaced and a dressing room is being added.

''We are still in that process,'' she said. ''In the ideal, fingers-crossed time line, we may get the keys by the end of the week.''

That will be followed by the addition of furniture and clothing racks.

Meanwhile, the women have scheduled the first of many mandatory orientation and training sessions for volunteers. People are needed in administration, inventory, fundraising, outreach, and technical and graphic areas. Soon, there will be a need for volunteers in the career center to conduct mock interviews, offer job search tips and edit résumés and cover letters. The training session will be held at the Central Library downtown.

''That is where we held our start-up meeting in May,'' Wagoner said. ''We have come so far since then. We've come full circle.''

The sessions are geared to get everyone on the same page, she said. A video provided by the worldwide organization will be shown, featuring Joi Gordon, chief executive officer, who will talk about the program.

Those in attendance will be able to select their preferred area in which to help.

The Eastland site has more than 2,000 square feet of space and was the ''last missing piece of the puzzle,'' Monarch said. It will be enough space for organized racks of professional clothing, two dressing rooms, an area with computers, and office space.

''With the space, we have everything we need to start helping women, which is our No. 1 and only goal,'' she said.

Clients are helped through referral only, Wagoner said, and after completing a job training program through a government or social services agency.

The client then works with a volunteer personal shopper who helps her select appropriate attire and also provides support and encouragement as she prepares for job interviews.

After landing a job, the client can then return for more clothing and support.

On Sept. 19, referral agencies will be invited to an open house to learn about the program's mission. But that's not all the events being planned. On Oct. 1, Mayor Jim Gray will be on hand for the official opening.

And on Oct. 17, local designers, who have been given outfits that aren't suited for the workplace, will show off their skills in a Recycle the Runway fundraiser and fashion show at The Grand Reserve on Manchester Street.

Wagoner and Monarch are determined to see this program flourish. Considering where they started and where they are now, I wouldn't advise anyone to stand in their way.

It will be better for us to just get onboard.

REMEMBERING GEORGE CARNES, JR.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to report some sad news to my Senate colleagues. On June 29, 2014, Mr. George Carnes Jr. of Walker, KY, passed away at the age of 87.

George was born on November 3, 1926, to George and Mossie Bargo Carnes. In the aftermath of the Second World War, he served his country as a part of the U.S. Army's German occupation force.

Upon returning from Germany, George married Lena Shelton on a summer day in 1953. Family was paramount in George's life, and the two were happily married for 52 years until Lena's passing. Together they had, and are survived by, three children Alene Foley, Sandra Howard, and George Carnes III.

I am fortunate to know well one of his four grandchildren, Andrew Howard, who is on my staff, and to see firsthand the product of George's influence. George loved most of all spending time with his family, whether it was discussing the latest Kentucky basketball and Cincinnati Reds news, passing down his farming techniques, or simply playing with his two great-grandchildren.

George was also a man of great faith. As an ordained Baptist minister, he was a member of the Salt Gum Baptist Church and former pastor of the Moore's Creek Baptist Church.

George was an exemplary citizen who served his country honorably, was devoted to his church and community, and loved his family. I ask that my Senate colleagues join me in paying tribute to George Carnes Jr.

Mr. President, Hopper Funeral Home, Inc. recently published in area newspapers an obituary for Mr. Carnes. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From Hopper Funeral Home, Inc.]

GEORGE CARNES JR.

George Carnes Jr. (Junior) age 87, of Walker, Kentucky, was born there on November 3, 1926, to the late George and Mossie Bargo Carnes. Junior died Sunday, June 29, 2014, in the Pineville Community Hospital. On July 7, 1953, he united in marriage to Lena Shelton and they were married for 52 years before her passing and were loving parents to Alene Foley of Barbourville, Kentucky; Sandra Howard and husband, Rev. Rondald Howard, Pineville, Kentucky, George Carnes III, of Walker, Kentucky. Along with his parents and wife, Lena, George was preceded in death by his brothers; Alonzo, Cloyd, McCoy, LeeRoy, Raymond, Flem D. and sisters; Dorothy Carnes and Edna Carnes Messer.

In addition to his three children, Junior is survived by his sister, Evelyn Carnes Warren of Arjay, Kentucky; four grandchildren and two great-grandchildren who he loved dearly. His grandchildren include granddaughter Beth Howard; three grandsons; Michael Foley and wife, Jennifer; Jason Foley and wife, Codi; and Andrew Howard. Junior's favorite times were spent with his two great-grandchildren; Connor Foley and Grace Foley, having tea parties, watching dance performances, playing baseball and passing on his love for farming. He also loved Kentucky basketball and the Cincinnati Reds and would chat with anyone on any given day about the Wildcats or the Reds.

Junior was a member of the Salt Gum Baptist Church and an ordained Baptist Minister and former pastor of the Moore's Creek Baptist Church. He served in the United States Army as part of the German occupation force and was an employee of McCracken-McCall Lumber Company, Viall Lumber Company, Marshall Lumber Company and Forest Products.

Funeral Services for George Carnes Jr. will be conducted at the Chapel of the Hopper Funeral Home on Thursday, July 3, 2014, at 1:00 pm, with Rev. Rondald Howard and Bro. Terry Joe Messer officiating and special music by Rev. and Mrs. Ricky Broughton. Burial will follow in the George Carnes Cemetery at Walker. Pallbearers will be grandsons, nephews, family and friends. Friends will be received at the Hopper Funeral Home, Wednesday after 6:00 pm and Thursday after 10:00 am until the funeral hour at 1:00 pm.

REMEMBERING KEN GRAY

Mr. DURBIN. Today, we mourn the loss of a Southern Illinois legend, Congressman Ken Gray. Kenny had many roles in his lifetime. He was a licensed auctioneer, a pilot, and a magician. But he made his greatest mark serving the people of Southern Illinois in the U.S. House of Representatives for nearly a quarter of a century.

Kenny was a World War II veteran who served with the Army and Air Force in North Africa, Italy, Southern France and Central Europe. After the war he operated an air service in Benton, IL.

He was elected to Congress in 1954 at the age of 30 and went on to serve 10 consecutive terms. When he first went to Washington, Southern Illinois was an impoverished, rural area. Congressman Gray took great pride in the regional improvements he helped steer to his region. His work made a real difference in the daily lives of Southern Illinoisans.

His constituents loved him and the House entrusted him with increasing responsibilities. Speakers of the House Sam Rayburn and Tip O'Neil regularly called on him to preside over the chamber.

You could never forget Kenny Gray. With his rainbow of sport coats and personal helicopter, Kenny was a legend. He even had a pink Cadillac. His repertoire of jokes borrowed heavily from Red Skelton and hometown stories from Little Egypt.

Among his notable achievements in Congress: Ken helped write the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act, which created America's interstate highway system. Kenny kept the pen that President Dwight D. Eisenhower used to sign the historic legislation.

With president Deltye Morris, Kenny Gray helped to put Southern Illinois University Carbondale on the map as a leading university in America.

Today the section of Interstate 57 between milepost 0, at the Illinois State line, to milepost 106, at the Marion/Jefferson County line, is known as Ken Gray Expressway in honor of his role in the creation of America's highway system.

You can also see Kenny Gray's legacy in Rend Lake, which was created by the Army Corps of Engineers and supplies 15 million gallons of water per day to 300,000 people in more than 60 Southern Illinois communities. Rend Lake has saved more than $100 million worth of property downstream during flood years and it would not exist without Kenny Gray's leadership.

Congressman Gray stepped away from Congress in 1974. My mentor Paul Simon succeeded him in Congress. When Paul ran for the Senate in 1984, Kenny Gray returned to Congress to serve two more terms. In 1988, Kenny left Congress for the last time to come home after developing a muscular disorder caused by a tick bite on a congressional visit to Brazil.

Ken Gray passed away just days after we lost another Illinois political giant with whom he served in Congress, Senator Alan Dixon.

Alan Dixon once said of Kenny Gray, ''A true political legend, Gray never was defeated. He just quit.''

Congressman Gray remained a voice in the community after leaving Congress. We will miss that voice, but we won't forget his achievements.

I want to express my condolences to Kenny's family, especially his wife Margaret ''Toedy'' Holley-Gray, his daughters: Diann, Becky and Candy, and his grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

CYPRUS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to mark a troubling anniversary—that of the 40th year of the division of the island of Cyprus.

U.N. peacekeepers first came to Cyprus in 1964 due to intercommunal fighting.

Since 1974, Cyprus has been divided into the government-controlled two-thirds of the island and the remaining one-third of the island which is administered by Turkish Cypriots and occupied by Turkish military forces. The Republic of Cyprus, which joined the European Union in 2004, continues to be the only internationally recognized government on the island.

Tragically, Cyprus has been divided now for four decades, with a U.N. buffer zone separating the entire island—the so-called green line. Violence today is rare, but the long-term impacts of the separation are stark—displaced people, memories of family members killed in earlier violence, and lost property rights. Quite simply, a people who share a common island have been unnecessarily divided for far too long.

Over the last decade there have been signs of hope that the island would be reunified and the Turkish occupation brought to an end. In 2009, for example, I visited Cyprus and met with then Cypriot President Demetris Christofias and Turkish Cypriot leader Mehmet Ali Talat. Christofias and Talat, at considerable political risk, had undertaken negotiations that showed real promise—talks that I and the international community hoped would succeed. Unfortunately, they did not, and several years have passed without a resolution.

Meanwhile, the situation in Cyprus has left an island and a region divided. People have died. Families have been separated. An entire coastal area, Varosha, remains an occupied ghost town. There has been a great deal of pain inflicted on the people of this island.

While I am saddened by this 40th anniversary, I am also encouraged that a new group of leaders in Cyprus has undertaken talks that show some promise. After Vice President JOE BIDEN visited Cyprus in May, Cypriot President Nicos Anastasiades and Turkish Cypriot leader Dervis Eroglu agreed to meet at least twice a month and undertake confidence building measures aimed at easing the many years of mistrust between the two sides.

I hope the leaders of Turkey will also step forward and bring an end to the military occupation of a third of the island. Such military seizure of territory has no place in today's modern Europe.

While this is a Cypriot-led process and negotiation, I wish to express my strong hope and support for the current negotiations to bring peaceful and enduring settlement to the island.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the situation in Cyprus. Forty years ago this week, military forces from Turkey invaded Cyprus, eventually taking control of 38 percent of the island. Cyprus has remained divided ever since. As we observe this solemn occasion, I call on all parties to find a peaceful negotiated settlement in Cyprus.

Cyprus is an important partner to the United States, and I appreciate the recent attention given to Cyprus reunification by the Obama administration. In May 2014, Vice President BIDEN visited the island and met with President Anastasiades and Dr. Eroglu. Vice President BIDEN personally conveyed our country's support for reunification of Cyprus as a bizonal, bicommunal federation. However, as Vice President BIDEN said, ''. . . ultimately, the solution cannot come from the outside. It cannot come from the United States or anywhere else; it has to come from the leaders of the two communities, and from the compelling voices of the civil society leaders . . .''

In February 2014, Cypriot leaders issued a joint statement, prompting the formal resumption of unification talks. I was encouraged by this step but have followed this issue long enough to know that negotiators face a difficult, though not insurmountable, task. I wish them well in their negotiations and hope we can soon see progress towards a peaceful reunification in Cyprus.

MOUNT CHASE SESQUICENTENNIAL

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the Town of Mount Chase, ME. Mount Chase was built with a spirit of determination and resiliency that still guides the community today, and this is a time to celebrate the generations of hard-working and caring people who have made it such a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families.

While this sesquicentennial marks Mount Chase's incorporation, the year 1864 was but one milestone in a long journey of progress. For thousands of years, the land surrounding Mount Katahdin, Maine's highest peak, was the hunting and fishing grounds of the Penobscot and Maliseet tribes. In the 1830s, the first White settlers were drawn by the fertile soil, vast stands of timber, and fast-moving streams, and the young village became a center of the Maine North Woods' lumber industry. The wealth produced by the forests and saw mills was invested in schools and churches to create a true community. The incorporated town that followed was named for the prominent mountain peak, Mount Chase, which towers more than a half-mile above the farms and forests below.

The arrival of the railroads in the aftermath of the Civil War further secured Mount Chase's prominence in the lumber industry, and the town was home to the largest cold-storage plant on the line for wild game and other perishable food products. By the end of the 19th century, modern transportation and the region's spectacular scenery and abundant wildlife combined to create a new economic opportunity—great sporting camps and lodges that drew outdoor enthusiasts from around the world. Today, the people of Mount Chase continue to honor the strong land use traditions and love of the outdoors that have helped make such places as Shin Pond a favorite recreation destination for residents and visitors.

In the early 20th century, the history, industry, and beauty of the Mount Chase region were made immortal by the great Swedish-born artist Carl Sprinchorn, who spent many years at Shin Pond. From his paintings of the strenuous daily life of lumberjacks to his evocative landscapes, the artist recorded a very special time in Maine history and a place that remains special today.

This 150th anniversary is not just about something that is measured in calendar years. It is about human accomplishment, an occasion to celebrate the people who for generations have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a community. Thanks to those who came before, Mount Chase has a wonderful history. Thanks to those who are there today, it has a bright future.

HAMTRAMCK FIRE DEPARTMENT BICENTENNIAL

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, our Nation's first responders are in many ways our everyday heroes. Always

ready when we need them most, they risk their lives to ensure our safety. To do this, they spend long hours away from their families on grueling shifts and make countless other sacrifices. For the last century, the Hamtramck Fire Department has been a part of this distinguished tradition.

The Hamtramck Fire Department was established in its current form in 1914, but the department's roots run deeper. The Hamtramck Spouters, the first organized firefighting unit in the area, was founded in February 1857. From its inception, the department has sought to improve with each passing year, which has led to many advances, including updated technology, lowered response times, and fewer fires through prevention efforts. The department has served Hamtramck citizens with distinction, even as tough economic times have made the job harder. Their mission to protect the residents of Hamtramck is as vital today as it was 100 years ago.

Today, the fire department tackles a heavy load, making more than 3,100 runs each year. In the process, they have saved countless lives and property, often at great personal risk. Their courageous service is remarkable, and their reputation within the community is impeccable.

The Hamtramck Fire Department also has sought to make an impact in the community outside of the fire hall. From organizing park cleanups, to buying uniforms for Hamtramck High School's women's basketball team, the fire department has provided valuable services to the community.

Just this year, the fire department won a fireworks display for the city in the national Red, White & You contest. They were chosen from a group of more than 2,500 entries. Because of their efforts, the city hosted its first Fourth of July fireworks display in more than three decades. Announcing the fireworks display, Fire Chief Paul Wilk noted, ''We are a very diverse city that's fallen on hard times—we need a boost like this.''

The pride in their city and sense of service the department displayed in their application to the Red, White & You contest bears repeating. Firefighter John Dropchuck, who has been with the department for 15 years, wrote, ''Cultural diversity and a strong blue collar work ethic make up the backbone of our town. There is no better representation of the pursuit of the 'American Dream' than Hamtramck. . . The Hamtramck Fire Department is entering this contest on behalf of our residents, who we feel deserve this celebration.'' The commitment of Hamtramck's firefighters to going above and beyond for their city and its citizens is an example for all of us.

On May 3, 2014, the Hamtramck Fire Department celebrated its 100th anniversary with the annual St. Florian March and Mass. It was a fitting way to mark this historic milestone, giving the community an opportunity to offer their thanks. On July 5, the celebrations continued with an impressive fireworks display, another opportunity to come together in fellowship and thanksgiving.

We owe our Nation's firefighters and first responders a huge debt of gratitude. Their bravery and willingness to serve provides families across Michigan with a measure of security. I know my colleagues join me in congratulating the Hamtramck Fire Department on a century of service and a job well done. They are a wonderful example of public service, and I wish them much success as they continue their mission to protect the public.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SPECIALIST FRANCISCO J. BRISENO-ALVAREZ

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a true American hero, Army SPC Francisco Briseno-Alvarez who died on September 25, 2011 serving our Nation in Laghman Province, Afghanistan. Specialist Briseno-Alvarez was assigned to Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 279th Infantry Regiment, 45th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, Oklahoma Army National Guard.

SPC Briseno-Alvarez died of injuries sustained when the vehicle in which he was riding was attacked with an improvised explosive device in Laghman Province while conducting combat operations. He was 27 years old.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to those in his family he left behind: his father Javier Briseno, mother Lurdes Alvarez, and siblings Adrian and Diana Briseno.

Francisco graduated from U.S. Grant High School in Oklahoma City in 2003. He enlisted in the Oklahoma National Guard on September 11, 2010 and served as a motor transport operator in the 700th Brigade Support Battalion and then with the 1–279th Infantry Regiment.

