United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2013 No. 64

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 8, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK R. MEADOWS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

Almighty God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this House for the leadership of our Nation.

May all the Members have the vision of a world where respect and understanding are the marks of civility, and honor and integrity are the marks of one's character.

Send Your blessing today upon our honored guest, Madam President, the Honorable Park Geun-hye of the Republic of Korea. Raise up, O God, women and men from every nation who will lead toward the paths of peace and whose good judgment will heal the hurt between all peoples.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within these hallowed halls be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, April 24, 2013, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly, (at 9 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1022

JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HER EXCELLENCY PARK GEUN-HYE, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

During the recess, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Mrs. Kerri Hanley, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The joint meeting will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN);

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS);

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON);

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY);

Printed on recycled paper.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT);

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER);

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT);

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL);

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL);

The gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU);

The gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL); and

The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH);

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ);

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN);

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO);

The Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI); and

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER).

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Hersey Kyota, the Ambassador of the Republic of Palau.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 10 o'clock and 36 minutes a.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Paul D. Irving, announced Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea.

The President of the Republic of Korea, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

President PARK. Speaker BOEHNER, Vice President BIDEN, distinguished Members of the House and the Senate, ladies and gentlemen,

I am privileged to stand in this Chamber—this hallowed ground of freedom and democracy—to speak about our friendship and our future together.

After I arrived in Washington the day before yesterday, I went to the Korean War Memorial near the banks of the Potomac. I read the words etched in granite: ''Our nation honors her sons and daughters, who answered the call to defend a country they never knew and a people they never met.'' Time and again, I am moved when I read those familiar words.

Let me express—on behalf of the people of the Republic of Korea—our profound gratitude to America's veterans. Their blood, sweat and tears helped safeguard freedom and democracy.

I also offer my heartfelt appreciation to four men in particular. They served in that war and now serve in this Chamber. Their names are Congressmen JOHN CONYERS, CHARLES RANGEL, SAM JOHNSON and HOWARD COBLE.

Gentlemen, my country thanks you.

When the guns fell silent in the summer of 1953, Koreans were surviving on $67 a year. Six decades later, Korea is one of the top five car producers and the eighth-largest trading nation.

Some call this the ''Miracle on the Han River.''

But for those of us in Korea, it was anything but a miracle. And it wasn't just built from within. Koreans worked tirelessly in the mines of Germany, in the jungles of Vietnam, and in the deserts of the Middle East.

These are the people—the proud Korean people—I am so honored to serve as President.

They are the ones that made Korea what it is today.

Together, we will write a sequel to that story: ''A Second Miracle on the Han River.''

This time, it will be written with a revived economy, with a people that are happy, with a flourishing culture, and on a pathway to a reunified Peninsula.

These are the four tenets that guide my government. We also know that we didn't come this far on our own.

Along our journey we have been aided by great friends, and among them the United States is second to none. America, I thank you for your friendship.

If the past is anything to go by, our new journey will also be filled with excitement.

This year, we honor the 60th anniversary of our alliance. And today, I would like to acknowledge one iconic family that captures those 60 years.

It is the family of Lieutenant Colonel David Morgan.

Colonel Morgan's grandfather, the late Warren Morgan, fought in the Korean War. The senior Morgan was a commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve.

His father, John Morgan, also served in the Korean War. He was a battery commander of the 213th Field Artillery.

Colonel Morgan himself has served two tours in Korea in 1992 and 2005.

The Morgan family is a living testimony to our 60 years together—three generations of Americans helping to safeguard Korea. That family is here with us today.

As President of a grateful nation, I salute the Morgan family and the commitment and friendship of the American people.

Looking forward, our precious alliance is setting its sights on a better world—a brighter future. Bound by trust, guided by shared values, we are cooperating across and beyond our own boundaries.

Korea has stood by the United States in Iraq and Afghanistan. Together, we supported peace-building and reconstruction in those nations.

Following the Washington Conference in 2010, Seoul hosted the second Nuclear Security Summit last year. There we reaffirmed our commitment to the vision of ''a world without nuclear weapons.''

A world without nuclear weapons—President Obama's vision—must start on the Korean Peninsula. For the Peninsula is home to the only divided nation-state and directly faces the threat of nuclear weapons. It is an ideal test bed for a future free of nuclear arms. If we can pull it off on the Korean Peninsula, then we can pull it off anywhere else.

Korea has been pursuing the peaceful use of nuclear energy. It is also firmly committed to the principle of nonproliferation. Korea and the United States are partnering to build reactors in third countries. In this regard, we need a modernized, mutually beneficial successor to our existing civil nuclear agreement. Such an accord will bring huge benefits to related industries in both our countries.

Our partnership also extends to development assistance.

The United States and Korea send the largest numbers of aid volunteers abroad. We will work side by side to help lower-income countries. In 2011, our aid agencies signed a document that facilitates these efforts. And Korea's aid agency will soon be signing another with the U.S. Peace Corps.

In March of last year, the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement went into effect. The agreement adds an economic pillar to our alliance. It has moved us closer to a comprehensive strategic alliance.

We can do even more. If the bill on visa quotas for Korean professionals is passed in this Congress, both our economies will benefit, for it would help create many more jobs. It would show our people what the FTA can do for them.

I ask Congress for its understanding—for its support.

Our FTA also connects East Asia and North America and provides a key platform for building a common Asia-Pacific market. The agreement also helps underpin Washington's rebalancing toward the region.

Collectively, these developments paint a forward-leaning alliance. They point to a 21st century partnership that is both comprehensive and strategic.

Ladies and gentlemen,

That is our present, the foundation on which we stand. I now wish to share my vision of ''our future together''—a future that we will build together as partners.

Following our meeting yesterday, President Obama and I adopted a joint declaration. Building on the extraordinary accomplishments of the last 60 years, we determined to embark on another shared journey toward peace on the Korean Peninsula, toward cooperation in Northeast Asia, and, finally, toward prosperity around the world.

It is my hope that as we make this journey, our partnership will be guided by a three-part vision.

The first is to lay the groundwork for enduring peace on the Korean Peninsula and over time for reunification.

That future, I know, feels distant today.

North Korea continues to issue threats and provocations firing long-range missiles, staging nuclear tests that undermine peace on the Peninsula and far beyond it.

The Korean Government is reacting resolutely but calmly. We are maintaining the highest level of readiness. We are strengthening our cooperation with the U.S. and other international partners.

Korea's economy and financial markets remain stable. Companies—both domestic and foreign—see this, and are expanding their investments.

Korea's economic fundamentals are strong. Its government is equal to the task. And it is backed by the might of our alliance. So long as this continues, you may rest assured: no North Korean provocation can succeed.

I will remain steadfast in pushing forward a process of trust-building on the Korean Peninsula. I am confident that trust is the path to peace, the path to a Korea that is whole again.

The Republic of Korea will never accept a nuclear-armed North Korea. Pyongyang's provocations will be met decisively.

At the same time, I will not link humanitarian aid provided to the North Korean people, such as infants and young children, to the political situation.

And with the trust that gradually builds up, through exchange, through cooperation, we will cement the grounds for durable peace and, eventually, peaceful reunification.

But as we say in Korea, it takes two hands to clap. Trust is not something that can be imposed on another.

The pattern is all too familiar—and badly misguided. North Korea provokes a crisis. The international community imposes a certain period of sanctions. Later, it tries to patch things up by offering concessions and rewards. Meanwhile, Pyongyang uses that time to advance its nuclear capabilities. And uncertainty prevails.

It is time to put an end to this vicious cycle.

Pyongyang is pursuing two goals at once—a nuclear arsenal and economic development. We know these are incompatible. You cannot have your cake and eat it, too.

The leadership in Pyongyang must make no mistake. Security does not come from nuclear weapons. Security comes when the lives of its people are improved. It comes when people are free to pursue their happiness.

North Korea must make the right choice. It must walk the path to becoming a responsible member in the community of nations.

In order to induce North Korea to make that choice, the international community must speak with one voice. Its message must be clear and consistent.

Only then will we see real progress in inter-Korean relations. Only then will lasting peace be brought to the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia.

Sixty years ago, a stretch of earth bisecting the Korean Peninsula was cleared of arms. Today, that demilitarized zone drawn to prevent armed collision is the most militarized place on the planet. And the standoff around the DMZ has the potential to endanger global peace.

We must defuse that danger. Not just South and North Korea. The world must also get involved. The demilitarized zone must live up to its name, a zone that strengthens the peace, not undermines it.

It is with this vision in mind that I hope to work toward an international park inside the DMZ. It will be a park that sends a message of peace to all of humanity. This could be pursued in parallel with my trust-building process. There, I believe we can start to grow peace—to grow trust. It would be a zone of peace, bringing together not just Koreans separated by a military line, but also the citizens of the world. I call on America and the global community to join us in seeking the promise of a new day.

Honorable Members of Congress,

The second leg of our journey extends beyond the Korean Peninsula to all of Northeast Asia, where we must build a mechanism of peace and cooperation.