As evident from reading through quotes from friends and family, Francisco touched people's lives in remarkable ways:

Brenda Fetzko, a neighbor said, ''I know he loved his mother very much so'' and was a good man and had a strong connection to his family. ''He was a very good person and was just getting his life going.''

Ruben Gonzalez, a friend said, ''Paco was a very nice man, and I am proud to say that he was my friend from high school and after. . . . I'm very proud of you Francisco.''

Juan Cerano, a cousin said, ''He died doing the right thing. He died serving and protecting his country. He was like the brother I never had. There's always going to be a part of him in our hearts.''

MG Myles Deering, the Oklahoma Adjutant General said, ''My thoughts and prayers are with the Briseno-Alvarez family and those of our wounded heroes. SPC Briseno-Alvarez answered the call to serve this great Nation and help defend it. His loyalty and ultimate sacrifice for the sake of our Country will never be forgotten.''

A true warrior, Francisco died while participating in tough and demanding combat operations. This fight took Francisco from us prematurely, but make no mistake; it is a fight we will win. We must continue our unwavering support for the men and women protecting our Nation and allies.

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Francisco's family and friends. Francisco lived a life of love for his family and country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice for our protection and freedom.

ARMY SPECIALIST CHRISTOPHER D. GAILEY

Mr. President, it is my honor to also remember Army SPC Christopher D. Gailey. Chris and PFC Sarina N. Butcher, 19, of Checotah, OK, lost their lives November 1, 2011, in Laja Ahmad Khel, Paktia province of Afghanistan, when an improvised explosive device detonated near their military vehicle during a supply mission.

Born September 15, 1985, in Bartlesville, OK, Chris attended Wentworth Military Academy in Lexington, MO, before returning and graduating with the class of 2005 from Caney Valley High School in Ramona, OK.

Those who knew Chris said he was a man who ''loved his country, loved America and loved his family.''

Eager to join the National Guard, he enlisted in June 2004 before graduating high school and was assigned to the 700th Brigade Support Battalion, 45th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, Oklahoma National Guard, Tulsa, OK. Previously deployed to Iraq in 2007 to 2008 as a motor vehicle operator, he departed for Afghanistan in June 2011.

The Oklahoma National Guard family is deeply saddened by the loss of these two outstanding citizen-soldiers,'' MG Myles L. Deering, the Adjutant General for Oklahoma, said in a news release. ''Their commitment and willingness to serve our nation during a time of war is indicative of their tremendous character and courage. Our thoughts and prayers are with their families, friends and those that continue to serve our country in Afghanistan.''

Survivors include his parents Shan and Tammy Gailey of Ochelata, OK, his daughter Allison Marie Gailey of Bartlesville, one brother Beau Dugan of Merriam, KS, two sisters Angelina Janelle Niko of Bartlesville and Kristina Jeanette Gailey of Stillwater, OK, his paternal grandmother Lela Belle Gailey of Marshfield, MO, his maternal grandparents Carl Eugene Maples and his wife Carol of Joplin, MO, one uncle Jesse Robert Gailey, four aunts: Barbara Jane Foster, Shawn Dee Adams, Manya Alice Maples, and Sonya Jolene Hamblin,

and several nieces, nephews and cousins.

''Keep good memories of him,'' his father Shan Gailey said. ''Keep him in your heart.''

Funeral services were held on November 12, 2011 in the Bartlesville Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Full military rites were conducted by the Oklahoma National Guard and interment was in the Ochelata Cemetery in Ocheleta, OK.

Today we remember Army SPC Christopher D. Gailey, a young man who loved his family and country and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

ARMY STAFF SERGEANT ALLEN R. MCKENNA, JR.

Mr. President, I also wish to remember a remarkable young man, Army SSG Allen R. McKenna, Jr. Robby died February 21, 2012 in Kandahar province, Afghanistan, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Robby was born July 17, 1983 in Oklahoma City, OK and graduated from Noble High School, where he met his wife Lindsey. He enlisted in the Army in September 2004 and was assigned to the 1st Squadron, 10th Cavalry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Carson, CO.

The military was a natural choice for him, and he took college courses to advance his military career, his mother said. ''He had his clothes ironed by 5 a.m. That boy loved it,'' she said. ''He just always had a love for the military, the discipline and the way they hold their head high.''

His second tour of duty to Afghanistan began on September 6, 2011. While deployed he was able to come home in December 2011 to witness the birth of his youngest child Waylon.

''He was the greatest father my boys could ask for. He was a great husband who loved us all very much. It makes me sad to know we won't grow old together, but he lived a beautiful life and (he) gave me three of the most beautiful things I could ask for,'' his wife Lindsey said.

His mother said she looked forward to getting calls from her son while he was in Afghanistan. ''I learned very quick when a phone call came in at 3 a.m. to jump up and answer it,'' Mitchell said. ''He would call and play his guitar and sing me a song he had written.''

On March 6, 2012, Robby was laid to rest in Hillside Cemetery in Purcell, OK. Oklahoma Governor, Mary Fallin ordered flags on State property to fly at half-staff on March 6, 2012 in honor of Robby.

Robby is survived by his wife Lindsey McKenna of Purcell, three sons: Allen Robert McKenna III, Michael ''Mickey'' McKenna, and Waylon Roan McKenna, and the only girl in the family, his pet cat ''Scat;'' father and stepmother, Allen and Pam McKenna of Purcell, grandparents Bill and Charlotte McKenna of Alex, Alvie and Cleta Mitchell and Grace Cummins of Noble, OK; three brothers and their families, Billy and Jamie Bingenheimer of Little Axe, OK, Bobby and Charlene Bingenheimer of Purcell, OK, and Scotty and Lenette McKenna of Anchorage, AK, one sister Jessi McKenna of Purcell, OK, stepfather Lamar Bingenheimer, step-grandparents Frankie and Mary Rinehart of Purcell, OK, father-in-law,Donnie Jones of Noble, OK, mother-in-law Donya Jones of Norman, OK, numerous cousins, nieces, nephews and a host of other relatives and friends.

Today we remember Army SSG Allen R. McKenna, Jr., a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING WALTER PARKER

• Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I would like to take the time to recognize the loss of Walter Parker. Walter Parker passed away on June 25, 2014, in Anchorage, AK. Walt Parker was dedicated to our State and he made his mark in many ways.

Walter Parker came up to Alaska in 1946 after serving in World War II and held vital roles in the development of the State of Alaska. From overseeing the construction of the Dalton Highway to being appointed to the Alaska State Pipeline office, Walter Parker helped shape Alaska into what it is today. He was a constant advocate for stronger communities, higher education, parks and trails, safer transportation and better communities. He was a musher, trapper, bush pilot, planner and borough assemblyman who never lost his commitment or faith to help make Alaska a great place to live.

Throughout his life, Walter Parker approached all parts of his life with excitement, passion, idealism and energy—he was a force to be reckoned with. He passed on his knowledge by teaching at the University of Alaska and helped our State after the devastation of the Exxon Valdez oil spill. He served as chairman of the Alaska Oil Spill Commission. Later in his life, he held various government positions and was involved in public interest organizations that helped make Alaska better.

The loss of Walter Parker is sad and all who knew him mourns his loss. The work Walter Parker did for Alaska will never be forgotten, and we are all thankful for his commitment and dedication to the people of Alaska.•

REMEMBERING FRED BROWN

• Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I wish to honor and remember long time Alaskan, Mr. Fred Brown. Mr. Brown died in Fairbanks at the Denali Center on Friday, June 27, 2014 at the age of 70.

Fred Brown was a former 4-term Fairbanks legislator who was elected in 1974 served in the Alaska House of Representatives in the 1970s and early 1980s. He was not only an active member of the community, but a man with a passion for contributing to the development of the State of Alaska. With a remarkable passion for music and radio, he enriched the territory and State for decades. He was an avid ham radio operator known by the call sign KL7CUS.

Outside the legislature, Fred Brown played the flute, piccolo and contra bassoon for 50 years with the Fairbanks Symphony Orchestra. He was also an active member at St. Matthew's Episcopal Church where his memory will be honored.

Fred Brown cared deeply about his community and was committed to public service. As a legislator, he carried himself and the State forward with self-determination and dignity. His wife Helen said her husband had three main passions: ''Politics, music and religion were what mattered to him, which is a strange combination, but that really was the triumvirate of his life.'' He was a master of parliamentary procedure and scrupulously ran meetings according to Mason's Rules in the interest of fairness to all.

While we mourn the loss of his presence, the legacy of this remarkable man lives on. He leaves behind many friends who are grateful to have known his exceptional character. The people of Alaska will always owe a debt of gratitude to former Alaska legislator Fred Brown.

On behalf of his family and his many friends, I ask that we honor Fred Brown's memory.•

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE FORMER LIBERIAN REGIME OF CHARLES TAYLOR THAT WAS ESTABLISHED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13348 ON JULY 22, 2004—PM 50

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004, is to continue in effect beyond July 22, 2014.

Although Liberia has made significant advances to promote democracy,

and the Special Court for Sierra Leone convicted Charles Taylor for war crimes and crimes against humanity, the actions and policies of former Liberian President Charles Taylor and other persons, in particular their unlawful depletion of Liberian resources and their removal from Liberia and secreting of Liberian funds and property, still challenge Liberia's efforts to strengthen its democracy and the orderly development of its political, administrative, and economic institutions. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 15, 2014*.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on July 14, 2014, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 255. An act to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 272. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the ''Major General William H. Gourley VA–DOD Outpatient Clinic''.

H.R. 291. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota.

H.R. 330. An act to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

H.R. 356. An act to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled ''An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes''.

H.R. 507. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes.

H.R. 803. An act to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to strengthen the United States workforce development system through innovation in, and alignment and improvement of, employment, training, and education programs in the United States, and to promote individual and national economic growth, and for other purposes.

H.R. 876. An act to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1158. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

H.R. 1216. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Vet Center in Prescott, Arizona, as the ''Dr. Cameron McKinley Department of Veterans Affairs Veterans Center''.

H.R. 2337. An act to provide for the conveyance of Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado.

H.R. 3110. An act to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed during the session of the Senate by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on July 14, 2014, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1376. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the ''Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1813. An act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, as the ''Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin, Jr., Post Office Building''.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed during the session of the Senate by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:21 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. 451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 North Brevard Avenue in Cocoa Beach, Florida, as the ''Richard K. Salick Post Office''.

H.R. 606. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1192. An act to redesignate Mammoth Peak in Yosemite National Park as ''Mount Jessie Benton Fremont''.

H.R. 1786. An act to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2223. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 Elm Avenue in Munising, Michigan, as the ''Elizabeth L. Kinnunen Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2291. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 Lexington Avenue in New York, New York, as the ''Vincent R. Sombrotto Post Office''.

H.R. 2802. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 418 Liberty Street in Covington, Indiana, as the ''Fountain County Veterans Memorial Post Office''.

H.R. 3027. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 Miller Valley Road in Prescott, Arizona, as the ''Barry M. Goldwater Post Office''.

H.R. 3085. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3534. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Michigan Avenue in Jackson, Michigan, as the ''Officer James Bonneau Memorial Post Office''.

H.R. 4185. An act to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4193. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4195. An act to amend chapter 15 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the Federal Register Act), to modernize the Federal Register, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4197. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the period of certain authority with respect to judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4355. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 B Street in Perryville, Arkansas, as the ''Harold George Bennett Post Office''.

H.R. 4416. An act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 161 Live Oak Street in Miami, Arizona, as the ''Staff Sergeant Manuel V. Mendoza Post Office Building''.

H.R. 5029. An act to provide for the establishment of a body to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation that can strengthen the domestic science and technology enterprise and support United States foreign policy goals.

H.R. 5031. An act to define STEM education to include computer science, and to support existing STEM education programs at the National Science Foundation.

H.R. 5056. An act to improve the efficiency of Federal research and development, and for other purposes.

At 5:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5021. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 North Brevard Avenue in Cocoa Beach, Florida, as the ''Richard K. Salick Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 606. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1192. An act to redesignate Mammoth Peak in Yosemite National Park as ''Mount Jessie Benton Frémont''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1786. An act to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2223. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 Elm Avenue in Munising, Michigan, as the ''Elizabeth L. Kinnunen Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2291. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 Lexington Avenue in New York, New York, as the ''Vincent R. Sombrotto Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2802. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 418 Liberty Street in Covington, Indiana, as the ''Fountain County Veterans Memorial Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3027. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 Miller Valley Road in Prescott, Arizona, as the ''Barry M. Goldwater Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3085. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3534. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Michigan Avenue in Jackson, Michigan, as the ''Officer James Bonneau Memorial Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4195. An act to amend chapter 15 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the Federal Register Act), to modernize the Federal Register, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4197. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the period of certain authority with respect to judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4355. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 B Street in Perryville, Arkansas, as the ''Harold George Bennett Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4416. An act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 161 Live Oak Street in Miami, Arizona, as the ''Staff Sergeant Manuel V. Mendoza Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5029. An act to provide for the establishment of a body to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation that can strengthen the domestic science and technology enterprise and support United States foreign policy goals; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 5031. An act to define STEM education to include computer science, and to support existing STEM education programs at the National Science Foundation; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5056. An act to improve the efficiency of Federal research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2599. A bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

H.R. 4718. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 5021. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 2609. A bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 1865. A bill to amend the prices set for Federal Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps and make limited waivers of stamp requirements for certain users (Rept. No. 113–210).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Joseph P. Mohorovic, of Illinois, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2012.

*Judith M. Davenport, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020.

*Elliot F. Kaye, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2013.

*Elliot F. Kaye, of New York, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

*Elizabeth Sembler, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020.

*Robert S. Adler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2014.

*Victor M. Mendez, of Arizona, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

*Peter M. Rogoff, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.

*Bruce H. Andrews, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

*Marcus Dwayne Jadotte, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Angela R. Holbrook and ending with Martha A. Rodriguez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2014.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 2601. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to ensure futures commission merchant compliance; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2602. A bill to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2603. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain National Forest System land in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2604. A bill to authorize the sale of certain National Forest System land in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 2605. A bill to preserve religious freedom and a woman's access to contraception; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 2606. A bill to require the termination of any employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs who is found to have retaliated against a whistleblower; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 2607. A bill to extend and modify the pilot program of the Department of Veterans Affairs on assisted living services for veterans with traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2608. A bill to provide for congressional approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments, to establish requirements for the declaration of marine national monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 2609. A bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2610. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing the John P. Parker House in Ripley, Ohio, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2611. A bill to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 502. A resolution concerning the suspension of exit permit issuance by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo for adopted Congolese children seeking to depart the country with their adoptive parents; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 84

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 84, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 109

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 109, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 398

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum, and for other purposes.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 864

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 864, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water systems, and for other purposes.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1251, a bill to establish programs with respect to childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer.

S. 1505

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1505, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to certain sporting good articles, and to exempt those articles from definition under that Act.

S. 1803

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1803, a bill to require certain protections for student loan borrowers, and for other purposes.

S. 2013

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2013, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of Senior Executive Service employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance, and for other purposes.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2103, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue or revise regulations with respect to the medical certification of certain small aircraft pilots, and for other purposes.

S. 2188

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2188, a bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes.

S. 2244

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2244, a bill to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 2323

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2323, a bill to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service.

S. 2329

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to prevent Hezbollah from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2335

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 2335, a bill to exempt certain 16 and 17 year-old children employed in logging or mechanized operations from child labor laws.

S. 2340

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2340, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary to provide for the use of data from the second preceding tax year to carry out the simplification of applications for the estimation and determination of financial aid eligibility, to increase the income threshold to qualify for zero expected family contribution, and for other purposes.

S. 2481

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2481, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide authority for sole source contracts for certain small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes.

S. 2498

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2498, a bill to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law.

S. 2529

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2529, a bill to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 399O of the Public Health Service Act.

S. 2543

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2543, a bill to support afterschool and out-of-school-time science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2563

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2563, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to improve highway safety and for other purposes.

S. 2577

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2577, a bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to $5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014.

S. 2578

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2578, a bill to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions.

S. 2585

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2585, a bill to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran to protect against human rights abuses in Iran, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. RES. 498

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 498, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 2607. A bill to extend and modify the pilot program of the Department of Veterans Affairs on assisted living services for veterans with traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce with my colleague Senator DEAN HELLER, legislation that would extend a critical and innovative program for our nation's veterans. Senator HELLER and I urge our colleagues to consider The Assisted Living Program for Veterans with Traumatic Brain Injury Extension, AL–TBI, Act which authorizes the continuation of a Veterans Health Administration program that provides intensive care and rehabilitation to veterans with severe brain injuries.