Sadly, today, the nations of this region fail to fulfill all that we can achieve collectively. That potential is tremendous.

The region's economies are gaining ever greater clout and becoming more and more interlinked. Yet differences stemming from history are widening.

It has been said that those who are blind to the past cannot see the future. This is obviously a problem for the here and now. But the larger issue is about tomorrow. For where there is failure to acknowledge honestly what happened yesterday, there can be no tomorrow.

Asia suffers from what I call ''Asia's paradox'': the disconnect between growing economic interdependence, on the one hand, and backward political, security cooperation on the other. How we manage this paradox—this will determine the shape of a new order in Asia.

Together, we must meet these challenges. And so I propose an initiative for peace and cooperation in Northeast Asia.

We cannot afford to put off a multilateral dialogue process in Northeast Asia. Together, the United States and other Northeast Asian partners could start with softer issues. These include environmental issues and disaster relief. They include nuclear safety and counterterrorism. Trust will be built through this process. And that trust will propel us to expand the horizons of our cooperation.

The initiative will serve the cause of peace and development in the region, but it will be firmly rooted in the Korea-U.S. alliance. In this sense, it could reinforce President Obama's strategy of rebalancing towards the Asia-Pacific.

Of course, North Korea could also be invited to join. If we start where our interests overlap, then later on it will be easier to find common ground on the larger challenges, easier to find solutions to our mutual benefit.

I firmly believe that Korea and the United States will work hand in hand as we shape an emerging process for cooperation in the region.

The third and final leg of our journey extends even farther beyond the Peninsula—beyond Northeast Asia to the rest of the world.

It is to contribute to happiness—the happiness of Koreans on both halves of the Peninsula, the happiness of all humanity. This is a vision I also advanced at my inauguration.

The ''pursuit of happiness'' is enshrined in the American Declaration of Independence. It also occupies a special place in the Korean Constitution. I have long believed that our alliance should aim far, that it should ultimately seek a happier world.

Guided by this spirit, we stood side by side in the frontiers of peace and freedom. Infused by this spirit, we are expanding cooperation on global issues,

issues like counterterrorism, nuclear nonproliferation and the global financial crisis.

Our efforts will not stop there. Together, we will help spread the universal values of freedom, human rights, and the rule of law. We will march together to take on global challenges—from fighting poverty to tackling climate change and other environmental issues.

Members of the House and the Senate,

Our journey since the Korean war has been led by a specific mission to respond to threats and provocations from the north and to defend freedom and peace on the Korean Peninsula.

Today, our alliance is called upon to go beyond that—beyond just the defense of freedom and peace. We are called upon to step forward on a new journey—a journey toward a Korea that is at peace, that is happy, and that is made whole.

Our economic partnership must also aim higher and reach further into the future.

President Obama has outlined the Startup America Initiative. Together, with my strategy for a creative economy, we can advance toward a common goal—to help channel the innovative ideas, the passion, and the drive of our youths towards a brighter future.

Koreans and Americans are partnering in new ways, whether at world tours of Korean pop stars for Hollywood films or at reconstruction sites in the Middle East.

Together, we can envision a future that is richer, that is safer, and that is happier.

Our chorus of freedom and peace, of future and hope, has not ceased to resonate over the last 60 years and will not cease to go on.

Thank you very much.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m., Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President's Cabinet;

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, (at 11 o'clock and 16 minutes a.m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1201

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 8, 2013 at 9:27 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1071.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, as a mother who has worked for many years outside of the house raising our three children, I know firsthand about the challenges of trying to balance work with family life. That is why I'm a proud cosponsor of the Working Families Flexibility Act, which would give more time to workers, the freedom to decide how to use their time. For some people, this may mean taking a sick child to the doctor or attending their daughter's ballet recital or caring for an aging parent.

Currently, an outdated law prohibits private sector employers from even offering their employees the option to choose paid time off as compensation for overtime hours worked. The Working Families Flexibility Act would put an end to this arbitrary restriction.

By leveling the playing field and giving more employees the freedom to control their overtime compensation, this commonsense proposal will help strengthen families and our workforce.

TRAVEL AND TOURISM

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this week is the 30th annual National Travel and Tourism Week. On Monday, I met with travel and tourism leaders in my State to discuss what we can do at the Federal level of government to strengthen this key sector of our economy.

According to the U.S. Travel Association, travel and tourism generated $2 trillion in economic output in 2012. The industry is also one of America's largest employers, supporting 14.6 million jobs. And this is especially important for my home State of Rhode Island, where the travel and tourism sector supports more than 40,000 jobs and generates $3.5 billion in spending. But we need to do more to support the travel industry, as well as the small business community that depends on a thriving tourism economy.

I am a cosponsor of the bipartisan JOLT Act, a bill that would revise existing visa laws to support the American travel and tourism economy while maintaining essential national security protocols.

I look forward to working further with my colleagues to highlight the importance of our travel and tourism economy in a way that will put men and women back to work in Rhode Island and across our country.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. DENHAM. As chair of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines and Hazardous Materials, tomorrow the full Transportation Committee will be taking up legislation which represents a significant opportunity to create American jobs and spur economic growth in our country.

Quite simply, the Northern Route Approval Act will end years of bureaucratic delays and finally allow construction to the Keystone XL pipeline project. The delay alone over the last 4 years has blocked 120,000 American jobs. The delays have to stop. This has bipartisan support. It is time to stop the delays. In my home State of California, we have not only seen huge skyrocketing gas prices, but we continue to see high unemployment and rolling blackouts.

I'm part of the House Energy Action Team, and it is time to make sure that we have energy independence, lower

gas prices and energy prices, and create American jobs. It's time to stop the delays of the Keystone XL pipeline.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, today we're considering the Republican's latest attack on workers' rights. Republicans are calling this bill the Working Families Flexibility Act, but a more appropriate name would be the More Work, Less Pay Act. This bill is bad for middle class families and would make life worse for workers.

It would essentially end the 40-hour workweek by permitting employers to not pay overtime to workers who exceed 40 hours per week. Instead, it would allow employers to hold earned comp time in their control. It would allow employers to refuse the right of workers to take time off to help a family member in need or attend a parent-teacher conference. That's wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Productivity of our Nation's workers is at an all-time high, yet again we see efforts to whittle down the rights of hardworking families.

Instead of focusing on attacking workers, maybe we should focus on creating good-paying jobs. That's what our constituents want. That's what Americans want.

REINING IN REGULATION TO HELP JOBS RECOVER

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, America's workers and families are in a jobs depression. Since 2009, 9.5 million people have dropped out of the workforce. America's workforce participation rate is the lowest since Jimmy Carter was President. Millions looking for full-time work can find only part-time jobs.

Overreaching Federal regulation is a big reason for this jobs disaster. The Obama administration's onslaught of new major regulation is unprecedented. Every day, Federal agencies erect more roadblocks to economic growth and a jobs recovery.

The House Judiciary Committee is working hard to provide relief. It passed the REINS Act last month and is at work on other groundbreaking legislation to reduce unneeded regulation. This legislation is critical to the growth and recovery America needs, and the Judiciary Committee will do all it can to achieve it.

□ 1210

CANCEL THE SEQUESTER ACT

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. It has now been 857 days since I arrived in Congress, and the Republican leadership has still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis.

The nightmare of joblessness is destroying the American Dream.

When I was graduating from college, my American Dream was owning a home and starting a family, while, for the class of 2013, the American Dream means just having a job—any job—to make ends meet. By eliminating public sector jobs during a time of high unemployment, the sequester is killing the American Dream. It's up to us to cancel the sequester and ensure that America is again a land of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, let's bring H.R. 900, the Cancel the Sequester Act, to the floor for a vote to end this shame. Our mantra should be jobs, jobs, jobs.

AMERICAN AND SOUTH KOREAN ALLIANCE

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

Mr. GARRETT. I rise to speak about the strong relationship between the United States and South Korea, one of our most important relationships, for South Korea is one of America's closest allies in Asia and, indeed, in the entire world. Since the Korean war in the 1950s, the U.S. and South Korea have stood side by side in the name of democracy and liberty and to face down the forces of tyranny and oppression and dictatorship from North Korea and the broader world.

All you need to do is to compare North and South Korea to understand how successful South Korea has been and how much of a failure the Kim regime in the North has been.

South Korea is the world's 15th-largest economy and Asia's fourth-largest. Companies like Samsung, Kia, and LG are major, globally known brands, while Seoul ranks as one of the great cities of the world. South Korea is a vibrant, open society with an equally vibrant and open political system.

Now take North Korea. North Korea is a kleptocratic, vicious dictatorship that tramples on the most basic rights of its citizens, all in the name of glorifying the Kim family and its cadre of jack-booted thugs. There is no freedom of choice, no freedom of religion, and no freedom to dissent from the line of the Kim regime. For the average North Korean, there is only poverty, despotism, and no hope as the regime squanders its resources on its bloated military and dangerous nuclear program.