Thanks to this program, veterans with traumatic brain injuries more quickly re-adjust to their day-to-day lives—from making dinner for others, to fixing a faucet, to doing yard work. AL–TBI consists of privately run group homes around the country where veterans are immersed in therapies for movement, memory, speech, and gradual community reintegration. Veterans in these homes benefit from 24-hour team-based care. There are about twenty of these homes in New Jersey that have yielded impressive results. Nationally, several dozen veterans have been rehabilitated from severe injuries that are notoriously difficult to treat.

This program is working to help a generation of veterans with traumatic brain injuries and so many older veterans that have been suffering for decades. Since 2001, more than 265,000 U.S. troops suffered traumatic brain injuries, according to the Defense and Veterans Brain Injury Center. While most were mild concussions, over 26,000 men and women veterans suffered from moderate or severe head wounds. Advances in medicine keep alive soldiers with head wounds that might have killed them in previous conflicts. However, the ability to cure these injuries has not kept pace. Innovative, effective programs must be supported by Congress in order to give our veterans the care they need and deserve.

But unfortunately, as the program nears the end of its 5-year authorization, veterans across the country are being told that they need to prepare to move out of the facilities in September. I have heard from a veteran in New Jersey, who was told he will need to be out of the program on September 15 and worries he will be out on the street. He has made tremendous gains with the AL–TBI program. He has rekindled his relationship with his son. He is able to do basic math again. But, he has a lot more to do to get his independence back. We cannot leave him and other veterans like him out in the cold.

The VA offers no alternative program that replicates the comprehensiveness of the rehabilitative care, the benefit of providing care in a residential setting, and the positive impact on veterans of sustained, longer-term care.

This is a proven program that does not require new funds, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join Senator HELLER and myself in supporting this critical piece of legislation for our Nation's veterans.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2611. A bill to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2611

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Helping Unaccompanied Minors and Alleviating National Emergency Act'' or the ''HUMANE Act''.

TITLE I—PROTECTING CHILDREN

SEC. 101. REPATRIATION OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

Section 235(a) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending the paragraph heading to read as follows: ''RULES FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''who is a national or habitual resident of a country that is contiguous with the United States''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by amending the subparagraph heading to read as follows: ''AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES''; and

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''countries contiguous to the United States'' and inserting ''Canada, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and any other foreign country that the Secretary determines appropriate''; and

(2) in paragraph (5)(D)—

(A) in the subparagraph heading, by striking ''PLACEMENT IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS'' and inserting ''EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN'';

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking '', except for an unaccompanied alien child from a contiguous country subject to the exceptions under subsection (a)(2), shall be—'' and inserting ''who does not meet the criteria listed in paragraph (2)(A)—'';

(C) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) shall be placed in a proceeding in accordance with section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which shall commence not later than 7 days after the screening of an unaccompanied alien child described in paragraph (4);'';

(D) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively;

(E) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

''(ii) may not be placed in the custody of a nongovernmental sponsor or otherwise released from the custody of the United States Government until the child is repatriated unless the child is the subject of an order under section 235B(e)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;'';

(F) in clause (iii), as redesignated, by inserting ''is'' before ''eligible''; and

(G) in clause (iv), as redesignated, by inserting ''shall be'' before ''provided''.

SEC. 102. EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS AND SCREENING OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after section 235A the following:

''SEC. 235B. HUMANE AND EXPEDITED INSPECTION AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

''(a) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term 'asylum officer' means an immigration officer who—

''(1) has had professional training in country conditions, asylum law, and interview techniques comparable to that provided to full-time adjudicators of applications under section 208, and

''(2) is supervised by an officer who—

''(A) meets the condition described in paragraph (1); and

''(B) has had substantial experience adjudicating asylum applications.

''(b) PROCEEDING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 7 days after the screening of an unaccompanied alien child under section 235(a)(4) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)(4)), an immigration judge shall conduct a proceeding to inspect, screen, and determine the status of an unaccompanied alien child who is an applicant for admission to the United States.

''(2) TIME LIMIT.—Not later than 72 hours after the conclusion of a proceeding with respect to an unaccompanied alien child under this section, the immigration judge who conducted such proceeding shall issue an order pursuant to subsection (e).

''(c) CONDUCT OF PROCEEDING.—

''(1) AUTHORITY OF IMMIGRATION JUDGE.—The immigration judge conducting a proceeding under this section—

''(A) shall administer oaths, receive evidence, and interrogate, examine, and cross-examine the alien and any witnesses;

''(B) may issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and presentation of evidence; and

''(C) is authorized to sanction by civil money penalty any action (or inaction) in contempt of the judge's proper exercise of authority under this Act.

''(2) FORM OF PROCEEDING.—A proceeding under this section may take place—

''(A) in person;

''(B) at a location agreed to by the parties, in the absence of the alien;

''(C) through video conference; or

''(D) through telephone conference.

''(3) PRESENCE OF ALIEN.—If it is impracticable by reason of an alien's mental incompetency for the alien to be present at the proceeding, the Attorney General shall prescribe safeguards to protect the rights and privileges of the alien.

''(4) RIGHTS OF THE ALIEN.—In a proceeding under this section—

''(A) the alien shall be given the privilege of being represented, at no expense to the Government, by counsel of the alien's choosing who is authorized to practice in such proceedings;

''(B) the alien shall be given a reasonable opportunity—

''(i) to examine the evidence against the alien;

''(ii) to present evidence on the alien's own behalf; and

''(iii) to cross-examine witnesses presented by the Government;

''(C) the rights set forth in subparagraph (B) shall not entitle the alien—

''(i) to examine such national security information as the Government may proffer in opposition to the alien's admission to the United States; or

''(ii) to an application by the alien for discretionary relief under this Act; and

''(D) a complete record shall be kept of all testimony and evidence produced at the proceeding.

''(5) WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION.—In the discretion of the Attorney General, an alien applying for admission to the United States may, and at any time, be permitted to withdraw such application and immediately be returned to the alien's country of nationality or country of last habitual residence.

''(d) DECISION AND BURDEN OF PROOF.—

''(1) DECISION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—At the conclusion of a proceeding under this section, the immigration judge shall determine whether an unaccompanied alien child is likely to be—

''(i) admissible to the United States; or

''(ii) eligible for any form of relief from removal under this Act.

''(B) EVIDENCE.—The determination of the immigration judge under subparagraph (A) shall be based only on the evidence produced at the hearing.

''(2) BURDEN OF PROOF.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In a proceeding under this section, an alien who is an applicant for admission has the burden of establishing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the alien—

''(i) is likely to be entitled to be lawfully admitted to the United States or eligible for any form of relief from removal under this Act; or

''(ii) is lawfully present in the United States pursuant to a prior admission.

''(B) ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS.—In meeting the burden of proof under subparagraph (A)(ii), the alien shall be given access to—

''(i) the alien's visa or other entry document, if any; and

''(ii) any other records and documents, not considered by the Attorney General to be confidential, pertaining to the alien's admission or presence in the United States.

''(e) ORDERS.—

''(1) PLACEMENT IN FURTHER PROCEEDINGS.—If an immigration judge determines that the unaccompanied alien child has met the burden of proof under subsection (d)(2), the judge shall order the alien to be placed in further proceedings in accordance with section 240.

''(2) ORDERS OF REMOVAL.—If an immigration judge determines that the unaccompanied alien child has not met the burden of proof required under subsection (d)(2), the judge shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review unless the alien claims—

''(A) an intention to apply for asylum under section 208; or

''(B) a fear of persecution.

''(3) CLAIMS FOR ASYLUM.—If an unaccompanied alien child described in paragraph (2) claims an intention to apply for asylum under section 208 or a fear of persecution, the officer shall order the alien referred for an interview by an asylum officer under subsection (f).

''(f) ASYLUM INTERVIEWS.—

''(1) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection, the term 'credible fear of persecution' means, after taking into account the credibility of the statements made by the alien in support of the alien's claim and such other facts as are known to the officer, there is a significant possibility that the alien could establish eligibility for asylum under section 208.

''(2) CONDUCT BY ASYLUM OFFICER.—An asylum officer shall conduct interviews of aliens referred under subsection (e)(3).

''(3) REFERRAL OF CERTAIN ALIENS.—If the officer determines at the time of the interview that an alien has a credible fear of persecution, the alien shall be held in the custody of the Secretary for Health and Human Services pursuant to section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)) during further consideration of the application for asylum.

''(4) REMOVAL WITHOUT FURTHER REVIEW IF NO CREDIBLE FEAR OF PERSECUTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), if the asylum officer determines that an alien does not have a credible fear of persecution, the officer shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review.

''(B) RECORD OF DETERMINATION.—The officer shall prepare a written record of a determination under subparagraph (A), which shall include—

''(i) a summary of the material facts as stated by the applicant;

''(ii) such additional facts (if any) relied upon by the officer;

''(iii) the officer's analysis of why, in light of such facts, the alien has not established a credible fear of persecution; and

''(iv) a copy of the officer's interview notes.

''(C) REVIEW OF DETERMINATION.—

''(i) RULEMAKING.—The Attorney General shall establish, by regulation, a process by which an immigration judge will conduct a prompt review, upon the alien's request, of a determination under subparagraph (A) that the alien does not have a credible fear of persecution.

''(ii) MANDATORY COMPONENTS.—The review described in clause (i)—

''(I) shall include an opportunity for the alien to be heard and questioned by the immigration judge, either in person or by telephonic or video connection; and

''(II) shall be conducted—

''(aa) as expeditiously as possible;

''(bb) within the 24-hour period beginning at the time the asylum officer makes a determination under subparagraph (A), to the maximum extent practicable; and

''(cc) in no case later than 7 days after such determination.

''(D) MANDATORY PROTECTIVE CUSTODY.—Any alien subject to the procedures under this paragraph shall be held in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to Section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b))—

''(i) pending a final determination of credible fear of persecution; and

''(ii) after a determination that the alien does not such a fear, until the alien is removed.

''(g) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (f)(4)(C) and paragraph (2), a removal order entered in accordance with subsection (e)(2) or (f)(4)(A) is not subject to administrative appeal.

''(2) RULEMAKING.—The Attorney General shall establish, by regulation, a process for the prompt review of an order under subsection (e)(2) against an alien who claims under oath, or as permitted under penalty of perjury under section 1746 of title 28, United States Code, after having been warned of the penal ties for falsely making such claim under such conditions to have been—

''(A) lawfully admitted for permanent residence;

''(B) admitted as a refugee under section 207; or

''(C) granted asylum under section 208.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amendment by inserting after the item relating to section 235A the following:

''Sec. 235B. Humane and expedited inspection and screening for unaccompanied alien children.''.

(b) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDERS OF REMOVAL.—Section 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', or an order of removal issued to an unaccompanied alien child after proceedings under section 235B'' after ''section 235(b)(1)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting ''or section 235B'' after ''section 235(b)(1)'' each place it appears; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting ''OR 235B'' after ''SECTION 235(B)(1)''; and

(II) in clause (iii), by striking ''section 235(b)(1)(B),'' and inserting ''section 235(b)(1)(B) or 235B(f);''; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting ''OR 235B'' after ''SECTION 235(B)(1)'';

(B) by inserting ''or section 235B'' after ''section 235(b)(1)'' in each place it appears;

(C) in subparagraph (2)(C), by inserting ''or section 235B(g)'' after ''section 235(b)(1)(C)''; and

(D) in subparagraph (3)(A), by inserting ''or section 235B'' after ''section 235(b).

SEC. 103. DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) SPECIAL MOTIONS FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—

(1) FILING AUTHORIZED.—Beginning on the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may, at the sole and unreviewable discretion of the Secretary, permit an unaccompanied alien child who was issued a Notice to Appear under section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229) during the period beginning on January 1, 2013, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) to appear, in-person, before an immigration judge who has been authorized by the Attorney General to conduct proceedings under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 102;

(B) to attest to their desire to apply for admission to the United States; and

(C) to file a motion—

(i) to expunge—

(I) any final order of removal issued against them between January 1, 2013 and the date of the enactment of this Act under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a); or

(II) any Notice to Appear issued between January 1, 2013 and the date of the enactment of this Act under section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229); and

(ii) to apply for admission to the United States by being placed in proceedings under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(2) MOTION GRANTED.—An immigration judge may, at the sole and unreviewable discretion of the judge, grant a motion filed under paragraph (1)(C) upon a finding that—

(A) the petitioner was an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232)) on the date on which a Notice to Appear described in paragraph (1) was issued to the alien;

(B) the Notice to Appear was issued during the period beginning on January 1, 2013, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(C) the unaccompanied alien child is applying for admission to the United States; and

(D) the granting of such motion would not be manifestly unjust.

(3) EFFECT OF MOTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the granting of a motion to expunge under paragraph (2)—

(A) the Secretary of Homeland Security shall immediately expunge any final order of removal resulting from a proceeding initiated by any Notice to Appear described in paragraph (1), and such Notice to Appear; and

(B) the immigration judge who granted such motion shall, while the petitioner remains in-person, immediately inspect and screen the petitioner for admission to the United States by conducting a proceeding under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(4) PROTECTIVE CUSTODY.—An unaccompanied alien child who has been granted a motion under paragraph (2) shall be held in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232).

SEC. 104. EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION JUDGE RESOURCES.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall designate up to 40 immigration judges, including through the hiring of retired immigration judges or magistrate judges, or the reassignment of current immigration judges, that are dedicated to conducting humane and expedited inspection and screening for unaccompanied alien children under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 102.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The Attorney General shall ensure that sufficient immigration judge resources are dedicated to the purpose described in subsection (a) to comply with the requirement under section 235B(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 105. PROTECTING CHILDREN FROM HUMAN TRAFFICKERS, SEX OFFENDERS, AND OTHER CRIMINALS.

Section 235(c)(3) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting '', including a mandatory biometric criminal history check'' before the period at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following—

''(D) PROHIBITION ON PLACEMENT WITH SEX OFFENDERS AND HUMAN TRAFFICKERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may not place an unaccompanied alien child in the custody of an individual who has been convicted of—

''(I) a sex offense, (as defined in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S. 16911); or

''(II) a crime involving a severe form of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS OF CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.—A biometric criminal history check under subparagraph (A) shall be based on a set of fingerprints or other biometric identifiers and conducted through—

''(I) the Identification Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

''(II) criminal history repositories of all States that the individual lists as current or former residences.''.

TITLE II—BORDER SECURITY AND TRADE FACILITATION

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(2) COCAINE REMOVAL EFFECTIVENESS RATE.—The term ''cocaine removal effectiveness rate'' means the percentage that results from dividing the amount of cocaine removed by the Department of Homeland Security's maritime security components inside or outside a transit zone, as the case may be, by the total documented cocaine flow rate as contained in Federal drug databases.

(3) CONSEQUENCE DELIVERY SYSTEM.—The term ''Consequence Delivery System'' means the series of consequences applied to persons illegally entering the United States by the Border Patrol to prevent illegal border crossing recidivism.

(4) GOT AWAY.—The term ''got away'' means an illegal border crosser who, after making an illegal entry into the United States, is not turned back or apprehended.

(5) HIGH TRAFFIC AREAS.—The term ''high traffic areas'' means sectors along the northern and southern borders of the United States that are within the responsibility of the Border Patrol that have the most illicit cross-border activity, informed through situational awareness.

(6) ILLEGAL BORDER CROSSING EFFECTIVENESS RATE.—The term ''illegal border crossing effectiveness rate'' means the percentage that results from dividing the number of apprehensions and turn backs by the number of apprehensions, turn backs, and got aways. The data used by the Secretary of Homeland Security to determine such rate shall be collected and reported in a consistent and standardized manner across all Border Patrol sectors.

(7) MAJOR VIOLATOR.—The term ''major violator'' means a person or entity that has engaged in serious criminal activities at any land, air, or sea port of entry, including possession of illicit drugs, smuggling of prohibited products, human smuggling, weapons possession, use of fraudulent United States documents, or other offenses serious enough to result in arrest.

(8) OPERATIONAL CONTROL.—The term ''operational control'' means a condition in which there is a not lower than 90 percent illegal border crossing effectiveness rate, informed by situational awareness, and a significant reduction in the movement of illicit drugs and other contraband through such areas is being achieved.

(9) SITUATIONAL AWARENESS.—The term ''situational awareness'' means knowledge and an understanding of current illicit cross-border activity, including cross-border threats and trends concerning illicit trafficking and unlawful crossings along the international borders of the United States and in the maritime environment, and the ability to forecast future shifts in such threats and trends.

(10) TRANSIT ZONE.—The term ''transit zone'' means the sea corridors of the western Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean Sea, and the eastern Pacific Ocean through which undocumented migrants and illicit drugs transit, either directly or indirectly, to the United States.