THE MIRA LOMA SCIENCE BOWL WIN

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, a team from Mira Loma High School in Sacramento won the National Science Bowl for the third time since 2009. Hosted by the U.S. Department of Energy, the Science Bowl was created to encourage students to enter science and mathematics careers.

I want to congratulate these talented and hardworking students from my home district. They represent America's future. They are our country's next generation of innovators. We must continue to inspire our students to excel in fields like science and math. We need to make science cool.

To Jack Gurev, Daniel Shen, Siddharth Trehan, and Saaket Agrawal, you guys make us proud.

And, Coach James Hill, keep inspiring the next generation to go into science and math. It's cool.

OBAMA'S VISIT TO TEXAS SHOULD FOCUS ON ENERGY

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Tomorrow, the President of the United States will be traveling to the great State of Texas to talk jobs. I am proud that the President recognizes Texas as a leading job-producing State and that he understands what it is to create jobs and retain a robust economy.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, The Wall Street Journal had an interesting article—it's on my chart up here—about the energy boom in Texas. It stated that Texas produces as much oil as the next four oil-producing States combined. The Lone Star State now pumps nearly 2 million barrels a day.

Now, the President's tour only has one stop in Texas, south of Austin, which is unfortunate. I would like to invite the President to come to my energy-rich district along the Texas gulf coast and see what job creation really looks like. If the President wants to create jobs, there is a project—the Keystone pipeline to be exact—that has been waiting 1,692 days to do just that.

I encourage and welcome President Obama to come to my district so he can talk with local business leaders who want the Keystone pipeline.

That's the way it is from where I sit. I'm RANDY WEBER.

THE CAMARILLO SPRINGS WILDFIRE AND THE HEROISM OF THE FIRST RESPONDERS

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Last week, Ventura County endured one of the largest wildfires in our county's history. The Camarillo Springs wildfire burned over 28,000 acres, damaging some homes and buildings and threatening many neighborhoods in Ventura County.

I rise today to thank more than 1,800 firefighters and first responders who

worked around the clock to control the blaze and who, in so doing, saved every single life and prevented the potentially massive destruction of personal property. Despite high heat, dry temperatures, and very windy conditions, firefighters in Ventura County joined others from throughout the State to successfully contain the fire quickly and without any loss of life.

I am so proud of our first responders and of our brave firefighters. All of Ventura County is so very grateful for their heroic dedication to our continued safety.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, we will be voting on the House floor for the Working Families Flexibility Act. This legislation will allow private sector employers to empower their workforce by allowing them to choose compensation in the form of paid time off or in cash wages.

Now let me tell you a story about Karen and her family.

Karen works hour after hour to meet the family needs, to make ends meet, and to provide for her two children. Sometimes there just does not seem to be enough hours in the day. When school starts up, she can never have enough hours with Matt and Sarah to support them in their extracurricular activities. Instead of being able to use her overtime for time instead of wages, she has to take time off without pay. Federal law mandates that Karen take money when what she really values is time with the family.

Folks, the key word when discussing this bill is ''choice.'' This is not a mandate on our job creators. Let me repeat that: this is not a mandate. This is a step toward letting hardworking Americans decide what is best for them and getting government out of their lives.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the so-called Working Families Flexibility Act. Mr. Speaker, this is a wolf in sheep's clothing—a guise to pressure employees to work more and get paid less.

H.R. 1406, which I like to call ''Paying Working Families Less Act,'' cuts overtime pay and eliminates all flexibility. Rather than pay overtime when the work is performed, this bill provides that the employers have up to a year to pay an employee his overtime, essentially providing employers unauthorized, interest-free loans. This bill will hurt working class families and wage workers who depend on their overtime to pay their rent, their grocery bills, their heating and water bills. They can't afford to wait a year for pay that they have rightfully earned.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a worker or a family friendly bill, as some of my colleagues are leading this body to believe. Rather, it is a blatant attempt to dismantle the Fair Labor Standards Act and roll back workers' rights 100 years. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill. We should be strengthening the fair labor laws and standards for working men and women, not destroying them.

□ 1220

FULL FAITH AND CREDIT ACT

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President vowed to veto the Full Faith and Credit Act, charging that it would ''result in Congress refusing to pay obligations it has already agreed to.''

I challenge the President to name one Member of Congress who has ever suggested that this is an acceptable substitute for not paying our other bills. His reliance on this falsehood is a measure of the bankruptcy of his argument.

Delaying payments on our other obligations would do enormous damage. But one thing could do even more damage, and that is the threat of defaulting on our sovereign debt. H.R. 807 takes that threat off the table and assures credit markets that their investments in the United States are absolutely guaranteed, no matter what political storms are raging in Washington.

One would think that a President who has run up more debt than almost all of his predecessors combined would understand the importance of guaranteeing the credit that supports that debt.

INVEST IN SUSTAINABLE ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Safe Climate Caucus to highlight the fact that investing in sustainable energy technologies won't only move the Nation towards a clean energy future, but it will also grow our economy.

In order to prevent the worst impacts of climate change, we must transition to lower carbon energy systems. Making the necessary investments in the Nation's smart grid is one way to facilitate this transition. Smart grid investments are already producing real economic benefits.

The Department of Energy recently released a report on the economic impact of Recovery Act investments in the smart grid. The report found that for every million dollars of direct spending on smart grid, the Nation's GDP increased by $2.5 million. In addition, a wide variety of industrial sectors have benefited from these smart grid investments.

Mr. Speaker, climate change is a real threat to our way of life, and there's no time to waste. Fortunately, if we take action now, we can cut pollution while growing our economy.

THE IMPACT OF OBAMACARE

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this past week, I was back in my district, like the other Members were, talking with folks about how Washington is affecting their families. One of the biggest concerns I heard was how ObamaCare could impact their lives.

It turns out the health care law seems to be anything but affordable and more of a problem than a solution. For example, since it was signed into law in 2010, the administration hasn't been completely transparent about the new health care exchanges. The exchanges are just over 6 months from implementation, and we still know very little about how they will operate.

There's also the impact the law could have on jobs. The CBO estimates ObamaCare will become a $1 trillion tax hike. These tax hikes could hurt small businesses across Alabama and across the country as employers cut hours to avoid covering employees' health care. In fact, according to a study by the Hudson Institute, over 54,000 jobs in Alabama related to the hospitality, restaurant, and leisure industries are at risk because of the health care law.

I voted against this bill because of these concerns and more, and I also voted to repeal it time and time again. It's looking like a train wreck of a law, and we need to stop it.

NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of our teachers during National Teacher Appreciation Week.

Across the country, we trust teachers with our most valuable resource: our children.

Our teachers serve as role models and mentors to our kids, helping them to reach their potential; and in New Jersey, we have among the most talented teachers in the country.

It was because of the mentorship of my teachers in high school that I applied for college and eventually became a teacher myself, and it is because of my experience in the classroom that I

understand the challenges of our educators today.

While we ask our teachers to prepare our children to meet the challenges of the 21st century, we must also give them the tools to rise to these challenges. Competitive salaries and financial resources must be provided so that they can recruit the very best teachers in science, technology, engineering, math, and the arts.

While we honor our teachers this week, let's not forget the services they do for our children every day. Let us join together in recognizing teachers across this country.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, as a father and a grandfather, I am fully aware of the responsibilities and challenge of balancing a vocation and job responsibilities with taking care of the needs of my family. Mr. Speaker, that challenge is even greater today for American hardworking families who have to address the needs of their young children or perhaps aging parents who live nearby.

For almost 30 years, we have allowed this flexibility and option for those who work for the government to have the choice between taking comp pay or taking additional pay for additional work that they have to perform. Wouldn't it be great if we would do the same thing for those who are in the private sector? For some reason, we haven't allowed that.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I'm supporting the Working Families Flexibility Act. We need to pass this today in the United States Congress to give the same privileges, rights, and options to those in the private sector as we allow in the public sector.

THE SO-CALLED WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Today is just a few days before Mother's Day, and the House Republican leadership has this House considering the so-called Working Families Flexibility Act on the floor.

This bill is no Mother's Day bouquet, but instead it amounts to a bunch of dead flowers. It denies working mothers—like my mother, who still works today as a secretary and is a part of our middle class—and other hardworking Americans the flexibility they need. This bill only gives flexibility to employers.

Under this misguided legislation, employers would have the flexibility to substitute compensation time for overtime pay. This legislation makes it less expensive for employees to work overtime, encouraging employers to demand more overtime, leading to more work and less pay.

Instead, we should be voting on priorities for working families like equal pay for all, raising the minimum wage, and giving hardworking Americans true flexibility. Unfortunately, the majority just does not understand the needs of working Americans.

Today, I will be voting ''no'' on H.R. 1406 because I will defend hardworking moms like my mom and others who rely often on overtime pay to make ends meet.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for working families. Vote ''no'' on H.R. 1406 and give working moms what they deserve this Mother's Day, which is equal pay for equal work.

THE IMMIGRATION BILL THREATENS PUBLIC SAFETY

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Center for Immigration Studies has analyzed the Senate immigration bill and found it threatens public safety. For example:

The bill allows the legalization of illegal immigrants who have been convicted of three misdemeanors, including multiple offenses for drunk driving, vehicular homicide, domestic violence, certain sex offenses, and identity theft;

It requires immigration agencies to ignore convictions under State laws for immigrant smuggling and human trafficking;

It waives criminal offenses for anyone under 18, even if the offender was tried as an adult; and

Anyone simply claiming eligibility for any legalization program may not be detained and need not show proof of eligibility.

So the Senate bill threatens American safety, which is another reason it should be opposed.

□ 1230

GIVING NIAGARA FALLS THE WATERFRONT IT DESERVES

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, this week's announcement that New York State is committing to take action on removing the Robert Moses Parkway in Niagara Falls is welcome news for western New York. Niagara Falls is a national treasure, drawing millions of visitors each year, yet the parkway has created a physical and economic barrier between Niagara Falls and its extraordinary waterfront.

With Federal infrastructure dollars already stretched thin, we must take every opportunity to look at alternative funding sources. In this case, the New York Power Authority, the body responsible for the creation of the parkway and the current owner of its infrastructure, has the responsibility and the capacity to fund its removal.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let the New York Power Authority off the hook on this historic wrong. By holding them to this obligation, we free up State and Federal resources for additional projects in Niagara Falls, maximizing the impact of our investment. It's time for Niagara Falls to have the waterfront it deserves.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, in our recovering economy today, we have many families that have two working parents, each juggling their careers, coordinating children at school and extracurricular activities, parent-teacher meetings, and other work obligations. For so many Americans, balancing these important demands of family and work proves to be extremely difficult and oftentimes exhausting.

That is why I rise today in support of giving private sector employees the same flexibility and choice to balance their careers and home lives that public sector employees have enjoyed for the past 30 years.

The Working Families Flexibility Act simply gives employees a choice that already exists for public employees; and if passed, this commonsense legislation would correct an outdated Federal law and help give all employees more options to take care of family obligations.

Mr. Speaker, during our continued economic recovery, at a time when it is difficult for Americans to see Washington come together and pass bipartisan, positive solutions, let's show them that we understand times are difficult for many and pass the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013.

HONORING BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS AND TRAINMEN

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 150th anniversary of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen, North America's oldest rail labor union. Since its founding on May 8, 1863, the BLET has always played a critical role in the transportation of people and goods throughout our Nation.

As America expanded westward, locomotive engineers and trainmen led the way. Our men and women on the railroads connected two oceans and opened up the new frontier.

Today, U.S. railroads transport 2.5 trillion metric tons a year. As we expand into new technology and high-speed rail, locomotive engineers will continue to propel the American economy forward.

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen now counts 55,000 active and retired members among its ranks. These are the men and women who work around the clock to literally make the trains run on time.

In recognition of the 150th anniversary of the Brotherhood, I ask my colleagues to join me in passing a resolution to honor them for their contributions in growing this great Nation.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make life work a little easier for moms and dads in the St. Louis region. I rise today on behalf of every parent who wished they had more time to spend with their children or more time to care for a parent or a loved one. I rise today to level the playing field for all private sector employees so they receive the same flexibility public sector employees have enjoyed for nearly 30 years.

That is why I cosponsored the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013, which allows employees the choice, voluntary choice, of paid time off or comp time in lieu of cash wages for overtime. The Working Families Flexibility Act is commonsense legislation that will help balance the needs of family life and the workplace, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure and make life work a little easier for all Americans.

REPEAL SEQUESTRATION

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, we've heard the words ''sequestration'' and ''sequester'' so often they've now become household terms. But when the Budget Control Act of 2011 became law, no one intended that sequestration would take place. In fact, everyone thought it would be so devastating that neither political party would let it stand. Well, Mr. Speaker, it stands.

At every opportunity to repeal sequestration, it has not happened. Yet we know Congress can act to address the impacts if it hits the front page of the paper. Our Republican colleagues did so for the FAA. But it is now time for us to ask: What about the children's Head Start program? What about FEMA for the victims of Hurricane Sandy? What about nutrition for women and children, also called WIC?

We need to compromise on these and other major programs, just like for the FAA. We need Republicans to come to the table for the benefit of the people.

Wouldn't it be great if we could finally repeal sequestration?

GROWING JOBS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, just a few hours ago we had an opportunity to welcome the President of South Korea to this great body to listen to her words about how America, through not only our foreign policy but also with our United States military, helped South Korea to overcome the forces of Communism from the north and from China.

We heard the President speak about the economic growth and vitality of her people, of the Korean people who want more and better friendship with America. But the underlying theme was economic freedom—freedom for her people, freedom for people to make their own decisions. This is consistent with the message that we heard from the last head of a foreign government speaker we had, from Mexico, who spoke about how Mexico is going to aim for GDP growth of 6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we here in America catch on to what our allies are doing all across the globe, and that is seeking economic freedom, economic growth, and jobs for all of their people. We should be doing the same thing in this country. Mr. Speaker, that's why the Republican Party is trying to grow jobs and make sure life is better for Americans now.

STUDENT AID EXPANSION ACT

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the last 4 months, I have been proud to work towards building out what I have called the Infrastructure of Opportunity for our Nation. Recently, I had the opportunity to file legislation to reinforce one of the major cornerstones of that infrastructure: access to colleges and universities.

A few weeks ago, I filed the Student Aid Expansion Act of 2013 that will provide higher education students increased access to affordable financial aid. As we've all witnessed across our districts, the cost of tuition continues to rise. In Texas, for example, tuition and fees at public institutions have increased over 90 percent since 2003.

Meanwhile, students and families are left looking for ways to keep their higher education affordable. Over the last 10 years, we have seen students rely more heavily on loans to finance their education. Fifty-two percent of direct student aid now comes in the form of loans.

The Student Aid Expansion Act of 2013 would remove barriers that are currently preventing our institutions of higher education from promoting affordable, State-based alternatives. These types of loans are zero interest and can be fully forgiven if a student does well in school. Importantly, this legislation will not cost Federal, State, or local governments a single dime.

SUPPORT UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it has now been more than 2 months since mindless sequestration across-the-board cuts were enacted, crippling so many important services and benefits that Americans rely on, such as Social Security processing at Social Security offices around this country.

Well, there's another very important earned benefit that's being cut—unemployment benefits. Republicans keep rewarding the superrich while cutting unemployment benefits. When you cut benefits, you not only hurt men and women who are looking for work, you actually hurt economic recovery.

Fact: unemployment checks pump money back into local communities, helping the economy to recover. Where does the money go? Groceries, gasoline, school clothing, rent payments, basics.

The U.S. Department of Labor, during the Bush administration, found that every dollar spent on unemployment benefits pumped $2 back in to the local economy. It's a good deal. Therefore, sequestration cuts in unemployment compensation inflict pain not only on jobless families, but also harms economic growth in a major way.

I call on my Republican colleagues to come to the table, compromise, reverse the mindless sequester that is cutting unemployment benefits. Let's celebrate Mother's Day by paying workers their full earned benefits, not imposing more worry on the unemployed among America's working families.

□ 1240

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak against H.R. 1406, misnamed the Working Families Flexibility Act.

Feeding a family, paying our bills, and making sure that our kids have what they need, for most of us, those are the core things that we worry about each month, and they all involve money.

However, H.R. 1406, which would be more appropriately named the Working Families Get Less Act, does nothing for those working families who are

struggling to make ends meet. The bill fails to recognize that people usually work overtime because they need the money.

The legislation essentially ends overtime pay by allowing an employer to give time off instead. Supporters say it gives working mothers more flexibility because they would have the option of spending their time at home—that's the flexibility.

But no matter how you slice it, you cannot feed a family with time off. Every hour of work matters to a family's bottom line. It's a factor in food and clothing and keeping a roof over your head.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill that takes the money out of the pockets of working women and families in Texas and across the country.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 807, FULL FAITH AND CREDIT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 202 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 202

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 807) to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Camp of Michigan or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 202 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 807. This rule provides for discussion opportunities for Members of the minority and the majority to participate in this debate.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to guarantee the full faith and credit of the United States for generations to come by ensuring that our Nation will never default on our debt obligations.

Functionally, H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act of 2013, ensures that the Treasury Department will continue to make payments on the principal and interest of our debt, including debt held by the Social Security trust fund, in the event that the statutory debt limit is reached. Requiring the Treasury to make good on its obligations to the Social Security trust fund will ensure that those funds are available to honor our commitment to seniors and disabled Americans.

Moreover, H.R. 807 provides certainty to investors, small businesses, retirees, pension beneficiaries, and international markets that we will never negatively impact our economy by allowing this Nation to default on its debts.

In the larger sense, it is our opportunity to engage, in a public forum, the Treasury Department and the administration on what we believe is the right way to engage in discussions about how we will move forward in uncharted territories as it's dealing with the financial difficulties of our country.