(11) TURN BACK.—The term ''turn back'' means an illegal border crosser who, after making an illegal entry into the United States, returns to the country from which such crosser entered.

SEC. 202. BORDER SECURITY RESULTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, every 180 days thereafter until the Comptroller General of the United States reports on the results of the review described in section 203(k)(2)(B), and annually after the date of such report, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees and the Government Accountability Office that—

(1) assesses and describes the state of situational awareness and operational control; and

(2) identifies the high traffic areas and the illegal border crossing effectiveness rate for each sector along the northern and southern borders of the United States that are within the responsibility of the Border Patrol.

(b) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after receiving the initial report required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees regarding the verification of the data and methodology used to determine high traffic areas and the illegal border crossing effectiveness rate.

SEC. 203. STRATEGY TO ACHIEVE SITUATIONAL AWARENESS AND OPERATIONAL CONTROL OF THE BORDER.

(a) STRATEGY TO SECURE THE BORDER.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit, to the appropriate congressional committees, a comprehensive strategy for—

(1) gaining and maintaining situational awareness and operational control of high traffic areas not later than 2 years after the date of the submission of the implementation plan required under subsection (c); and

(2) gaining and maintaining operational control along the Southwest border of the United States not later than 5 years after such date of submission.

(b) CONTENTS OF STRATEGY.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include a consideration of the following:

(1) An assessment of principal border security threats, including threats relating to the smuggling and trafficking of humans, weapons, and illicit drugs.

(2) Efforts to analyze and disseminate border security and border threat information between the border security components of the Department of Homeland Security and with other appropriate Federal departments and agencies with missions associated with the border.

(3) Efforts to increase situational awareness, in accordance with privacy, civil liberties, and civil rights protections, including—

(A) surveillance capabilities developed or utilized by the Department of Defense, including any technology determined to be excess by the Department of Defense; and

(B) use of manned aircraft and unmanned aerial systems, including camera and sensor technology deployed on such assets.

(4) Efforts to detect and prevent terrorists and instruments of terrorism from entering the United States.

(5) Efforts to ensure that any new border security technology can be operationally integrated with existing technologies in use by the Department of Homeland Security.

(6) An assessment of existing efforts and technologies used for border security and the effect of such efforts and technologies on civil rights, private property rights, privacy rights, and civil liberties.

(7) Technology required to maintain, support, and enhance security and facilitate trade at ports of entry, including nonintrusive detection equipment, radiation detection equipment, biometric technology, surveillance systems, and other sensors and technology that the Secretary of Homeland Security determines to be necessary.

(8) Operational coordination of the border security components of the Department of Homeland Security.

(9) Lessons learned from Operation Jumpstart and Operation Phalanx.

(10) Cooperative agreements and information sharing with State, local, tribal, territorial, and other Federal law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction on the northern or southern borders, or in the maritime environment.

(11) Border security information received from consultation with—

(A) State, local, tribal, and Federal law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction on the northern or southern border, or in the maritime environment; and

(B) border community stakeholders (including through public meetings with such stakeholders), including representatives from border agricultural and ranching organizations and representatives from business and civic organizations along the northern or southern border.

(12) Agreements with foreign governments that support the border security efforts of the United States, including coordinated installation of standardized land border inspection technology, such as license plate readers and RFID readers.

(13) Staffing requirements for all border security functions.

(14) A prioritized list of research and development objectives to enhance the security of the international land and maritime borders of the United States.

(15) An assessment of training programs, including training programs regarding—

(A) identifying and detecting fraudulent documents;

(B) protecting the civil, constitutional, human, and privacy rights of individuals;

(C) understanding the scope of enforcement authorities and the use of force policies;

(D) screening, identifying, and addressing vulnerable populations, such as children and victims of human trafficking; and

(E) social and cultural sensitivity toward border communities.

(16) Local crime indices of municipalities and counties along the southern border.

(17) An assessment of how border security operations affect crossing times.

(18) Resources and other measures that are necessary to achieve a 50 percent reduction in the average wait times of commercial and passenger vehicles at international land ports of entry along the southern border and the northern border.

(19) Metrics required under subsections (e), (f), and (g).

(c) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of the strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit, to the appropriate congressional committees and to the Government Accountability Office, an implementation plan for each of the border security components of the Department of Homeland Security to carry out such strategy.

(2) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The implementation plan required under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) specify what protections will be put in place to ensure that staffing and resources necessary for the maintenance of operations at ports of entry are not diverted to the detriment of such operations in favor of operations between ports of entry; and

(B) include—

(i) an integrated master schedule and cost estimate, including lifecycle costs, for the activities contained in such implementation plan; and

(ii) a comprehensive border security technology plan to improve surveillance capabilities that includes—

(I) a documented justification and rationale for technology choices;

(II) deployment locations;

(III) fixed versus mobile assets;

(IV) a timetable for procurement and deployment;

(V) estimates of operation and maintenance costs;

(VI) an identification of any impediments to the deployment of such technologies; and

(VII) estimates of the relative cost effectiveness of various border security strategies and operations, including—

(aa) the deployment of personnel and technology; and

(bb) the construction of new physical and virtual barriers.

(3) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW.—Not later than 90 days after receiving the implementation plan in accordance with paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit an assessment of such plan to the appropriate congressional committees a report on such plan.

(d) PERIODIC UPDATES.—Not later than 180 days after the submission of each Quadrennial Homeland Security Review required under section 707 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 347) beginning with the first such Review that is due after the implementation plan is submitted under subsection (c), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit, to the appropriate congressional committees, an updated—

(1) strategy under subsection (a); and

(2) implementation plan under subsection (c).

(e) METRICS FOR SECURING THE BORDER BETWEEN PORTS OF ENTRY.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall implement metrics, informed by situational awareness, to measure the effectiveness of security between ports of entry, including—

(1) an illegal border crossing effectiveness rate, informed by situational awareness;

(2) an illicit drugs seizure rate, which measures the amount and type of illicit drugs seized by the Border Patrol in any fiscal year compared to an average of the amount and type of illicit drugs seized by the Border Patrol for the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years;

(3) a cocaine seizure effectiveness rate, which shall be measured by calculating the percentage of the total documented cocaine flow rate (as contained in Federal drug databases) that is seized by the Border Patrol.

(4) estimates, using alternative methodologies, including recidivism data, survey data, known-flow data, and technologically-measured data, of—

(A) total attempted illegal border crossings;

(B) total deaths and injuries resulting from such attempted illegal border crossings;

(C) the rate of apprehension of attempted illegal border crossers; and

(D) the inflow into the United States of illegal border crossers who evade apprehension; and

(5) estimates of the impact of the Border Patrol's Consequence Delivery System on the rate of recidivism of illegal border crossers.

(f) METRICS FOR SECURING THE BORDER AT PORTS OF ENTRY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall implement metrics, informed by situational awareness, to measure the effectiveness of security at ports of entry, which shall include—

(A) an inadmissible border crossing rate, which measures the number of known inadmissible border crossers who are apprehended, excluding those border crossers who voluntarily withdraw their applications for admission, against the total estimated number of inadmissible border crossers U.S. Customs and Border Protection fails to apprehend;

(B) an illicit drugs seizure rate, which measures the amount and type of illicit drugs seized by U.S. Customs and Border Protection in any fiscal year compared to an average of the amount and type of illicit drugs seized by U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years;

(C) a cocaine seizure effectiveness rate, which shall be measured by calculating the percentage of the total documented cocaine flow rate (as contained in Federal drug databases) that is seized by U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(D) estimates, using alternative methodologies, including survey data and randomized secondary screening data, of—

(i) total attempted inadmissible border crossers;

(ii) the rate of apprehension of attempted inadmissible border crossers; and

(iii) the inflow into the United States of inadmissible border crossers who evade apprehension;

(E) the number of infractions related to personnel and cargo committed by major violators who are apprehended by U.S. Customs and Border Protection at ports of entry, and the estimated number of such infractions committed by major violators who are not so apprehended; and

(F) a measurement of how border security operations affect crossing times.

(2) COVERT TESTING.—The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall carry out covert testing at ports of entry and submit to the Secretary of Homeland Security and the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the results of such testing. The Secretary shall use such results to inform activities under this subsection.

(g) METRICS FOR SECURING THE MARITIME BORDER.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall implement metrics, informed by situational awareness, to measure the effectiveness of security in the maritime environment, which shall include—

(1) an estimate of the total number of undocumented migrants the Department of Homeland Security's maritime security components fail to interdict;

(2) an undocumented migrant interdiction rate, which measures the number of undocumented migrants interdicted against the total estimated number of undocumented migrants the Department of Homeland Security's maritime security components fail to interdict;

(3) an illicit drugs removal rate, which measures the amount and type of illicit drugs removed by the maritime security components of the Department of Homeland Security inside a transit zone in any fiscal year compared to an average of the amount and type of illicit drugs removed by such components inside a transit zone for the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years;

(4) an illicit drugs removal rate, which measures the amount of illicit drugs removed by the maritime security components of the Department of Homeland Security outside a transit zone in any fiscal year compared to an average of the amount of illicit drugs removed by such components outside a transit zone for the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years;

(5) a cocaine removal effectiveness rate inside a transit zone;

(6) a cocaine removal effectiveness rate outside a transit zone; and

(7) a response rate which measures the Department of Homeland Security's ability to respond to and resolve known maritime threats, both inside and outside a transit zone, by placing assets on-scene, compared to the total number of events with respect to which the Department has known threat information.

(h) COLLABORATION AND CONSULTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall collaborate with the head of a national laboratory within the Department of Homeland Security laboratory network with expertise in border security and the head of a border security university-based center within the Department of Homeland Security centers of excellence network to develop, and ensure the suitability and statistical validity of, the metrics required under subsections (e), (f), and (g).

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN OTHER METRICS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the head of the national laboratory and the head of a border security university-based center shall make recommendations to the Secretary of Homeland Security for other suitable metrics that may be used to measure the effectiveness of border security.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In addition to the collaboration described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall also consult with the Governors of every border State and the representatives of the Border Patrol and U.S. Customs and Border Protection regarding the development of the metrics required under subsections (e), (f), and (g).

(i) EVALUATION BY THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide the Government Accountability Office with the data and methodology used to develop the metrics implemented under subsections (e), (f), and (g).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after receiving the data and methodology referred to in paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the suitability and statistical validity of such data and methodology.

(j) CERTIFICATIONS AND REPORTS RELATING TO OPERATIONAL CONTROL.—

(1) BY THE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—

(A) TWO YEARS.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that situational awareness and operational control of high traffic areas have been achieved not later than 2 years after the date of the submission of the implementation plan required under subsection (c), the Secretary shall submit an attestation of such achievement to the appropriate congressional committees and the Comptroller General of the United States.

(B) FIVE YEARS.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that operational control along the southwest border of the United States has been achieved not later than 5 years after the date of the submission of the implementation plan required under subsection (c), the Secretary shall submit an attestation of such achievement to the appropriate congressional committees and the Comptroller General of the United States.

(C) ANNUAL UPDATES.—Every year beginning with the year after the Secretary of Homeland Security submits the attestation under subparagraph (B), if the Secretary determines that operational control along the southwest border of the United States is being maintained, the Secretary shall submit an attestation of such maintenance to the appropriate congressional committees and the Comptroller General of the United States.

(2) BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(A) REVIEWS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review and assess the attestations of the Secretary of Homeland Security under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1).

(B) REPORTS.—Not later than 120 days after conducting the reviews described in subparagraph (A), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report on the results of each such review to the appropriate congressional committees.

(k) FAILURE TO ACHIEVE SITUATIONAL AWARENESS OR OPERATIONAL CONTROL.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that situational awareness, operational control, or both, as the case may be, has not been achieved by the dates referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (j)(1), as the case may be, or if the Secretary determines that operational control is not being annually maintained pursuant to subparagraph (C) of such subsection, the Secretary shall, not later than 60 days after such dates, submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) describes why situational awareness or operational control, or both, as the case may be, was not achieved; and

(2) includes a description of impediments incurred, potential remedies, and recommendations to achieve situational awareness, operational control, or both, as the case may be.

(l) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT ON BORDER SECURITY DUPLICATION AND COST EFFECTIVENESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that addresses—

(1) areas of overlap in responsibilities within the border security functions of the Department of Homeland Security; and

(2) the relative cost effectiveness of border security strategies, including deployment of additional personnel and technology, and construction of virtual and physical barriers.

(m) REPORTS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that contains—

(1) a resource allocation model for current and future year staffing requirements that includes—

(A) optimal staffing levels at all land, air, and sea ports of entry; and

(B) an explanation of U.S. Customs and Border Protection methodology for aligning staffing levels and workload to threats and vulnerabilities and their effects on cross border trade and passenger travel across all mission areas;

(2) detailed information on the level of manpower available at all land, air, and sea ports of entry and between ports of entry, including the number of canine and agricultural specialists assigned to each such port of entry;

(3) detailed information that describes the difference between the staffing the model suggests and the actual staffing at each port of entry and between the ports of entry; and

(4) detailed information that examines the security impacts and competitive impacts of entering into a reimbursement agreement with foreign governments for U.S. Customs and Border Protection preclearance facilities.

SEC. 204. PROHIBITION ON LAND BORDER CROSSING FEE STUDY.

The Secretary of Homeland Security may not conduct any study relating to the imposition of a border crossing fee for pedestrians

or passenger vehicles at land ports of entry along the southern border or the northern border of the United States.

SEC. 205. BORDER SECURITY RESOURCES.

(a) EQUIPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENTS.—Consistent with the Southern Border Security Strategy required under section 203, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, shall upgrade existing technological assets and equipment, and procure and deploy additional technological assets and equipment on the southern border.

(b) PHYSICAL AND TACTICAL INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.—

(1) CONSTRUCTION, UPGRADE, AND ACQUISITION OF BORDER CONTROL FACILITIES.—Consistent with the Southern Border Security Strategy required under section 203, the Secretary, shall upgrade existing physical and tactical infrastructure of the Department of Homeland Security, and construct and acquire additional physical and tactical infrastructure on the Southern Border, including the following:

(A) U.S. Border Patrol stations.

(B) U.S. Border Patrol checkpoints.

(C) Forward operating bases.

(D) Monitoring stations.

(E) Mobile command centers.

(F) Land border port of entry improvements.

(G) Other necessary facilities, structures, and properties.

(c) CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION PERSONNEL ENHANCEMENTS.—

(1) ADDITIONAL OFFICERS.—Consistent with the Southern Border Security Strategy required under section 203, the Secretary is authorized to increase the number of trained active-duty U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers deployed on the Southern Border, including—

(A) officers serving in the Office of the Border Patrol;

(B) officers serving in the Office of Air and Marine; and

(C) officers serving in the Office of Field Operations, including officers stationed at land border ports of entry.

(2) EXPEDITED TRAINING AND DEPLOYMENT AUTHORITY.—When exercising authority under this section, the Secretary is authorized—

(A) to conduct enhanced recruiting operations for U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel;

(B) to conduct additional training academies for U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel; and

(C) to promulgate regulations allowing for the expedited training of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel.

(d) NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORT FOR OPERATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this section may be expended, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, for the Governor of a State to order any units or personnel of the National Guard of such State to perform operations and missions under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, on the southern border.

(2) ASSIGNMENT OF OPERATIONS AND MISSIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—National Guard units and personnel deployed under paragraph (1) may be assigned such operations, including missions specified in paragraph (3), as may be necessary to provide assistance for operations on the southern border.

(B) NATURE OF DUTY.—The duty of National Guard personnel performing operations and missions described in subparagraph (A) shall be full-time duty under title 32, United States Code.

(3) RANGE OF OPERATIONS AND MISSIONS.—The operations and missions assigned under paragraph (2) shall include the temporary authority—

(A) to provide assistance for law enforcement, including the interdiction of human trafficking, illicit drugs, and contraband crossing the border;

(B) to assist in the provision of humanitarian relief;

(C) to increase ground-based mobile surveillance systems;

(D) to deploy additional unmanned aerial systems and manned aircraft sufficient to maintain continuous surveillance of the southern border;

(E) to deploy and provide capability for radio communications interoperability between U.S. Customs and Border Protection and State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies;

(F) to construct checkpoints along the southern border to bridge the gap to long-term permanent checkpoints;

(G) to provide assistance to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, particularly in rural, high-trafficked areas, as designated by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(H) to enhance law enforcement rotary wing operations supporting quick reaction forces, medical air evacuations, and incident awareness and assessment operations; and

(I) to provide equipment and training to law enforcement agencies.