However, today's debate is symptomatic of the larger problem. For far too long, our Federal Government has spent too much money and borrowed too much. We have spent money and not listened to the American people, nor looked ahead at the consequences of spending too much, saving too little, and not creating jobs that will help to sustain the American Dream, the next generation, and the systems which we hold so dear to the American system.

House Republicans however, today, come to the floor, under the leadership of our great Ways and Means Chairman, DAVE CAMP, and some ideas that have come from Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK of California, and we are working on ideas with commonsense solutions to cut wasteful spending, reform entitlement programs, and balance the budget in a way that furthers our country, strengthens what we do, and makes sure we are ready for tomorrow.

Yet at almost every turn, including yesterday, up in the Rules Committee upstairs, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have opposed progrowth agendas and pushed for higher taxes and more spending. It happens almost every single day, every single bill that we bring before the Rules Committee, a demand to increase spending and increase taxes.

Our Nation does not have a taxing problem. It has a spending problem; and until we enact meaningful reforms, we will not improve our dire financial dilemma and the circumstances that come with trying to manage a problem instead of a growth opportunity to make our country stronger.

Today, the American economy is struggling and has been struggling now in our fifth year to regain momentum and is burdened by massive amounts of Federal spending and Federal debt. Allowing our Nation to default would severely hinder what little growth there is, potentially causing the U.S. to slip back into another recession and risk another downgrading of our credit rating.

For these reasons, default is unacceptable; and that is why House Republicans, we think weeks, perhaps months ahead of trying to finally address this issue, we think it's time that our ideas are on the floor of the House of Representatives, talking openly, not just among ourselves and with the administration, but also the American people. And that is the purpose of us being here today.

House Republicans are willing to work with our colleagues in the Senate, as well, and also at the White House; and we'd like to find a compromise that would raise the debt limit, while simultaneously enacting meaningful legislation that will fix our Nation's broken tax system.

We need to create jobs through job enrichment, through a Tax Code that is vibrant and does not harm job creation, that does not do things that would cause people to want to not invest in this country because of taxes that are out of control and spending that harms their business.

So we want to rein in our out-of-control spending and reform our ballooning entitlement programs to preserve them for generations to come. It should be our responsibility.

We, as Members of Congress, were elected by the people, and we should be able to come and face tough issues with good answers. We should not try and scare people back home. We should be able to tell the truth about the legislation, and we need to be honest about the circumstances of the pathway that we remain on because of our President's and the Democrats' agenda.

So, unfortunately, President Obama has already stated that he is unwilling to negotiate with the House or the Senate over the debt limit.

□ 1250

It is this President when he was a Senator who voted repeatedly against a debt limit increase, called it irresponsible and a lack of leadership; and yet today he says just give him all the power, he'll take care of this himself. As such, the bill before us today is a necessary and prudent safety net designed to avoid economic calamity

should we reach the debt limit and not have resolved that between the House, the Senate, and the President.

I applaud Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK, my dear friend from California, and our great young chairman from Michigan, DAVE CAMP, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Each of them brings their work product to the floor today, as well as many of our other colleagues such as my Rules Committee member, the young man from Orlando, Florida, DAN WEBSTER, who brought forth ideas that would help shape not only the legislation that we have today, but the desire of the Republican conference to make sure that we continue to talk about the issues and problems that we see before they become a crisis, before they become something that is unworkable and rather to share our great ideas now. So for the timeless work on this issue, I thank all three of them for working on this bill today.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes.'' I encourage them to vote ''yes'' on the rule, I encourage them to be thoughtful and truthful about the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I really begin, I want to make clear that what the President said in his statement of disapproval and veto, that he would not negotiate over this foolish bill, that he was not going to negotiate what to do if we go into default because his intent, as well as the intent of the Democratic Party, is not to default.

It's right honest, but instead of really talking about today lifting the debt limit, we're going to discuss the usual do-nothing legislative agenda: let's fiddle while Rome burns and pass a one-House bill that the Senate will never touch and the President will never see, which is what we do here once, sometimes twice, a week.

But today, I think they've really outdone themselves. Instead of wasting time on a bill that can be characterized as redundant like we do the 35, 36 times that we vote against health care, the majority is now considering legislation that treads into the realm of the precarious.

Regardless of whether the legislation before us is approved by this Chamber, the very fact that the majority is proposing policies to manage the economic default is by itself a threat to our economy. Both the Treasury and outside experts have made clear that picking and choosing which debts we pay is legally questionable and logistically impossible.

The President has, as my colleague said, warned that in the highly unlikely event that this bill reaches his desk, he will unequivocally veto it. But instead of listening to this fact, the majority is moving ahead with a proposal and a debate that puts us on the road to default. They do so even as The Washington Post reports this morning that the economy is improving, revenues are up and spending is down, which undermines the stream of doom that we hear. But today the irresponsible actions of the majority are, once again, needlessly encouraging the economic recovery.

Let me be clear: the legislation does not raise the debt ceiling, which is the only way to take away the threat of default; but, instead, the bill guarantees that when we hit the debt ceiling, our foreign creditors and the Social Security trust fund will be paid in full while the well-being of millions of Americans—vendors and people we owe legitimate debts to—are left to chance.

Under this legislation, the majority is actively putting the interests of China before millions of Americans, including Active military servicemembers, veterans, and even the men and women who clean the floors of the Capitol and fold napkins in the Members' dining room. Every single one of these citizens relies upon their paycheck and upon the United States Government to pay the debts in order to put the food on their tables and to make ends meet.

With today's bill, the majority is proposing that the welfare of these Americans be left to chance while they protect China and foreign bondholders from the threat of default. In addition, the majority is endangering the regular payments owed to infrastructure projects, food safety inspectors, education programs, and public health research. It is a reckless plan that would directly hurt the most vulnerable members of society who already struggle in the sequestration to get by.

Furthermore, the act of choosing whom we will repay when we default on our debt is in and of itself an act that will threaten to throw our economy back into recession. During the recent hearing of the Committee on Ways and Means, the MIT economist Simon Johnson warned that if we default on even a portion of our debt, the unemployment rate would more than double, countless companies would go out of business, and investors would flee the United States.

Meanwhile, The Economist magazine has written:

> Failure to raise the debt ceiling would force immediate spending cuts equal to 6 percent of GDP. Not only would that threaten to send the economy back into recession; it would also deprive doctors, pensioners, contractors, and millions of others the money needed to meet their own obligations and set off a chain reaction of defaults. Even a few days' default would roil the global financial system which relies on Treasuries in countless transactions. The mere possibility could incite skittish investors to dump their holdings, driving up interest rates.

Tony Fratto, a former spokesperson for President George W. Bush, said:

> Prioritization is impossible. Is the government really going to be in the position of withholding benefits, salaries, rent, contractual payments, and so forth in order to pay off Treasury bondholders? That would be a political catastrophe.

It should be clear by now that the act of even bringing a bill such as this to the floor for debate can scare investors and endanger our economy. This type of economic brinksmanship is extremely dangerous. The majority's games are compounded by their uninterest in repealing the sequester. As we speak, the sequester is preventing thousands of cancer patients from receiving lifesaving treatment and keeping thousands more children from receiving the education—I think 70,000 is the figure—through the Head Start program. These are some of the devastating cuts that don't go away simply because the majority refuses to take action and repeal the sequester in full.

Tragically, the majority's willingness to endanger our economy is not new. In August of 2011, the majority headed down the road to default for the first time in our history by threatening to default on our debts. Despite the opportunity to reach compromise with the administration, the majority claimed a zero-sum political game that had serious consequences. And because of their actions, August 2011 was the worst month for job creation in 3 years. The Dow Jones Industrial Average plunged 2,000 points, and our Nation's credit rating was downgraded for the very first time. The effects were very real and very dangerous. A responsible legislative body would never head down that road again a second time. But that's exactly what we're doing here today.

For more than 225 years, this Chamber has been dedicated to preserving the order and stability of our government even in the most partisan of times. Despite their differences, generation after generation of legislators has known that when it comes to the integrity of our Nation, we must succeed together or else fall alone.

Dangerously in the last 2 years, the majority has taken step after step to undermine the central pillar of our government, including the proposal that they put forward today. We've frequently done so through a closed legislative process. And while the majority states that today's legislation is moving forward under a structured rule, it is only structured for the Members of the majority.

For the second time this week, the majority is bringing forth a rule that denies consideration of a single Democrat amendment. As a result, we debate a dangerous proposal and one that puts the interests of China before the welfare of the American people and the economic stability of the United States.

Yesterday, the Speaker of the House was asked if the proposal laid before us would indeed pay China before paying U.S. troops. He admitted that it would and said:

> Listen, those who have loaned us money, like in any other proceeding, if you will,

court proceeding, the bondholders usually get paid first. The same thing here.

That simple statement tells us what we need to know.

□ 1300

I refuse to put China's interests before the interests of the American people, and I refuse to sit silently as the majority moves us one step closer to default.