(4) MATERIEL AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall deploy such materiel and equipment and logistical support as may be necessary to ensure success of the operations and missions conducted by the National Guard under this subsection.

(5) EXCLUSION FROM NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL STRENGTH LIMITATIONS.—National Guard personnel deployed under paragraph (1) shall not be included in—

(A) the calculation to determine compliance with limits on end strength for National Guard personnel; or

(B) limits on the number of National Guard personnel that may be placed on active duty for operational support under section 115 of title 10, United States Code.

(6) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

(e) STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Emergency Management Agency shall enhance law enforcement preparedness, humanitarian responses, and operational readiness along the Southern border through Operation Stonegarden.

(2) GRANTS AND REIMBURSEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), amounts made available under this section shall be allocated for grants and reimbursements to State and local governments in Border Patrol Sectors on the southern border for personnel, overtime, travel, costs related to combating illegal immigration and drug smuggling, and costs related to providing humanitarian relief to unaccompanied alien children who have entered the United States.

(B) FUNDING FOR STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—Allocations for grants and reimbursements to State and local governments under this paragraph shall be made by the Federal Emergency Management Agency through a competitive process.

(3) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 502—CONCERNING THE SUSPENSION OF EXIT PERMIT ISSUANCE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO FOR ADOPTED CONGOLESE CHILDREN SEEKING TO DEPART THE COUNTRY WITH THEIR ADOPTIVE PARENTS

Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 502

Whereas according to UNICEF, over 4,000,000 orphans are estimated to be living in the Democratic Republic of Congo;

Whereas cyclical and violent conflict has plagued the Democratic Republic of Congo since the mid-1990s;

Whereas the United States has made significant financial investments in the Democratic Republic of Congo, providing an estimated $274,000,000 bilateral aid to the Democratic Republic of Congo in fiscal year 2013 and an additional $165,000,000 in emergency humanitarian assistance;

Whereas the policy of the United States Government toward the Democratic Republic of Congo is ''focused on helping the country become a nation that . . . provides for the basic needs of its citizens'';

Whereas the United Nations, the Hague Conference on Private International Law, and other international organizations have recognized a child's right to a family as a basic human right worthy of protection;

Whereas adoption, both domestic and international, is an important child protection tool and an integral part of child welfare best practices around the world, along with family reunification and prevention of abandonment;

Whereas, on September 27, 2013, the Congolese Ministry of Interior and Security, General Direction of Migration, informed the United States Embassy in Kinshasa that effective September 25, 2013, they had suspended issuance of exit permits to adopted Congolese children seeking to depart the country with their adoptive parents;

Whereas there are United States families with finalized adoptions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the necessary legal paperwork and visas ready to travel home with these children but are currently unable to do so; and

Whereas, on December 19, 2013, the Congolese Minister of Justice, Minister of Interior

and Security, and the General Direction of Migration confirmed to members of the United States Department of State that the current suspension on the issuance of exit permits continues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that all children deserve a safe, loving, and permanent family;

(2) recognizes the importance of ensuring that international adoptions of all children are conducted in an ethical and transparent manner;

(3) expresses concern over the impact on children and families caused by the current suspension of exit permit issuance within the Democratic Republic of Congo;

(4) respectfully requests that the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo—

(A) resume processing adoption cases and issuing exit permits via the Ministry of Gender and Family's Interministerial Adoption Committee and Directorate of General Migration;

(B) prioritize the processing of intercountry adoptions which were initiated before the suspension; and

(C) expedite the processing of those adoptions which involve medically fragile children; and

(5) encourages continued dialogue and cooperation between the United States Department of State and the Democratic Republic of the Congo's Ministry of Foreign Affairs to improve the intercountry adoption process and ensure the welfare of all children adopted from the Democratic Republic of Congo.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3557. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3557. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1069. ANNUAL REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

Not later than June 30, 2015, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on greenhouse gas emissions of the Department of Defense during the previous calendar year. The report shall include a review and description of greenhouse gas emissions by military department, Defense Agency, and type of activity, including electricity consumption, transportation, and heating.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, July 22, 2014, at 10:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The title of the hearing is, ''Leveraging America's Resources as a Revenue Generator and Job Creator: A View from State and Local Partners,'' and the purpose is to focus on the State and local government benefits in terms of revenue generated and jobs created from natural resource production.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC, 20510–6150, or by email to Caroline_Bruckner@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Caroline Bruckner at (202) 224–7556.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2014, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2014, at 12 p.m. in room S–216 of the United States Capitol.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2014, at 10:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Chronic Illness: Addressing Patients' Unmet Needs.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2014, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''S. 1696, The Women's Health Protection Act: Removing Barriers to Constitutionally Protected Reproductive Rights,''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 15, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Taking Down Botnets: Public and Private Efforts to Disrupt and Dismantle Cybercriminal Networks.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNLOCKING CONSUMER CHOICE AND WIRELESS COMPETITION ACT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 461, S. 517.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 517) to promote consumer choice and wireless competition by permitting consumers to unlock mobile wireless devices, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Unlocking Consumer Choice and Wireless Competition Act''.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF EXISTING RULE AND ADDITIONAL RULEMAKING BY LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

(a) REPEAL AND REPLACE.—As of the date of the enactment of this Act, paragraph (3) of section 201.40(b) of title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, as amended and revised by the Librarian

of Congress on October 28, 2012, pursuant to the Librarian's authority under section 1201(a) of title 17, United States Code, shall have no force and effect, and such paragraph shall read, and shall be in effect, as such paragraph was in effect on July 27, 2010.

(b) RULEMAKING.—The Librarian of Congress, upon the recommendation of the Register of Copyrights, who shall consult with the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information of the Department of Commerce and report and comment on his or her views in making such recommendation, shall determine, consistent with the requirements set forth under section 1201(a)(1) of title 17, United States Code, whether to extend the exemption for the class of works described in section 201.40(b)(3) of title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, as amended by subsection (a), to include any other category of wireless devices in addition to wireless telephone handsets. The determination shall be made in the first rulemaking under section 1201(a)(1)(C) of title 17, United States Code, that begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) UNLOCKING AT DIRECTION OF OWNER.—Circumvention of a technological measure that restricts wireless telephone handsets or other wireless devices from connecting to a wireless telecommunications network—

(1)(A) as authorized by paragraph (3) of section 201.40(b) of title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, as made effective by subsection (a); and

(B) as may be extended to other wireless devices pursuant to a determination in the rulemaking conducted under subsection (b); or

(2) as authorized by an exemption adopted by the Librarian of Congress pursuant to a determination made on or after the date of enactment of this Act under section 1201(a)(1)(C) of title 17, United States Code,

may be initiated by the owner of any such handset or other device, by another person at the direction of the owner, or by a provider of a commercial mobile radio service or a commercial mobile data service at the direction of such owner or other person, solely in order to enable such owner or a family member of such owner to connect to a wireless telecommunications network, when such connection is authorized by the operator of such network.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as expressly provided herein, nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter the scope of any party's rights under existing law.

(2) LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.—Nothing in this Act alters, or shall be construed to alter, the authority of the Librarian of Congress under section 1201(a)(1) of title 17, United States Code.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) COMMERCIAL MOBILE DATA SERVICE; COMMERCIAL MOBILE RADIO SERVICE.—The terms ''commercial mobile data service'' and ''commercial mobile radio service'' have the respective meanings given those terms in section 20.3 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.—The term ''wireless telecommunications network'' means a network used to provide a commercial mobile radio service or a commercial mobile data service.

(3) WIRELESS TELEPHONE HANDSETS; WIRELESS DEVICES.—The terms ''wireless telephone handset'' and ''wireless device'' mean a handset or other device that operates on a wireless telecommunications network.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 517) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2609, H.R. 5021

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2609) to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I now ask for a second reading en bloc and I object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2014

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 16, 2014, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of Executive Calendar No. 850 with the time until 10:15 a.m. controlled as follows: 10 minutes for Senator GRASSLEY, 10 minutes for Senator CORNYN, 10 minutes for Senator SHAHEEN, and any remaining time under the control of Senator MCCASKILL; further, that at 10:15 a.m., the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination; and that if cloture is invoked, the time until 12:20 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; and at 12:20 p.m., all postcloture time be expired, the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination; that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; further, that upon disposition of the White nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 459, S. 2578, with the time until 2 p.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, and the time from 2 p.m. until 2:10 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; finally, that at 2:10 p.m., the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 2578.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, this agreement sets up as many as three rollcall votes tomorrow: at 10:15 a.m. a cloture vote on the White nomination; at 12:20 p.m. a vote on confirmation of the White nomination, if cloture is invoked; and at 2:10 p.m. a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 2578, Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act of 2014.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. 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 7:24 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 16, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 15, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PAUL NATHAN JAENICHEN, SR., OF KENTUCKY, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ROBERT A. WOOD, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NORMAN C. BAY, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2018.

CHERYL A. LAFLEUR, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2019.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JAMES D. NEALON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE WORK OF MICHAEL WERNER

HON. SUZAN K. DelBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Michael Werner, who was recently selected as the first Innovative Teacher of the Year by the Center of Excellence for Aerospace and Advanced Manufacturing for his extraordinary work at Granite Falls High School.

Since Mr. Werner began teaching at Granite Falls in 2007, he has been a pioneer for its STEM education programs. In addition to the classes he teaches, Mr. Werner has created an excellent manufacturing program for his students from the ground up.

Mr. Werner's teaching engages students by pushing them to apply materials learned in class to real-world projects and challenges. His dedication to preparing his students is important for the future of Washington state's skilled workforce and manufacturing industries. Mr. Werner plans on introducing similar hands-on technical education in elementary schools to encourage an interest for engineering in our youngest students.

In 2009, Mr. Werner began the Eco Car program at Granite Falls High School. The program challenges students to design and build extremely fuel-efficient cars for the Shell Eco-Marathon Americas competition. As a strong advocate for female participation in the historically male-dominated manufacturing and engineering fields, Mr. Werner has created an all-girls team, ShopGirls, to compete in the competition, as well as a coed team, UrbanAutos.

I want to congratulate Michael Werner on his well-earned achievement, and I thank him for his commitment to building a better future for the students of Granite Falls High School.

SALUTING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALPENFEST IN GAYLORD, MI

HON. DAN BENISHEK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute the city of Gaylord, Michigan, on the occasion of the 50th Alpenfest this year. Since 1964, the Alpenfest has celebrated the city of Gaylord, its connection with the particle board industry, and the heritage of many of the region's residents.

The first Alpenfest (then called the Alpine Festival) was formulated in 1964, with the imminent location of a U.S. Plywood particle board plant in 1965. To celebrate this occasion, as well as complete a goal of establishing an alpine look for Gaylord, the inaugural festival was set for July 5 through July 10 of 1965. The festival was a great success despite no dedicated source of funding and the need to dress the town and the residents with alpine garb to complete the aesthetic for the festival.

The Chamber of Commerce, along with many local businesses, civic associations, and citizens help to make this event possible every year. In addition to the transformation of Main Street in Gaylord, numerous activities are enjoyed by all during the week, including the Alpenstrausse arts and crafts market, a carnival, the crowning of the Alpenfest queen, activities for children, and the "World's Largest Coffee Break." This festival is one of the highlights of summer in Otsego County and Northern Michigan as a whole.

As a final note, I wish to invite all Members of this body and all Americans to come to Northern Michigan and experience the natural beauty, great events such as Alpenfest, and friendly hospitality that make my home state one of the best places in the country to visit.

IN RECOGNITION OF GERMANY'S WORLD CUP VICTORY

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate our friends in Germany on an incredible victory in the World Cup final on Sunday. As Co-Chair of the German-American Caucus, I watched the game with great interest. It was a truly deserved victory for the Germany team in what has been an excellent tournament.

I am certain that many Americans were as thrilled as I was by Germany's outstanding performance in Brazil. Our two countries share important political, economic, and cultural links, with roughly 50 million Americans reporting some level of German ancestry. Hundreds of Americans have worked in the German Bundestag through the International Parliamentary Scholarship, and thousands of Germans and Americans have forged closer relationships through the Congress-Bundestag exchange program. No matter what challenges we have in the transatlantic relationship, important connections such as these will ensure that our great relationship continues for years to come.

So, congratulations Germany! ("herzlichen Glückwunsch Deutschland!"). And I look forward to the day when the United States and Germany meet in the World Cup finals.

HONORING THE LAKE COUNTY CHAPTER OF THE LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS AND THE YOUTH COUNCIL FOR THEIR OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT TO THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITY

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to honor the Lake County Chapter of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC). In particular, I would like to recognize the LULAC Lake County Youth Council for its efforts to mobilize fellow members of the Waukegan community to clean up their streets.

For more than 80 years, LULAC has helped enhance economic and educational opportunities for the U.S.'s Hispanic population, empowering Hispanic-Americans to become more active and influential citizens. LULAC advances these efforts by harnessing the passions of community leaders, who establish local chapters, such as LULAC Lake County in my district.

In June, I had the privilege of joining members of the LULAC Lake County Youth Council for a Day of Service in Waukegan. As a part of the "Operation Clean Up Waukegan" initiative, the 11 youth members on the Council recruited more than 50 volunteers from the Waukegan community to help clear brush and garbage from an overridden city alley, as well as paint over gang graffiti on a family's garage.

The enthusiasm and commitment to service displayed by the Youth Council members is truly an inspiration. I am so proud to see our youth taking an active role in their community, engaging their friends and neighbors in the effort to restore the damaged and neglected areas of their hometown.

RECOGNIZING THE ARNOLD PALMER MEDICAL CENTER

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Arnold Palmer Medical Center in Orlando, Florida has, once again, been recognized as one of the best children's hospitals in the country by U.S. News & World Report. Arnold Palmer Medical Center, comprised of Arnold Palmer Hospital for Children and Winnie Palmer Hospital for Women & Babies, was ranked by U.S. News & World Report in eight different specialties this year—the most they have ever received.

In 2007, U.S. News introduced the Best Children's Hospitals rankings in order to help

families find the best medical care available for their children. These rankings include detailed information about the hospitals' performance and their reputation in the pediatric community.

Arnold Palmer Hospital for Children is a world-class facility dedicated exclusively to the needs of children. The hospital provides expertise in pediatric specialties and is known for its excellence in cardiac care, neurology, orthopedics and sports medicine.

Adjacently, the Winnie Palmer Hospital for Women & Babies is a 285-bed facility dedicated to the care of women and babies. It is a national leader in neonatal intensive care and is highly regarded for providing comprehensive healthcare for women throughout all stages of life.

Both of these institutions are Magnet-designated for their commitment to quality patient care, safety, research, and service excellence. Arnold Palmer Medical Center attributes its many accolades to the high level of care its medical team provides every day. I take comfort in knowing that the women and children of Central Florida have access to the nation's best care close to home. It is my distinct pleasure to recognize Arnold Palmer Medical Center for their dedication to the Central Florida community.

SUPPORT FOR THE CHALDEAN COMMUNITY FOUNDATION'S FUNDING OPPORTUNITY ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I am writing to express my support for the Chaldean Community Foundation's Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA). The continued work of this organization will improve our health care system and the lives of countless Americans.

The Chaldean Community Foundation provides invaluable support to consumers navigating our health care system and comparing insurance plans. Although our burgeoning deficit makes allocating funds one of the most difficult parts of my job, my decision to support the foundation's grant request was an easy one. Millions of ordinary citizens need help avoiding obstacles that could impede their physical health and quality of life. Like you, the health and well-being of the American people is my top priority. With that solemn responsibility in mind, I am proud to reaffirm my support for the Chaldean Community Foundation.

Since my election to Congress, I have tirelessly advocated for fiscal responsibility. In addition to assisting consumers, the Chaldean Community Fund combats waste, fraud, and abuse in our health care system by providing desperately needed oversight. As baby boomers retire in ever greater numbers and life expectancy continues to rise, the need for organizations like the Chaldean Community Foundation will increase exponentially. I urge you to accept their request.

CRS CENTENNIAL

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, as Ranking Member of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, it is my distinct pleasure to congratulate the diverse workforce of Congressional Research Service analysts, attorneys, information professionals and support staff on the 100th anniversary of CRS service to Congress.

Since its creation in 1914, CRS has developed expertise and services to Members, committees, and congressional staff as a shared resource. From a handful of staff to today's nearly 600 employees, CRS is known for its unique role in serving Congress and bolstering our democracy. Congress expanded that role in 1946, after World War II, and in 1970 to include close support for Members of Congress and committees.

In recent years, CRS evolved as a forward thinking organization and provides products and services across multiple formats to facilitate and expedite the work that we do on behalf of our constituents in Congress. We depend on CRS expertise for confidential, authoritative, objective, and nonpartisan research and analysis in assisting us in shaping legislation and addressing key regional, national and international issues that challenge us today in a complex world.