I urge my colleagues to please vote ''no'' on today's rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, one of the Members of Congress that I spoke about that not only brought pieces of this legislation to the Ways and Means Committee but really as part of the debate for our conference and to the American people is our next speaker.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Elk Grove, California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule to bring the Full Faith and Credit Act to the House floor.

I had hoped that amidst all the controversies gripping this Congress that certainly we should at least be able to agree that the full faith and credit of the United States Government should not hang in the balance every time there's a fiscal debate in Washington. Unfortunately, even so commonsense a proposition as this cannot produce a consensus in today's Congress.

This bill simply guarantees the debt of the United States. No matter what political storms are raging in Washington, the public credit must be maintained. Yet this President and his followers—who have taken our Nation on the biggest borrowing binge in its history, who have run up more debt than almost all of his predecessors put together—oppose this commonsense attempt to assure credit markets that whatever else happens in Washington, their loans to this government are absolutely safe.

You know, most States have had similar provisions in their laws or constitutions guaranteeing their debt for generations. Last year, in testimony to the Senate, Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke praised these State provisions for maintaining confidence in State and municipal markets. He told our own House Budget Committee that a similar measure at the Federal level would help protect our Nation against the threat of default.

The President and his followers argue that this is somehow an excuse for not paying our other obligations. What absolute nonsense. I challenge them to name one Member of Congress who has ever suggested that this measure is an acceptable alternative to not paying our other bills.

Their reliance on this falsehood is a measure of the bankruptcy of their argument. Do they actually suggest that all of these other States—that have guaranteed their sovereign debts for many generations—have ever used these guarantees as an excuse not to pay their other bills? On the contrary, by providing clear and unambiguous mandates to protect their credit first, they actually support and maintain their ability to pay for all of their other obligations.

The gentlelady from New York puts forth the argument that this measure would put foreign creditors ahead of programs serving Americans. Well, I would remind her that public credit is what makes possible all of the other programs of this government, from paying our troops to seniors' health care. Without it, we cannot pay our other bills.

I would also remind her that most of the public debt is held by Americans—much of it through American pension funds. China holds less than 10 percent. So the overwhelming effect of this measure is to protect the investments that Americans have made in their own government while protecting the credit that supports every other expenditure of this government, including our troops.

In its original form, this measure restated the already existing authority of the Treasury Department to prioritize the other obligations in order to assure prompt and full payment of the debt, and added a mandate requiring it to do so. The committee's much simpler and more practical approach directs the Treasury Secretary to pay the debt, even if it means temporarily borrowing outside the debt limit in order to do so. I want to thank it for this improvement, which I gratefully acknowledge and wholeheartedly endorse.

Let me say this again: no one advocates that this government delay paying any of its bills, and this legislation does no such thing. Indeed, this measure protects our ability to pay all of our other bills because paying those bills depends on maintaining the Nation's credit.

But given the precarious nature of our Nation's finances, principle disputes over how the debt limit is addressed are going to happen from time to time. I remember just a few years ago when then-Senator Barack Obama vigorously opposed increasing the debt limit sought by the Bush administration. Well, I've never equated Mr. Obama's opposition to the debt limit increase as anything other than a principled and well-placed concern over the proper management of our finances. It's sad that he cannot grant the motives of his opposition the same courtesy.

But when these controversies erupt—as they inevitably will do in a free society—it is imperative that credit markets are supremely confident that their loans are secure.

So I say this a third time: an impasse on the debt limit is something much to be avoided because it could do enormous damage to our Nation's prestige and its prosperity. But there is one thing that could do even more damage than delaying payments on our other bills, and that is the threat of a default on our sovereign debt. This measure takes that threat off the table. It assures credit markets that their investments in the United States are as certain as anything that can be had in this life.

Mr. Speaker, let us pass this rule and proceed with consideration of the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. LEVIN. You know, when you boil this all down, essentially what this bill says is pay some bills first and not others. I came here because, if the rule passes, we'll have a full discussion tomorrow, but I wanted to share with everybody the story that I saw this morning. It's accurate.

The headline is: ''John Boehner on Debt Ceiling: Let's Pay China First, Then U.S. Troops.'' That headline in Huff Post is based on an interview with the Speaker on Bloomberg TV by Peter Cook. I quote Mr. Cook:

> Doesn't it mean, as Democrats have suggested, that you're basically choosing to pay China before you pay U.S. troops?
>
> The Speaker: Listen, those who have loaned us money, like in any other proceeding, if you will, court proceeding, the bondholders usually get paid first. Same thing here.

Then the Speaker says, to conclude his comments as to the Administration:

> If it comes to the point where they don't have enough money to pay the bills, here is some order that we think is sound.

It's not sound. As the SAP says, it's not workable. It endangers our economy. I quote Keith Hennessey, a former Bush administration economist:

> It would be the first step to becoming a banana republic. A bloody mess.

As mentioned earlier by our distinguished ranking member on the Rules Committee, another Bush administration official, Tony Fratto, said:

> Prioritization is impossible. Is the government really going to be in the position of withholding benefits, salaries, rent, contract payments in order to pay off Treasury bondholders?

Almost half, by the way, are held by foreigners. So it isn't sound also to choose some over others. So I just wanted to go through the list, if I might, so everybody understands essentially what this is saying.

China and other bondholders first, not American troops in harm's way.

China first, not retired and disabled veterans.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEVIN. China first, not doctors and hospitals treating Medicare patients.

China first, not American small businesses who provide goods and services.

China and others first, not school lunch programs.

China and others first, not universities doing medical research.

China and other bondholders first, not college students who earn Pell Grants, or taxpayers due refunds, or other Federal trust funds holding Treasury bonds—for example, Medicare trust funds, deposit insurance, highway and airport trust funds, and the Federal Housing Authority.

□ 1310

In a word, this is irresponsible. Default is default is default. The Republicans are playing with fire, I think, to gain political leverage. Instead, they should think of the national interest.

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

We've had an opportunity once again today, as we did yesterday, to hear from the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Michigan. He brought his ideas, the best ideas he had, up to the Rules Committee yesterday on this same issue.

But the issues that the gentleman speaks about are attacking our answers. Their answer that they propose is tax increases and spending increases, and that way we'll simply have more money into the system. Because as we've already heard today just a few minutes ago, the more money we give in unemployment compensation, the more vitality is in our cities, more spending takes place, more unemployment compensation, more vitality, more spending in our cities.

Mr. Speaker, that's the wrong way to go. The Republican Party does not believe that we should create a permanent underclass of people who receive unemployment compensation or who are afraid of facing the truth about where this country is headed.

The facts of the case are other countries are ahead of us on this curve. Most of them are in Europe, and they ignored the signs that Republicans are here talking about today, the signs of spending too much, relying on its people to raise taxes for them to bring money in, and a big government continuing to put rules and regulations and impediments in front of people.

The facts of the case are simple. We are here today because it is President Obama and the Democrats who spent too much money, who are destroying jobs, and who even today are holding back the Keystone pipeline, what could be thousands of jobs for people in this country, lessen our reliance on other parts of the world for our energy, and bring back American-made jobs. This is exactly why we are having problems.

So, it's the Republican Party that is trying to offer a public discussion, a public debate, including our great Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, who says we need to make sure that part of the debate comes down to, if we get to that point, that we pay back the people who loaned us money in the first place. They need to have confidence that they can continue loaning us money because we are still having to borrow a lot of money.

I can think of few things that would be worse than to publicly announce we are going to pay somebody else before we pay back our creditors. That is how creditors no longer lend any money to you.

So, what Republicans are doing is having a public debate. We are bringing this to the floor. And I do recognize our friends on the other side, our Democrat friends, that they want to spend more and tax more. They have never seen enough spending in this place. They want more and more. They are like our President—they have an insatiable appetite to spend people's money. And then, like, literally, somebody who started a fire, is an arsonist, show up as the firefighter, the hero, to say, but I want to save our country.

They created the economic malaise that we have. It is overspending, it's holding back job creation, and Republicans are going to stand on the floor and have this debate with the media and the American people and the administration and say, let's know what we are going to do when we get there months ahead of time so that we don't falter like we did some time ago, and take on the President's idea again of sequestration only to have him argue against his own idea later and then try to mislead the American public what this whole issue is about. It's about the economic demise of the United States of America and how we are having to work here to make sure that we publicly discuss this before it becomes too late.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California, one of our impressive freshmen, Mr. HUFFMAN.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the impossibly misnamed Full Faith and Credit Act, a bill which would actually make a mockery of our country's full faith and credit. It prepares our country for default by prioritizing payments to Wall Street and foreign governments over nearly every other national obligation.

We've seen the disastrous effects on our credit rating, our stock market, and our economic recovery when Congress plays political games with the debt ceiling, but here we go again.

Why would my colleagues across the aisle prioritize paying the Chinese Government over paying our troops in Afghanistan? What about air traffic controllers, FBI investigators, disabled veterans, small businesses who contract with the government, doctors who treat Medicare patients? This bill says it's okay to stiff all of them, as long as Chinese bondholders are paid in full.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to move forward with House-Senate negotiations on a final budget resolution that strengthens the economy and avoids default. That's what we've been asking Speaker BOEHNER to do. Instead of taking that responsible step, we are here today considering a bill that will take us closer to the brink of economic chaos.

For the sake of American workers and businesses, I urge my colleagues to reject this dangerous bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Once again, the dominant theme from our friends on the other side seems to be China first, this pays China first. That's the constant refrain we're hearing.

Let me again remind them, China holds about 10 percent of our debt; Americans hold more than half of it. All of our spending from this government depends on maintaining our credit.

That means whoever is loaning us money, whether China or Timbuktu, whether it's the Teamsters pension fund or a child's savings bond that they've gotten for their birthday, we are borrowing over a quarter of everything that we spend. If we cannot borrow, if the confidence of the credit markets is ever compromised, this whole house of cards collapses around us, a house of cards constructed by this administration's profligate borrowing.

Our credit is now bearing a greater burden and strain that it has ever borne before. All this measure suggests is that we should at least reinforce that credit with exactly the same guarantees that most of our States have successfully employed for generations and, I would remind my friend from California, California has had in its Constitution for over 100 years.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I'm opposed to the rule, and I'm opposed to the Pay China First bill. It is my understanding that they've added something, I think it's called the Camp amendment, that would make sure that Members of Congress are not paid if the Nation, in fact, defaults. This borrows an idea that I introduced back in the summer of 2011, H.R. 2653. We had a number of bipartisan cosponsors.

I'm worried, though, that despite imitation being the sincerest form of flattery they've diluted this concept to make it unconstitutional. Due to the 27th Amendment, it is unconstitutional to adjust Member pay during a session. We had it drafted so that Members would be paid last, which would pretty much ensure that we would not be paid. Perhaps they've corrected the drafting on their side.

□ 1320

They've also done this to me once before this year. They took our no budget-no pay idea that the No Labels

group had sponsored, which has now become law, but they took out the heart of it. Right now, we should be having a House-Senate conference since both Houses have finally passed legislation. The Senate being the laggard, now after 4 years, they've finally passed a budget, but now we're refusing to conference the budget.

I am a believer in pay-for-performance. The American taxpayers are not getting their money's worth from today's Congress. They should be getting their money's worth, and I think these concepts about penalizing Congress when we fail to do our job are very powerful concepts; but they should be given full strength, not diluted and unconstitutional treatment in a quicky amendment such as is being offered here. The core idea of pay-for-performance I hope that more of my colleagues will look at because Congress does many things right, and we should be rewarded for that. We fail in many ways, and we should be penalized for that.

Today, sadly, the only people in America who are not able to pay Congress by performance are the taxpayers. Those special interests are paying us by performance all the time whether in PAC contributions or in post-retirement job opportunities. That is one reason this Congress is not performing to full capability. It is one reason we are not living up to our potential. So, as we look at this concept, at this Camp amendment, please let's do it right. Please, let's make sure that Congress is not paid for failure.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge Mr. COOPER's presence here today. His idea was valid and, in fact, was utilized in what we have done.

The slight difference of how I'd like to describe this to the gentleman is: we did not say that Members cannot be paid. What we said is that no new debt can be used to pay Members. So, if we're spending 40 percent too much money today and if 60 percent were coming in, we could be paid out of that amount, but we could not be paid out of the debt-side amount, which is what this legislation is about and why this legislation is germane.

I do thank the gentleman. I thank the gentleman for his idea that Members of Congress should equally suffer or equally gain as the American people have. In this circumstance, it's a loss for all of us, and that is why Chairman CAMP included this as an amendment. It was to make sure that we clarified: As part of this bill, Members of Congress could not be paid with new debt that was being brought to the United States.

So I hope that clarifies not only the success that we believe that Mr. COOPER brought with his ideas but also the intent of what this legislation actually does, what we spoke about in the Rules Committee and the fine line between paying a Member and whether it comes from new debt or whether it comes from operating entities that would be within the 60 percent that would not be the new debt. I hope this clarifies not only what we are trying to do but that we speak forthrightly to Members about what this legislation actually is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Article I, section 8.1:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Now Amendment 14, section 4:

> The validity of the public debt of the United States . . . including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services . . . shall not be questioned.

But that's precisely what the Republican Party, the Republican majority, is doing today. I have many friends on the Republican side of the aisle whom I respect, but I've never been as disappointed in them as I am today.

''Pari passu.'' That means ''equal.'' The United States of America, for 235 years, has treated all of its creditors equally. If you're the landlord, if you get a salary, if you mow the lawn on the National Mall, you get paid at the same time that somebody who loans money to the United States gets paid. Everybody gets paid. That's how we treat it. We don't treat it that China or Wall Street or Saudi Arabia, because they've loaned us money, gets paid before the nurse working in one of our VA hospitals. That's not America. That is wrong. That is not how we run our country. It is unconstitutional.

I'd say to my friends that this short, little bill of yours to prioritize our debts is exactly the wrong thing to do. If I were a credit-rating agency, I'd say, if you're prioritizing your debts, you're getting ready to not pay somebody. Everybody is treated equally. If I were that credit rating agency, I would downgrade us today.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I'd say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, to the majority party: Don't do this. This is wrong. This is not our Nation.

We have built this Nation on equality, and that includes the equality of payment. Whether you're a landlord or if you work for the country or if you're a veteran, whatever it may be, you get paid. That's how we operate it.

We in this Congress have the ability not only to raise the revenue that's needed to do that but to manage our expenses, but we don't stiff anybody. So I'd say to my friends: Withdraw this bill now. It is bad legislation. It is wrong for this Nation. Get rid of it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the Member from the Fifth District of Texas, the gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for yielding, Mr. Speaker.

I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who has been, perhaps, the most cogent defender of the Constitution on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and who has provided his leadership today to ensure that we do not have default on sovereign debt but that we put this Nation on a path to fiscal sanity, and I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the folks in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, whom I'm proud to represent, have a lot of insecurity about their personal economy, and they have great fear that their children will not enjoy a brighter future.

I heard my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, say that everyone gets paid. Well, maybe that's part of the problem. Maybe that is one of the reasons under President Obama's leadership there has been more debt created in the last 4 years than in our Nation's first 200. We are awash in debt. We know that we have a debt, not because we have insufficient taxes, but because we spend too much. Math is a pesky thing.

In the last 10 years, the Department of Ag: up 114 percent; HUD: up 61 percent; HHS: up 79 percent. Our total government spending has increased 70 percent; and measured by median family income, the family budget, which has to pay for the Federal budget, it is down 6 percent.

Now, some have said, You know, revenues are a problem. Well, revenues are up 52 percent, but you can't raise taxes enough to chase the spending that the Democrats and the President want to foist upon the American people. They have put us on a path to national bankruptcy. At some point, we've got to quit spending money we don't have. Again, we are on the precipice of a debt crisis, and we have it because of too much spending.

To some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, their answer to the debt ceiling is to get rid of it. Some have introduced legislation just to get rid of the debt ceiling.

□ 1330

That's kind of like, Mr. Speaker, a fire breaks out in your home and your response is to unplug the smoke detector because of that nuisance noise in the background that maybe your house is on fire. I would remind my friends on the other side of the aisle, Greece didn't have a debt ceiling vote, and yet we have Democrats who say, No, let's just get rid of it.

But for those who believe that we're not going to get rid of it, we have other friends from across the aisle who essentially want to use it as a hostage for

something that is not a debt. A debt is when you go out and you borrow money and you must pay it back. Every family understands this. It's one thing for an American family to borrow money to pay their mortgage versus borrowing money so that they can pay for a Las Vegas vacation that they would like to take. They are not equivalent.

Mr. Speaker, paying sovereign debt is not the same thing as borrowing money so that this institution and this town can continue to spend money for pottery classes in Morocco, to pay for the travel expenses of the Alabama Watermelon Queen, to pay for robotic squirrels and all the rest of the lunacy that this Federal Government spends and in the end takes bread off the table of hardworking American families.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the President has this power, but he says, No, I don't have this power. So I find it ironic that we're willing to codify what we already believe to be the law of the land, and the President says, No, I want to veto that. Again, he wants to use this as a hostage.

This is a very simple bill introduced by the gentleman from California to require our Treasury to make good on all of our debt payments. That's it. We must stop borrowing money to squander our children's future. This bill will help us do this.

But the Democrats, they don't want to take this specter of default off the table. It's the only way they can continue spending. They say they do. If they do, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing their name up on the big board soon.

This is the right thing and the smart thing to do, and I urge that the House, adopt this rule and adopt the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to talk about what it is we're trying to pay for on our side:

Pay and benefits for 1.4 million active duty troops and 780,000 troops in reserves will not be paid while China is paid;

Benefits to 3.4 million disabled veterans;

1.3 million veterans receiving education or home purchasing assistance;

Earned payments to American small businesses;

Payments to 1.1 million doctors and health care practitioners who provide care to seniors with Medicare;

Payments to schools for nutritious lunches served to 32 million children;

Payments to 44,000 National Institutes of Health grantees.