I join my colleagues in recognizing CRS for its achievements on its centennial anniversary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for votes on Monday, July 14, 2014, due to Flight No. 844 being diverted to Richmond International Airport before landing into Reagan National Airport due to inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

H.R. 4195—The Federal Register Modernization Act—Vote: "yes."

H.R. 5029—The International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2014—Vote: "yes."

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 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 $17,589,434,621,637.93. We've added $6,962,557,572,724.85 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 11, I missed a series of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on No. 403 and "yea" on No. 404.

On Monday, July 14, I missed a series of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 405 and No. 406.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM HUELSKAMP

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, due to weather-related flight delays, I was unable to vote in the House on Monday, July 14, therefore I am not recorded as voting. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 405, I would have voted "yea"; and rollcall No. 406, I would have voted "nay."

IN RECOGNITION OF MANA'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor MANA, a National Latina Organization, whose members will be in our nation's Capital from July 24 to July 26, 2014, to celebrate its 40th anniversary.

MANA was founded in 1974 as the Mexican American Women's National Association, as a national grassroots membership organization with chapters, individual members, and affiliates across the country. The organization has evolved to encompass Hispanic women from all ethnic and cultural backgrounds and is the oldest and largest Hispanic women's organization in the country. The MANA mission is to empower Latinas through leadership development, community service, and advocacy.

For 40 years, MANA has been a powerful voice for Latinas across the country to share their concerns, as well as their successes, as women, professionals, heads of households, educators, and trailblazers. Through its chapters and affiliates, MANA's expansive network has made the organization a leader for reaching the Latino community at the grassroots level. Each local chapter is supported by the commitment of passionate volunteers who are dedicated to the educational, health, political, and economic advancement of Hispanics in their respective communities, implementing the shared mission and vision of the national MANA office, headquartered in Washington, DC.

Throughout its rich history, MANA has established a number of programs to fulfill the mission of the organization and empower Latinas from every walk of life. The AvanZamos Initiative is a national effort to provide leadership development for adult Latinas.

Through training in the areas of financial literacy, mentoring, advocacy and leadership development at the annual MANA Latina Leadership Institute, Latina leaders from across the country are given the skills to help shape the lives of future generations in positive and upwardly mobile directions. The MANA Las Primeras Awards Gala honors Latinas who demonstrate important ''firsts'' in their fields with a national impact on the Hispanic community—highlighting Latinas' important contributions across the country. The Hermanitas Initiative is significant mentoring program in the United States developed specifically for Hispanic youth. The program empowers Latina adolescents by promoting educational achievement and personal enrichment; developing leadership abilities; encouraging cultural identity and awareness; and modeling proactive community involvement.

Finally, I salute the commitment of the founders of MANA—Blandina (Bambi) Cardenas, Organizing Chair; Bettie Baca, Organizing Vice Chair; and Evangeline (Vangie) Elizondo, the First Board President. Their early efforts were the building blocks for what MANA has become today.

It is my honor to congratulate MANA, a National Latina Organization, for 40 years of success in strengthening the Latina community in the United States.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 406:

My flight into DC on July 14, 2014, was rerouted to Norfolk, VA, due to inclement weather, and I was unable to make it to the House floor in time for votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea''.

HONORING CAFÉ LUSH

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Café Lush, and owners Tom Docherty and Sandy Gregory, on the 3rd anniversary of their distinguished local Albuquerque establishment.

Since opening in 2011, Café Lush has developed into a thriving business and popular hotspot for locals. Located in downtown Albuquerque, Café Lush features an exceptional menu that carries nutrient dense organic food and fresh seasonal produce that promotes happy, healthy, and sustainable lifestyles.

The beautiful street corner café, with its vibrant outdoor patio was not always a distinct feature in the neighborhood. In fact, before the establishment of Café Lush many restaurants unsuccessfully tried to establish themselves in the area. The location became known as a frequent site for new restaurants that would eventually close, or go out of business.

Despite this historical precedent, and a struggling economy, Café Lush launched a business model that appealed to the growing demand for locally grown healthy foods. Café Lush's fresh new take on organic ingredients with a New Mexico twist reverberated throughout the community and today the café continues to be wildly successful.

Café Lush's vision and accomplishments are an inspiration for future generations of entrepreneurs and small business owners, and demonstrate the ability of one business to change an entire neighborhood. Located next to two schools, a place of worship, and just a short walk away from the heart of downtown Albuquerque, Café Lush has reinvigorated the area and brought renewed energy to Albuquerque's scenic landscape.

I have no doubt that Café Lush will continue to have great success. Their quality food, great customer service, and beautiful outdoor patio are what continue to make me a frequent customer. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Café Lush on these accomplishments, their 3rd anniversary and the many more to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Monday July 14, 2014 I was not present for 2 votes.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 405, I would have voted ''yea.''

Had I been present for rollcall No. 406, I would have voted ''yea.''

RECOGNIZING OUR NATION'S COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PROFESSIONALS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our nation's community corrections professionals for the invaluable contribution they make to public safety and restorative justice throughout our country.

In the District of Columbia and nearly every community across America, thousands of women and men serve as pretrial, probation and parole officers or officials. As public servants, these Americans commit themselves to helping improve the lives of those involved in the criminal justice system, which ultimately results in stronger and safer communities for all.

In light of the value and contributions of pretrial and post-conviction supervision officers and entities, I am proud to stand in support and honor of Pretrial, Probation and Parole Supervision week, which commenced on Sunday, July 13, 2014, and will be celebrated through Saturday, July 19, 2014.

I am sure that my congressional colleagues would agree with me that community corrections is an essential part of the American justice system. Our constituents who serve as community corrections professionals work tirelessly to uphold the law with dignity, while recognizing the right of the public to be protected from criminal activity.

These individuals are responsible for supervising adult and juvenile offenders in the community. In many cases these trained professionals go above and beyond the call of duty by providing their clients supportive services or referrals to critical community-based resources, employment opportunities and housing programs Additionally, community corrections professionals provide services, support, and protection for victims, while continuously promoting the importance of crime prevention.

Mr. Speaker, in the District of Columbia, community corrections and supervision services for D.C. Code offenders are carried out by the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia (CSOSA) and the Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia (PSA).

CSOSA and PSA and their hundreds of pretrial and community supervision officers stand out as model community supervision agencies due to both their professionalism and their novel approach to enhancing public safety in the District of Columbia.

CSOSA provides innovative criminal justice and community leadership through active strategic planning, trend awareness, and partnership building. On any given day, CSOSA is responsible for supervising approximately 13,000 individuals on probation, parole or supervised release, whereas PSA supervises roughly 20,000 defendants.

The work that these agencies perform is vital and complex. Nevertheless, the community corrections professionals that comprise both CSOSA and PSA carry out their duties with skill, compassion and diligence, thereby serving as a true force for positive change for communities throughout the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition and honor of Pretrial, Probation and Parole Supervision Week 2014 and the contributions made by community corrections professionals, I hope my colleagues will join me in thanking these public employees for the important services they perform in helping to safeguard and improve the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an anniversary that all the Members of this House surely ought to celebrate. On July 18, 1914—one hundred years ago this Friday—the Congressional Research Service came into being. Ever since, it has provided Members on both sides of the aisle with important analysis, research assistance, and expertise on virtually every topic relating to our work on behalf of the American people.

The Congressional Research Service, known as the Legislative Research Service for its first fifty-six years, was the brainchild of Senator Robert LaFollette Sr. and Rep. John Nelson, both from Wisconsin. In the Progressive Era, reformers like Sen. LaFollette and Rep. Nelson sought to make government

more responsive by providing Members of Congress with greater access to the latest in scientific research and analytical tools. For a century, that is what the Congressional Research Service has done—and the men and women who work there have proven beyond a doubt the merit behind Sen. LaFollette and Rep. Nelson's proposal.

After World War II, as Congress's work expanded to meet the needs of a growing nation and economy and America's role as a military superpower, the Congressional Research Service adapted by hiring experts to provide briefings and answer Members' questions. So many Members and their staffs have come to rely on the timely responses from Congressional Research Service personnel on pending bills, legislative history, and issue tracking. Those who work at the Congressional Research Service continue to play an extraordinarily important role in Congress's work.

In my thirty-three years in this House, the Congressional Research Service has provided me with absolutely essential research on the legislative interests I have pursued. My work on the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act, the 2002 Help America Vote Act, the 2008 ADA Amendments Act, federal employee and civil service issues, and a wide range of constituent questions have all been aided immeasurably by Congressional Research Service reports and analysis.

As it begins its second century, the Congressional Research Service is adapting to new technologies to improve the way it keeps Members of Congress informed. Through social media, online research tools, and reports accessible by internet twenty-four hours a day, it continues to carry out its mission in a way its founders never could have imagined—but for which they would surely be proud.

I hope my colleagues will join me in thanking the Congressional Research Service's diverse workforce of over 600 researchers, analysts, attorneys, support staff, and information professionals for their tireless work in service to our nation.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF U.S. CONGRESSMAN KEN GRAY, A TRUE FRIEND AND CHAMPION OF SOUTHERN ILLINOIS

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of a great Southern Illinoisan, a man who knew this Chamber very well, U.S. Congressman Ken Gray.

Born and raised in Southern Illinois, Ken returned there after retiring from Congress. It is in Southern Illinois where he passed away this past Saturday and it is there, in his native West Frankfort, where he will be laid to rest. This is worth noting as we remember Congressman Ken Gray as one of the most persistent and productive advocates for his home district that ever served in this Chamber.

An entrepreneur from a young age, Ken answered the call to serve his country when he enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Forces during World War II. His military service would take him to North Africa and Italy, southern France and central Europe, and would result in several decorations, including three bronze stars.

Returning to Southern Illinois after the war, Ken first won election from the 25th Congressional District of Illinois in 1954. He continued to serve for a total of 10 successive terms before his first retirement in 1974. He ran again for Congress in 1984, won that election, and served another two terms before his final retirement in 1989.

Ken's ability to fight for our region is unparalleled. His accomplishments are legendary, from building our interstate highways, building Rend Lake and the Marion Federal Prison to countless post offices, roads, bridges and water lines. A proud veteran himself, Ken was a tireless advocate for our region's veterans and hundreds received care because of his efforts. Serving an area with many coal mines, Ken also saw that miners and their families received the black lung benefits they were due.

Whether convincing President Carter to tour an underground coal mine, or escorting President Kennedy to Carbondale and Marion—Congressman Gray was a one-of-a-kind advocate for Southern Illinois.

He loved serving in this House, and few Members spent as much time presiding in the Speaker's chair during his tenure. Like thousands of people in our region, I counted Ken among my friends. We'll always remember him as a character whose personality was as colorful as the suits he wore here to the Capitol each day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Congressman Ken Gray and extending our condolences and prayers to his family.

HONORING THE LIFE OF H. MINTON FRANCIS, SR.

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and pay tribute to the extraordinary achievements of my constituent, Henry Minton Francis, Sr., who devoted his entire life to serving our country and his community. Mr. Francis was also the oldest living African American graduate of West Point Academy.

H. Minton Francis, Lt. Col., USA Ret., was a fifth generation Washingtonian and resident of Chevy Chase, MD. He attended public schools in the District of Columbia where he graduated from the famous Paul Laurence Dunbar High School. Educated at the University of Pennsylvania and the United States Military Academy, he also studied at Syracuse University, where he earned an MBA degree with honors and was elected to the International Honor Society of Beta Gamma Sigma. Following graduation from West Point in 1944, Mr. Francis served the nation as an officer of the Regular Army for twenty-one years. He was a member of the Army Concept Team in Vietnam; a commander of artillery soldiers in the Korean Conflict and in World War II. His final military duty was to serve as a staff officer for the Comptroller of the Army and the Secretary of Defense.

Subsequent to his retirement from the Army, Mr. Francis worked both in government and the private sector. As Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. Francis was in charge of the Defense Human Goals Program guaranteeing protection of the rights of, and equal opportunities for, women, minorities and the disabled of all races, ethnic groups and religions. His program embraced the now famous Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) at Patrick Air Force Base in Florida, the first of its kind anywhere in the United States. For his extraordinary efforts, Mr. Francis was awarded the Distinguished Civilian Service Medal for his exceptional service in the Department of Defense.

On leaving federal service, Mr. Francis accepted appointments at Howard University as Director of University Planning; Executive Director of the University-Wide Self-Study Task force; Executive Secretary of the Presidential Search Committee in 1989; Special Assistant to the President; and Director of Governmental Affairs. In December 1992, he was appointed President of the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Foundation, authorized at that time by the United States Congress to erect a memorial on the National Mall in honor of the more than 5,000 African Americans who fought and died in the American Revolution.

For nearly 20 years Mr. Francis was a civilian aide to the Secretary of the Army, a voluntary office without compensation, where he carried the Army's message and image to the American people.

As a human resources consultant to the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Francis traveled to Europe at his own expense to investigate and report on the command climate with respect to race and gender relations in the U.S. Army units stationed in Germany. He performed a similar service for Army installations in the midwestern United States. The report produced by his group led to major changes in the Army's policy and practices with respect to race and gender.

Mr. Francis was a Life Member of Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Additionally, he was a Trustee Emeritus of the Association of Graduates of the United States Military Academy, a member of the Washington Institute of Foreign Affairs, the Board of Managers of the Historical Society of Washington, DC, and the Board of Directors of Metropolitan USO in Washington. He was a volunteer member of the Board of Directors of the Carroll Publishing Company of the Catholic Archdiocese of Washington. He held memberships in the National Press Club and the University Club of Washington, DC, and he was a member of Sigma Pi Phi, the oldest and one of the most prestigious African-American fraternities.

Mr. Francis is survived by his second wife Alicia G. D. Francis and five children from his first marriage: Marsha A. Francis, Henry M. Francis, Jr., M.D.; Peter M. Francis, Morya K.F. Ferris, and John H. Francis, six grandchildren and two great-grandchildren, nieces, nephews, other relatives and friends.

I am proud to speak today to honor this extraordinary man and I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. H. Minton Francis Sr.'s many accomplishments, his lifelong work on behalf of our nation's veterans, and his profound commitment to honoring their service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. RV 405–RV 406—missed due to weather delays; had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING ROVETA F. SIMMONS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Roveta F. Simmons.

Mrs. Simmons was born in Memphis, Tennessee. She is married to James A. Simmons of Chicago, IL. They have two children: Michael A. Walker, 37 and Jamal L. Walker, 24.

In 1999 Mrs. Simmons received a Bachelor of Arts in Social Science from Virginia Wesleyan College in Norfolk, VA. That same year she received her Collegiate Professional License for the Commonwealth of Virginia Elementary Education, kindergarten through fifth grade.

Mrs. Simmons is the Director of Little Rock Child Development Center. She is assigned to the 19th Force Support Squadron, Little Rock AFB, Arkansas. She is the director over the Infant Toddler Center.

The Little Rock Child Development Centers both are NAEYC accredited programs. The CDC maximizes availability and affordability of child care to include weekly, hourly, surge and emergency care, offering early intervention and provides the highest quality childcare that meets the development needs of each child and enables military and Department of Defense (DoD) parents to fulfill their military missions.

Mrs. Simmons began her Department of Defense career as a Palace Acquire Intern with the Department of the Air Force in June 2004. She completed her two year Child Development Specialist Internship at Randolph AFB, TX and was assigned to Keesler AFB, MS as the assistant director.

After two years she was promoted to Director of Keesler Child Development Center. She has worked tirelessly to create a well oiled machine. The Keesler CDC turned a failing budget around—from a $70,000.00 loss to a $12,000.00 profit year to date. Mrs. Simmons also served on active duty for the United States Air Force for 21 years where she retired at the rank of MSgt. Her last assignment was the Superintendent, Wing Operations Center, 402 TFW Holloman AFB, NM.

Among her many recognitions she has received the Exemplary Civilian Service Award, the Meritorious Service Medal, 1 Bronze Oak Leaf, Air Force Commendation Medal, Air Force Outstanding Unit 3 Bronze Oak Leaf, Air Force Good Conduct Medal 1 Silver and 1 Bronze leaf. She has also received the National Defense Medal 1 Bronze, a Service Star, Air Force Overseas Long Tour, Air Force Longevity Ribbon 4 Bronze, and the NCO Professional Military Education Ribbon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Roveta F. Simmons for her years of dedication and hard work.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Tuesday, July 8, 2014. Weather in the Midwest delayed my flight to Washington, DC until late that night. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 4263 (roll No. 369) and in favor of H.R. 4289 (roll No. 370).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district due to travel cancellations caused by inclement weather and I missed the votes on Monday, July 14, 2014. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 405, H.R. 4195—The Federal Register Modernization Act and "yea" on rollcall No. 406, H.R. 5029—The International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2014.

OCCUPIED CYPRUS—FORTY YEARS OF ILLEGAL OCCUPATION, ETHNIC CLEANSING, AND DESTRUCTION OF RELIGIOUS SITES

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark 40 years since the illegal occupation of the Republic of Cyprus by the government of Turkey. These forty years have been marked by tragedy for the Greek Cypriots, and by criminal guilt for the Turkish government. In July 1974 the Turkish army began its sneak invasion of the island—it was the beginning of a tragedy and outrage that continues today. At least one hundred eighty thousand Greek Cypriots were forced to flee the north. They lost all their property—shockingly, even today none of them have been allowed to return to their property. The Turkish government effectively "ethnically cleansed" the north of the island, where only a few hundred Greek Cypriots live in small enclaves, and even they are not allowed to worship freely.

During these forty years over five hundred Christian religious sites have been demolished, destroyed, or desecrated, for example turned into casinos or warehouses. Eighty stolen churches have been converted into mosques. Artifacts from churches and cemeteries continually show up on the international black market.

Mr. Speaker, in the current discussions about reunifying the island, the United States must stand firm on the complete withdrawal of Turkish military forces, respect for universally-recognized human rights for all Cypriots everywhere on the island, and an independent, unified government.

RECOGNIZING KEVIN LITTLE AND KURTIS MOORE

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and thank two outstanding men from my district for their service and sacrifice to share their time and talents to help others. Kevin Little and Kurtis Moore from Osage Valley Electric, volunteered for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's International Foundation in Haiti as part of the Caracol Community Electrification Project. They spent two weeks in northern Haiti building and upgrading more than a mile and a half of power lines to help communities there receive affordable, safe and reliable electricity.

Mr. Little and Mr. Moore even helped connect homes to electricity for the first time around Tru-du-Nord. To date, more than 4,800 consumers in the northern part of Haiti have access to electricity. Some homes now have TV antennas, a few towns have water treatment plants, doctors can provide better care to patients, and residents have opened their own small businesses like Internet cafés.

Electricity is a critical element in improving the quality of life. In Haiti less than 20 percent of the people there have regular access to electricity. I am blessed to represent Kevin Little and Kurtis Moore in Congress, grateful for their hard work and commitment to the community, and I wish them the best in all their future endeavors.

CONGRATULATORY LETTER TO THE CHINESE ASSOCIATION OF GREATER DETROIT

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Chinese Association of Greater Detroit on 22 years of service and community outreach.

Your work has been important for fostering better relations between Metro-Detroit, China, and the Chinese-American community. In the globalized world in which we live, these relations are important for improving Michigan's economy. It is obvious from your work in the soup kitchen, to your relationship with the Metro-Detroit Chinese School that you are committed to making Michigan a better place. I am pleased that such a great organization has found its home in Michigan's 11th Congressional District.

Thank you for everything you have done to serve Metro-Detroit and the Chinese-American community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF VICENTE (BEN) CABRERA PANGELINAN

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Vicente (Ben) Cabrera Pangelinan. Ben was a Senator of the 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th, 29th, 30th, 31st Guam Legislature and was currently serving in the 32nd Guam Legislature. Senator Pangelinan passed away on July 8, 2014 at the age of 58.

Senator Pangelinan moved from the island of Saipan to Guam at a very young age and grew up in the village of Barrigada. He graduated from Father Duenas Memorial School in 1974 before attending Georgetown University, where he graduated with a Bachelor's Degree in Government.

While Ben was a student at Georgetown University, he served as a staff assistant to Guam's Delegate, Congressman Antonio B. Won Pat. Upon graduating from college, Ben returned to Guam and worked under my late husband, Governor Ricardo J. Bordallo's administration.

Before beginning his public service to the people of Guam, Ben worked for an insurance company doing business in Guam, Saipan and California. He held many leadership positions at FHP/HML Guam, including Regional General Manager.

In addition to his work as a Senator in the Guam Legislature, Ben was also a respected businessman in the community. He was President and Owner of Group Pacific, Principal Consultant/President of Pacific Presence Group; Founding Director of Graphic Center, Inc. and Micronesia Graphics, Inc.; and Director of Fifth Wheel, Inc.

Senator Pangelinan served in the Guam Legislature for twenty years. He was first elected in the 22nd Guam Legislature and served as the Speaker in the 27th Guam Legislature.

Senator Pangelinan was serving as the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Public Debt, Retirement, Legal Affairs, Public Parks, Recreation, Historic Preservation, and Land. Through Senator Pangelinan's leadership, the Guam Legislature was able to pass budgets in a timely manner. He took pride in the fact that these budgets reflected the priorities of the people of Guam, such as education, health and safety.

After twenty years of service in the Guam Legislature, Senator Pangelinan will be remembered for championing many issues to improve the quality of living for the people of Guam and always staying true to his convictions.

During the 30th Guam Legislature, Senator Pangelinan notably authored Public Law 30–193 which designated I Milåyan i Måas Takhilo' na Sakrifisiu or the Medal of the Ultimate Sacrifice. The Medal of Ultimate Sacrifice is given to the survivors of Guam residents or service members stationed on Guam who were killed in action to recognize them for their service and sacrifice.

Ben was also a tireless advocate for Chamorro self-determination. Senator Pangelinan was a careful steward of our public funds, as well as our natural resources.

We are deeply saddened by the passing of Senator Ben Pangelinan, and I join the people of Guam in celebrating his life and recognizing his dedicated public service. My thoughts and prayers are with his family, loved ones and friends. He will be missed, and his memory will live on in the hearts of the people of Guam.

HONORING DR. VERONICA MAZ

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in remembering Dr. Veronica Maz, a founder of So Others Might Eat (S.O.M.E.) in the District of Columbia, who passed away on June 24, 2014. Dr. Maz's signature achievement was the co-founding of Martha's Table in 1980, upon realizing the need for children, particularly in the 14th Street corridor Northwest neighborhood, to have a refuge from violence and drugs. Originally, Martha's Table served as a place for children to get a free meal after school. After 35 years of service, Martha's Table has developed into a multifaceted social services organization, providing services that not only address the problem of hunger in DC communities, but also the lack of quality education and affordable clothing.

Dr. Maz was born in Aliquippa, Pennsylvania on October 15, 1924. She attended the University of Pittsburgh in 1947, where she received her undergraduate and a doctorate degree in sociology. Dr. Maz began her career as an educator, teaching at Lake Erie College for Women, Skidmore College, and Georgetown University. While teaching at Georgetown University, Dr. Maz decided to change careers and become a social entrepreneur. With the help of Father Horace B. McKenna, Dr. Maz founded S.O.M.E. and House of Ruth, a home for battered women. Today, both organizations continue to be bulwarks to the residents of the District, and have expanded their reach throughout the community.

Today, Martha's Table has almost 90 employees, and has expanded its operation to include McKenna's Wagon, a daily mobile feeding program for the hungry, Martha's Markets, a free and health-conscious market in 10 locations, and Martha's Outfitters, a thrift store for families in need and the community at large. Ultimately, Martha's Table, S.O.M.E. and House of Ruth maintain Dr. Maz's legacy of community service through holistic and solution-based support for the people of the District.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Veronica Maz for a life of committed service to the District of Columbia. Her legacy continues to offer a powerful example for how we should conduct our lives and strive to serve our communities.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 405—my flight into DC on July 14, 2014, was rerouted to Norfolk, VA due to inclement weather and I was unable to make it to the House floor in time for votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEDDIE SCHOOL

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, this year, Peddie School in Hightstown, New Jersey celebrates its 150th anniversary as one of the finest independent schools in the nation. Peddie School prides itself on the intellectual, social, and moral growth of its students.

I have been fortunate to have visited Peddie's campus and host interns who went to Peddie. Whenever I observed their work and work ethic, it was always apparent that their actions and skills reflected the values of Peddie, including respect, honesty, scholarship, balance, and courage—the same values that were also revered at its creation as a Baptist school during the Civil War. This philosophy is further evident in the uniting Ala Viva chant and student accomplishments in a diverse range of areas, from a dominant golf team to state poetry competition accolades.

I congratulate Peddie School for 150 years of fostering young women and men to become thoughtful and constructive members of society. May the next 150 years bring the same success and see generations of students develop into successful, upstanding citizens.

HONORING BAY VIEW HIGH SCHOOL ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Bay View High School celebrating its 100th Anniversary on October 4, 2014. Bay View High School opened in September, 1914 with seven teachers and 150 students. Mr. Gustav Fritsche, a German teacher, served as its principal. The school was then a one building barrack without central heating known as "Fritsche's Foundry". In 1922, classes were held in a new school building, still in use today and referred to as the "Castle on the Hill". The high school is a visible landmark from both the Hoan Bridge and Interstate I–43/1–94 in Milwaukee.

Bay View High School started a successful Student Government Association (SGA) in 1947 that led to unique programs such as honor study halls and building control. Many of the Bay View students involved in SGA have become politicians. Bay View High School has staged over 50 years of musicals. The high school has prepared many amateurs and professionals for a lifetime of music and the arts; they make up the current alumni choir and alumni band. Bay View High School's interscholastic sports program has developed champions after graduation who continue in their sport to set records and achieve a level of success up to and including Olympic gold.

Bay View High School's students have become community leaders and good citizens that include such luminaries as: State Representatives Sandy Pasch and La Tonya Johnson, Milwaukee County Board Chair Marina Dimitrijevic, Esther Jones, 1992 US Olympic Gold Medalist in track and my granddaughter, Taylor Walker.

Many Bay View High School students have gone on to become educators. In fact, many have returned both as teachers and administrators with some spending their entire careers at their Alma Mater.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the Bay View High School is located in the 4th Congressional District. I wish them another 100 years of success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 2014, my flight was delayed and I was unable to vote on rollcall votes 405 and 406.

If present, I would have voted ''yea'' on H.R. 4195 and H.R. 5029.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4461–S4511

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2601–2611, and S. Res. 502. **Pages S4502–03**

Measures Reported:

S. 1865, to amend the prices set for Federal Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps and make limited waivers of stamp requirements for certain users, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 113–210) **Page S4502**

Measures Passed:

Unlocking Consumer Choice and Wireless Competition Act: Senate passed S. 517, to promote consumer choice and wireless competition by permitting consumers to unlock mobile wireless devices, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4510–11**

Measures Considered:

Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2578, to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions. **Pages S4461–63, S4480–96**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill upon disposition of the nomination of Ronnie L. White, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, with the time until 2 p.m., on Wednesday, July 16, 2014 equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees, and the time from 2 p.m. until 2:10 p.m. equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees; and that at 2:10 p.m., Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S4511**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor that was established in Executive Order 13348 on July 22, 2004; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–50) **Pages S4500–01**

White Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, July 16, 2014, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Ronnie L. White, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, with the time until 10:15 a.m. controlled as follows: 10 minutes for Senator Grassley, 10 minutes for Senator Cornyn, 10 minutes for Senator Shaheen, and any remaining time under the control of Senator McCaskill; that at 10:15 a.m., Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination; that if cloture is invoked, the time until 12:20 p.m. be equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees; and at 12:20 p.m., all post-cloture time be expired, and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination. **Page S4511**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 52 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 224), Norman C. Bay, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. **Pages S4472–79, S4511**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 222), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S4472**

By 90 yeas to 7 nays (Vote No. EX. 225), Cheryl A. LaFleur, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. **Pages S4472–79, S4511**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 85 yeas to 10 nays (Vote No. 223), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S4472**

James D. Nealon, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Honduras.

Pages S4480, S4511

Robert A. Wood, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the Conference on Disarmament. **Page S4480**

Paul Nathan Jaenichen, Sr., of Kentucky, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration.

Pages S4480, S4511

Messages from the House: **Page S4501**

Measures Referred: **Pages S4501–02**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S4461, S4502**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S4502, S4511**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S4502**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4503–04**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4504–10**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4500–01**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S4510**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S4510**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S4510**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—225) **Pages S4472, S4479**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:24 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 16, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4511.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense approved for full committee consideration an original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015.

SEMIANNUAL MONETARY POLICY REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress, after receiving testimony from Janet L. Yellen, Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Elliot F. Kaye, of New York, to be a Commissioner and Chairman, and Joseph P. Mohorovic, of Illinois, and Robert S. Adler, of the District of Columbia, both to be a Commissioner, all of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, Judith M. Davenport, of Pennsylvania, and Elizabeth Sembler, of Florida, both to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Victor M. Mendez, of Arizona, to be Deputy Secretary, and Peter M. Rogoff, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Policy, both of the Department of Transportation, Bruce H. Andrews, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary, and Marcus Dwayne Jadotte, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary, both of the Department of Commerce, and a Coast Guard Promotion List.

WILDLAND FIRE PREPAREDNESS AND FOREST SERVICE BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine wildland fire preparedness and to consider the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2015 for the Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Senators Feinstein, McCain, and Crapo; Thomas Tidwell, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Kim Thorsen, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Safety, Resource Protection and Emergency Services; Ken Pimlott, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Chief, Sacramento; Dan Gibbs, Summit County Commissioner, Breckenridge, Colorado; and David Porter Tenney, Navajo County Board of Supervisors, Holbrook, Arizona.

CHRONIC ILLNESS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine chronic illness, focusing on addressing patients' unmet needs, after receiving testimony from Stephanie Dempsey, American Heart Association, Varnville, South Carolina; William A. Bornstein, Emory University Healthcare, Atlanta, Georgia; Cheryl DeMars, The Alliance, Fitchburg, Wisconsin; and Mary Margaret Lehmann, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of John R. Bass, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey, Jane D. Hartley, of New York, to be Ambassador to the French Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as

Ambassador to the Principality of Monaco, Kevin F. O'Malley, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to Ireland, who was introduced by Senators McCaskill and Blunt, James D. Pettit, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Moldova, and Brent Robert Hartley, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 1696, to protect a women's right to determine whether and when to bear a child or end a pregnancy by limiting restrictions on the provision of abortion services, focusing on removing barriers to constitutionally protected reproductive rights, after receiving testimony from Senator Baldwin; Representatives Black, Chu, and Blackburn; Wisconsin State Representative Chris Taylor, Madison; Nancy Northup, Center for Reproductive Rights, New York, New York; Monique V. Chireau, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina; Carol Tobias, National Right to Life Committee, Washington, D.C.; and Willie Parker, Birmingham, Alabama.

CYBERCRIMINAL NETWORKS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism concluded a hearing to examine taking down botnets, focusing on public and private efforts to disrupt and dismantle cybercriminal networks, after receiving testimony from Leslie R. Caldwell, Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Joseph Demarest, Assistant Director, Cyber Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, both of the Department of Justice; Richard Domingues Boscovich, Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, Washington; Cheri F. McGuire, Symantec Corporation, Mountain View, California; Paul Vixie, Farsight Security, Inc., San Mateo, California; and Craig D. Spiezle, Online Trust Alliance, Bellevue, Washington.

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: 12 public bills, H.R. 5107–5118 were introduced. **Pages H6295–97**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H6297**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows: H. Res. 670, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions for food inventory (H. Rept. 113–522). **Page H6295**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Pittenger to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6219**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:42 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6223**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Steve Walker, Fairview Village Church, Eagleville, Pennsylvania. **Page H6223**

Private Calendar: On the call of the Private calendar, the House passed H.R. 306, for the relief of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic. **Page H6224**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act: H.R. 3086, to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act. **Pages H6228–34**

Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014: The House passed H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, by a recorded vote of 367 ayes to 55 noes, Roll No. 414. **Pages H6235–42, H6245–61**

Rejected the Blumenauer motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 193 yeas to 227 nays, Roll No. 413. **Pages H6258–61**

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee

on Ways and Means, modified by the amendments printed in H. Rept. 113–521, shall be considered as adopted. **Pages H6245–46**

H. Res. 669, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 408, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 407. **Pages H6241–42**

Notice of Intent To Offer Motion: Representative Gallego announced his intent to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230. **Page H6261**

Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2015: The House continued consideration of H.R. 5016, making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, July 16th. **Pages H6242–45, H6262–84**

Agreed to:

Roskam amendment that was debated on July 14th that increases funding, by offset, for taxpayer services of the Internal Revenue Service by $10,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 338 ayes to 80 noes, Roll No. 410); **Pages H6243–44**

Frelinghuysen amendment that reduces funding for the National Security Council by $4,200,000; **Pages H6262–63**

DeLauro amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enter into any contract with an incorporated entity if such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands, and such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity was previously incorporated in the United States; **Pages H6263–64**

Bachus amendment (No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014) that prohibits funds from being used to reinstall the Red Mountain sculpture on the plaza of the Hugo Black Courthouse in Birmingham, Alabama; **Pages H6264–65**

Schakowsky amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term ''Fair Labor Standards Act''; **Pages H6265–66**

Grayson amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if that offeror has (1) within a three-year period preceding this offer been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or (2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in paragraph (1); or (3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied; **Pages H6267–68**

Walberg amendment that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of chapter 29, 31, or 33 of title 44, United States Code; **Page H6272**

Farenthold amendment that prohibits funds from being made available for the Office of Management and Budget to process or approve an apportionment request that does not include the following phrase: ''Apportioned amounts are not available for any position that is held by an employee with respect to whom the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives has certified a statement of facts to a United States attorney under section 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 194)''; and **Pages H6272–73**

Price (GA) amendment (No. 6 printed in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014) that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to confidentiality and disclosure of returns and return information). **Pages H6276–77**

Rejected:

Jackson Lee amendment that was debated on July 14th that sought to reduce funding for the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network by $200,000 and increase funding for taxpayer services of the Internal Revenue Service by $100,000 (by a recorded vote of 161 ayes to 258 noes, Roll No. 409); **Pages H6242–43**

Moore amendment that was debated on July 14th that sought to strike section 501 from the bill, which relates to administrative provisions of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, specifically the repeal of section 1017(a)(2)(C) of Public Law 111–203 (by a recorded vote of 170 ayes to 244 noes, Roll No. 411); and **Page H6244**

Waters amendment that was debated on July 14th that sought to increase funding for salaries and expenses of the Securities and Exchange Commission by $300,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 412). **Pages H6244–45**

Withdrawn:

Sherman amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds

from being used to implement, administer, or enforce final leasing accounting standard rules, regulations, or requirements in FASB Project 2013–270, Accounting Standards Update Topic 842; **Page H6268**

Marino amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used to collect any underpayment of any tax imposed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to the extent such underpayment is attributable to the taxpayer's loss of records (except in the case of fraud); and **Pages H6274–75**

DeSantis amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used for any Internal Revenue Service instant message or other electronic communications system that is not operationally searchable and archivable at all times. **Page H7277**

Point of Order sustained against:

Heck (WA) amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used, with respect to specified States, to prohibit or penalize a financial institution from providing financial services to an entity solely because the entity is a manufacturer, producer, or person that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling marijuana or marijuana products and engages in such activity pursuant to a law established by a State or local government and **Pages H6275–76**

Massie amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used by any authority of the government of the District of Columbia to prohibit the ability of any person to possess, acquire, use, sell, or transport a firearm except to the extent such activity is prohibited by Federal law (Subsequently, Representative Massie appealed the ruling of the Chair. The question was then put on sustaining the ruling of the Chair, and by voice vote it was agreed that the decision of the Chair shall stand as the judgement of the Committee). **Page H6274**

Proceedings Postponed:

Meehan amendment (No. 2 printed in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014) that seeks to prohibit funds from being used to modify or rebuild any portion of the White House bowling alley, including using phenolic synthetic material; **Pages H6266–67**

Fleming amendment (No. 1 printed in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014) that seeks to prohibit funds from being used to implement guidance FIN–2014–G001 (relating to BSA Expectations Regarding Marijuana-Related Businesses) issued on February 14, 2014; **Pages H6268–70**

Gosar amendment that seeks to prohibit funds from being used to pay a performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to any employee of the Internal Revenue Service; **Pages H6270–71**

Grayson amendment that seeks to prohibit funds from being used to pay any individual at an annual rate of Grade 1, Steps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6; or Grade 2, Step 1 or 2 as defined in the "Salary Table 2014-GS" published by the Office of Personnel Management, or to pay any individual at an hourly basic rate of Grade 1, Steps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6; or Grade 2, Step 1 or 2; **Pages H6273–74**

Heck (WA) amendment that seeks to prohibit funds from being used, with respect to specified States, to penalize a financial institution solely because the institution provides financial services to an entity that is a manufacturer, producer, or a person that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling marijuana or marijuana products and engages in such activity pursuant to a law established by a State or local government; **Pages H6271–72**

DeSantis amendment that seeks to prohibit funds from being used by the Internal Revenue Service to create machine-readable materials that are not subject to the safeguards established pursuant to section 3105 of title 44, United States Code; **Page H6277**

DeSantis amendment that seeks to prohibit funds from being obligated or expended by the Internal Revenue Service for conferences; **Pages H6277–73**

Blackburn amendment that seeks to reduce each amount made available by the bill by 1%, with the exception of specified accounts; **Pages H6278–79**

Blackburn amendment that seeks to prohibit funds from being used to provide funds from the Hardest Hit Fund program established by the Secretary of the Treasury under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to any State or local government for the purpose of funding pension obligations of such State or local government; **Pages H6279–80**

Blackburn amendment that seeks to prohibit funds from being used, with respect to specified States, by the Federal Communications Commission to prevent such States from implementing their own State laws with respect to the provision of broadband Internet access service by the State or a municipality or other political subdivision of the State; and **Pages H6280–82**

Blackburn amendment that seeks to prohibit funds from being used by the Consumer Product Safety Commission to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Voluntary Remedial Actions and Guidelines for Voluntary Recall Notices". **Pages H6282–84**

H. Res. 661, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 5016) and (H.R. 4718), was agreed to on July 10th.

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor is to continue in effect beyond July 22, 2014—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 113–135). **Page H6245**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and six recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6241, H6242, H6242–43, H6243–44, H6244, H6244–45, H6260–61 and H6261. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FUNDING FY 2015

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on Overseas Contingency Operations Funding FY 2015. This was a closed hearing.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on Interior and Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2015. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF THE PRISONER OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION COMMUNITY AND THE RESTRUCTURING OF THESE AGENCIES AS PROPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on the Government Accountability Office review of the Prisoner of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA) community and the restructuring of these agencies as proposed by the Department of Defense. Testimony was heard from Michael D. Lumpkin, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict, Department of Defense; and Jamie Morin, Director, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, Department of Defense.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S YOUTH: AN UPDATE FROM THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education held a hearing entitled "Protecting America's Youth: An Update from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children". Testimony was heard from a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee concluded a markup on the following legislation: H.R. 4771, the "Designer Anabolic Steroid Control Act"; H.R. 4250, the "Sunscreen Innovation Act"; H.R. 594, the "Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research and Education Amendments of 2014"; H.R. 669, the "Sudden Unexpected Death and Data Enhancement and Awareness Act"; H.R. 4290, the "Wakefield Act of 2014"; H.R. 4450, the "Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act of 2014"; and H.R. 5057, the "EPS Service Parts Act of 2014". The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 4771, H.R. 4250, H.R. 594, H.R. 669, H.R. 4290, and H.R. 4450. The following bill was ordered reported without amendment: H.R. 5057.

THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE'S "OPERATION CHOKE POINT"

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "The Department of Justice's 'Operation Choke Point' ". Testimony was heard from Stuart F. Delery, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice; Scott G. Alvarez, General Counsel, Federal Reserve Board; Richard J. Osterman, Acting General Counsel, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and Daniel P. Stipano, Deputy Chief Counsel, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

EXAMINING REGULATORY RELIEF PROPOSALS FOR COMMUNITY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, PART II

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled "Examining Regulatory Relief Proposals for Community Financial Institutions, Part II". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE FUTURE OF TURKISH DEMOCRACY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats held a hearing entitled "The Future of Turkish Democracy". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE RISE OF ISIL: IRAQ AND BEYOND

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade; and Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, held a joint subcommittee hearing entitled "The

Rise of ISIL: Iraq and Beyond''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LESSONS FROM THE STATES: RESPONSIBLE PRISON REFORM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Lessons from the States: Responsible Prison Reform''. Testimony was heard from Cam Ward, Chair, Prison Reform Task Force, Alabama State Senate; John E. Wetzel, Secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Corrections; and public witnesses.

MORAL RIGHTS, TERMINATION RIGHTS, RESALE ROYALTY, AND COPYRIGHT TERM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''Moral Rights, Termination Rights, Resale Royalty, and Copyright Term''. Testimony was heard from Karyn A. Temple Claggett, Associate Register of Copyrights and Director of Policy and International Affairs, U.S. Copyright Office; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law held a hearing on the ''Financial Institution Bankruptcy Act of 2014''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE 2013 HELIUM STEWARDSHIP ACT

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''Implementation and Administration of the 2013 Helium Stewardship Act''. Testimony was heard from Linda Lance, Deputy Director, Programs and Policy, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; and Anne-Marie Fennell, Director, Natural Resources and Environment Team, Government Accountability Office.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing on the following legislation: H.R. 3229, the ''Indian Health Service Advance Appropriations Act of 2013''; H.R. 4546, the ''Department of the Interior Tribal Self-Governance Act of 2014''; H.R. 4867, the ''Economic Development Through Tribal Land Exchange Act''; and S. 1603, the ''Gun Lake Trust Land Reaffirmation Act''. Testimony was heard from Kevin Washburn, Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Elizabeth Fowler, Deputy Director, Operations Management, Indian Health Service; and public witnesses.

IS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S GENERAL SCHEDULE (GS) A VIABLE PERSONNEL SYSTEM FOR THE FUTURE?

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and the Census held a hearing entitled ''Is the Federal Government's General Schedule (GS) a Viable Personnel System for the Future?''. Testimony was heard from Katherine Archuleta, Director, Office of Personnel Management; Robert Goldenkoff, Director, Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2014

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 4719, the ''Fighting Hunger Incentive Act of 2014''. The committee granted by record vote of 7–3 a closed rule for H.R. 4719. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–51 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Gerlach, Paulsen, Reed, Kelly (PA), and Levin.

ACTION DELAYED, SMALL BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES DENIED: IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTRACTING REFORMS IN THE FY 2013 NDAA

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce held a hearing entitled ''Action Delayed, Small Business Opportunities Denied: Implementation of Contracting Reforms in the FY 2013 NDAA''. Testimony was heard from John Shoraka, Associate Administrator, Government Contracting and Business Development, Small Business Administration; and public witnesses.

EPA'S EXPANDED INTERPRETATION OF ITS PERMIT VETO AUTHORITY UNDER THE CLEAN WATER ACT

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled ''EPA's Expanded Interpretation of its Permit Veto Authority Under the Clean Water Act''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

RECOVERY AT FIVE YEARS

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine an assessment of the recovery at five years, after receiving testimony from Lawrence Kudlow, CNBC, and Kudlow and Co., LLC, New York, New York; and Jared Bernstein, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Washington, DC.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security, to hold hearings to examine strengthening trade enforcement to protect American enterprise and grow American jobs, 2:30 p.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, with the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to hold a joint hearing to examine options for assuring domestic space access, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection, to hold hearings to examine what makes a bank systemically important, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: with the Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to hold a joint hearing to examine options for assuring domestic space access, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine consumer choice, consolidation and the future video marketplace, 2:30 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Water and Wildlife, to hold hearings to examine S. 571, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a deadline for restricting sewage dumping into the Great Lakes and to fund programs and activities for improving wastewater discharges into the Great Lakes, S. 1153, to establish an improved regulatory process for injurious wildlife to prevent the introduction and establishment in the United States of nonnative wildlife and wild animal pathogens and parasites that are likely to cause harm, S. 1175, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a program to provide loans and loan guarantees to enable eligible public entities to acquire interests in real property that are in compliance with habitat conservation plans approved by the Secretary of the Interior under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, S. 1202, to establish an integrated Federal program to respond to ongoing and expected impacts of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, restoring, and conserving the natural resources of the United States, and to maximize government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and tribal governments and other entities, S. 1232, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect and restore the Great Lakes, H.R. 1300, to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges, S. 1381, to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, S. 1650, to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to exempt certain Alaska Native articles from prohibitions against sale of items containing nonedible migratory bird parts, S. 2225, to provide for a smart water resource management pilot program, S. 2530, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or exportation of mussels of certain genus, and S. 2560, to authorize the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to seek compensation for injuries to trust resources and use those funds to restore, replace, or acquire equivalent resources, 3 p.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert W. Holleyman II, of Louisiana, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, and Cary Douglas Pugh, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and its Protocol, signed at Madrid on February 22, 1990 (Treaty Doc. 113–04), The Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Poland for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed on February 13, 2013, at Warsaw (Treaty Doc. 113–05), H.R. 4028, to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom, S. 2577, to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to $5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014, S. Res. 498, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization, S. Res. 500, expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for the Republic of Moldova's territorial integrity, and the nominations of Alfonso E. Lenhardt, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, Marcia Denise Occomy, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank, and Leslie Ann Bassett, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Paraguay, Department of State, 10 a.m., S–116, Capitol.

Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South and Central Asian Affairs, to hold hearings to examine reenergizing United States-India ties, 3 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine challenges at the border, focusing on examining and addressing the root of the causes behind the rise in apprehensions at the Southern Border, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of the Interior's land buy-back program, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the state of Veterans' Affairs health care, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine phone scams, focusing on progress and potential solutions, 2:15 p.m., SD–562.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, markup on H. Res. 649, directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing on Fiscal Year 2015 OCO Budget Request, 10:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing on Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) Requirements Assessment, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Long-Term Budget Outlook'', 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Review of CDC Anthrax Lab Incident'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Failure to Verify: Concerns Regarding PPACA's Eligibility System'', 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Iran's Destabilizing Role in the Middle East'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''The Growing Crisis of Africa's Orphans'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, hearing entitled ''Port of Entry Infrastructure: How Does the Federal Government Prioritize Investments?'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H. Res. 646, directing the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Justice that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011; and H.R. 744, the ''STOP Identity Theft Act of 2013'', 10:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee markup on the following legislation: H.R. 277, to revise the boundaries of John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Sachuest Point Unit RI–04P, Easton Beach Unit RI–05P, Almy Pond Unit RI–06, and Hazards Beach Unit RI–07 in Rhode Island; H.R. 916, the ''Federal Land Asset Inventory Reform Act of 2013''; H.R. 1810, to revise the boundaries of John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Gasparilla Island Unit in Florida; H.R. 2158, the ''Expedited Departure of Certain Snake Species Act''; H.R. 3572, to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in North Carolina; H.R. 3806, the ''Great Smoky Mountains National Park Agreement Act of 2013''; H.R. 4751, to make technical corrections to Public Law 110–229 to reflect the renaming of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial, and for other purposes, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''White House Office of Political Affairs: Is Supporting Candidates and Campaign Fund-Raising an Appropriate Use of a Government Office?'', 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on a discussion draft of a House Resolution providing for the authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President inconsistent with his duties under the Constitution of the United States, 10 a.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Oversight; and Subcommittee on Environment, joint subcommittee hearing entitled ''Status of Reforms to EPA's Integrated Risk Information System'', 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Barriers to Entrepreneurship: Examining the Anti-Trust Implications of Occupational Licensing'', 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup on the following legislation: General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions; H. Con. Res. 103, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run; H.R. 3044, to approve the transfer of Yellow Creek Port properties in Iuka, Mississippi; H.R. 5078, the ''Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act of 2014''; H.R. 4854, the ''Regulatory Certainty Act''; H.R. 5077, the ''Coal Jobs Protection Act of 2014'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Creating Efficiency through Comparison: An Evaluation of Private Sector Best Practices and the VA Health Care System'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing entitled ''Advancing the U.S. Trade Agenda: The World Trade Organization'', 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 16

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: At 10:15 a.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Ronnie L. White, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. If cloture is invoked, Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Ronnie L. White at 12:20 p.m.

At 2:10 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2578, Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 16

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Complete consideration of H.R. 5016—Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2015.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beniskey, Dan, Mich., E1157
Bentivolio, Kerry L., Mich., E1158, E1161
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1162
Clarke, Yvette D., N.Y., E1161
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1158
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1163
DelBene, Suzan K., Wash., E1157
Enyart, William L., Ill., E1160
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1158
Hartzler, Vicky, Mo., E1161
Holt, Rush, N.J., E1162
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E1159
Huelskamp, Tim, Kans., E1158
Keating, William R., Mass., E1157
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E1161
Lujan Grisham, Michelle, N.M., E1159
Luján, Ben Ray, N.M., E1158
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1162
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1159, E1162
Pastor, Ed, Ariz., E1161
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E1159
Renacci, James B., Ohio, E1159, E1162
Sanford, Mark, N.C., E1158
Schneider, Bradley S., Ill., E1157
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1161
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E1161
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1160
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E1158
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E1157

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.