With that, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would raise the debt ceiling, but only insofar as necessary and only for the purpose of paying our debts to China and to Social Security.

Not raising the debt ceiling beyond what this bill does would mandate not paying Medicare beneficiaries or our troops overseas or our veterans here at home or anyone owed money for working for the Federal Government and would generally collapse the economy by forcing default on most of our debts.

Raising the debt ceiling merely allows us to pay debts we have previously incurred—all debts previously incurred. We should recognize this simple reality by eliminating the debt ceiling and passing responsible budgets. But Republicans now use the debt ceiling to hold the entire country hostage unless the demands that they haven't figured out yet are met. This reminds me of a 1930s gangster film: it's a nice restaurant you've got over there; it's a nice economy you've got over there; pity if it should happen to blow up if you don't meet our demands.

This Republican tactic has already brought about the first downgrade in the U.S. credit rating in history and has brought about brutal spending cuts that have punished the middle class, failed to help the millions of Americans looking for work, and weakened the safety net for working families and seniors.

Mr. Speaker, it was two wars and two Bush tax cuts and 8 years of irresponsibility that brought us the deficit in the last budget adopted under George Bush of 10.1 percent of GDP. We have reduced that budget deficit in 3 years from 10.1 percent of GDP to 4.8 percent today. This is the fastest deficit reduction since the demobilization after World War II.

Economists agree that the draconian austerity decreed by the sequester is slowing our economic growth, eliminating millions of jobs, and could create a double-dip recession. We have seen this in Europe where, starting 2½ years ago, they adopted the policies the Republicans want. They adopted severe austerity and they cut budgets too much. The result is a double-dip recession. With their negative economic growth, we're still at positive economic growth.

We're hearing from our Republican friends today about how endangered our credit rating is. Our credit rating is so endangered, despite their frightening rhetoric, that we are paying the lowest interest rates on our bonds ever, and our bonds are selling higher. People are getting in line to buy our bonds because our credit rating is, in fact, quite good.

Yet, in spite of presenting the American people with a plan to invest in our economy and create jobs for the 12 million Americans looking for work, Republicans are once again intent on manufacturing a crisis that will only increase unemployment. We should not develop a plan for how to generate and then manage a devastating default that will put our economy into chaos; we should repeal the sequester, slow down our deficit reduction, spend the money on highways and bridges and infrastructure investing and putting our people back to work so that more people work, unemployment goes down, government spending and unemployment insurance and food stamps go down, and the economy improves and our unemployment also goes down. That's the proper path.

What the Republicans are trying to do would say, Don't do that. Follow the path of Europe. Get 12 percent or 15 percent unemployment. This bill would head us in that direction. That's not the direction we should be going.

We ought to safeguard our credit and not even contemplate the possibility of default.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 202 and H.R. 807 because the last time Congress did something this dumb it cost the American public $19 billion over the next 10 years. Why? Because our credit rating was downgraded for the first time in the history of the United States. Let's not do something like that again.

That does not help the economy, and it doesn't put anyone to work. All it does is make sure that everybody around the world who loves to buy American-backed paper just gets more money for it, which means more money out of the pockets of Americans for one reason and one reason only: to have the optics of politics of a bill like this that actually basically states that we are not going to back the paper that people buy.

That is something that is not within our American values. That's something that doesn't even need to see the light of day. And it's a shame that we would play politics with the American dollar and we would play politics with the reputation of this great country by having these two bills before us.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has any more requests for time?

Mr. SESSIONS. Except for my final close, I do not. And I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman.

Let me introduce the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, if we can defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to hold a vote on the Student Loan Relief Act.

If Congress doesn't act, next month undergraduate students across the country will see a hike in their student loan interest rates. If my Republican colleagues want to talk about debt priority, this should be a part of the dialogue.

To discuss the proposal, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question.

As the gentlelady said, defeat of the previous question will allow her to propose, instead, an amendment to the rule to a bill that intentionally degrades the full faith and credit of our country, sets that aside and instead allows for consideration of the Student Loan Relief Act, a measure which will prevent the subsidized Stafford student loan program from doubling in 53 days.

□ 1340

Let me again reiterate that point. On July 1, if Congress does not act, the subsidized Stafford student loan program, which provides student loan assistance to over 7 million young Americans, will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. We have heard a lot of talk on the floor here today about debt and about trying to protect the young people of this country. Well, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York recently issued its latest update regarding student loan debt in this country, which is now $1.1 trillion. It's higher than credit card debt, and it is higher than car loan debt.

When we talk about the challenges facing, particularly, young people in this country who are trying to get the opportunity to upgrade their skills, something that this recession has taught us painfully is necessary because the unemployment rate of people with high school degrees or less is three times as high as people with 4-year degrees, the fact of the matter is that the subsidized Stafford student loan program is a lifeline in terms of young people being able to pay the rising cost of tuition.

Despite the fact that we have a ticking clock of 53 days and only 24 session days scheduled between now and July 1, the majority has not brought a single proposal forward to avoid this catastrophe from happening to young people all across the country.

The Student Loan Relief Act, which I am the lead cosponsor of, has over 125 cosponsors here in the House, will extend the lower rate for 2 years, and will allow this Chamber to once and for all get its arms around this serious, critical problem for the future of this country. The fact of the matter is that the student loan debt issue requires a comprehensive rewrite of the Higher Education Authorization Act which will give tools to young people, starting in high school, to make better choices about where they go to school, how they're going pay for it, with better awareness and information. It would also allow people who have graduated to be able to refinance their debt so they can lower those monthly payments.

Again, talk to the Realtors in this country about what's holding back the housing market. Young people in their twenties and thirties who are carrying student loan debt of 60, 70, $80,000 are not in a position to go out and buy a house because they can't qualify for a mortgage because of these high payments.

It is time for Congress to focus on what people are really waking up in the morning thinking about and worrying about, which is how to pay for college.

Mr. Speaker, on May 1, we just celebrated decision day, which is the day when young people make the choice about where they're going to college. Unfortunately, they have no clue about whether or not their subsidized Stafford loan rate, which has been in place for the last 6 years, is going to continue beyond July 1.

It is time for this Chamber to focus on what's important for American families. Let's take up the Student Loan Relief Act. Let's pass a higher education authorization bill which deals with this issue from soup to nuts, and let's set aside this crazy bill which intentionally degrades the full faith and credit of our country.

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

The fact that this Chamber has dedicated valuable time and resources to the consideration of an unconstitutional bill that will put our Nation on the road to default is regretful. The fact that this legislation puts the economic interests of China before paying our soldiers' salaries and providing benefits to our veterans is a disgrace.

The plan presented by the majority fails to raise the debt ceiling, which is the only way that we can prevent economic default. Instead, it simply wastes another week of valuable time and the $24 million that it costs to run this House of Congress for a week and moves us that much closer to yet another downgrade in our Nation's credit rating, something that had never happened until this majority assumed control of the House. And now it is actually possible the majority would lead us to the second downgrade of the Nation's credit over the course of 2 short years.

On May 19, our Nation will reach its debt ceiling, and emergency measures would be put into place to delay default. We've seen this film before, and we know how the movie ends—a twisted plot with terrible consequences that come by refusing to pay our bills. I urge my colleagues not to walk down that road again.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues most enthusiastically to vote ''no'' to defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule. I would like to see this bill withdrawn.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I have been around this place a long time, and I've heard of people who did not read bills. I have heard of people who did not understand bills, but I have never seen a circumstance such as today where the truth was being held hostage.

The facts of the case are very simple. Republicans today are offering a mechanism to the President of the United States and the American people that says, if we do get in a circumstance where we do not extend our debt to further allow the Federal Government to buy more debt to pay its obligations, then we offer this opportunity, and that is that the government can, even when we're in a circumstance where we cannot borrow more money, and let's say we spend 60 percent that we get money in but 40 percent is the debt that we can no longer have available to pay our obligations, about a 60/40 split, then we're allowing the Federal Government to go borrow more debt to pay its obligations so that it doesn't compete against the money that does come in to pay the bills of the United States as the President of the United States would choose.

I've never heard of a more reasonable option. We're not telling the President how to spend the money. We're giving authorization for new debt to pay our debt obligations. That's not cutting people off. It's not truthful to say we're going to do that. Anybody that tells you that didn't read the bill.

What this is about is to say, if we go into a debt circumstance where we cannot come to an agreement, then we are authorizing the Federal Government, the Treasury, to go get more debt, only enough to pay debt obligations to where we do not default, and then we work on the circumstances of how much money comes in.

This has been miscast. The truth has been held hostage, and I am disappointed in Members of Congress who came down here and misled the American people about what this bill is. It is nothing more than allowing the Treasury to go borrow money to pay its already obligations to people who loaned us money. It says nothing about how they will pay normal bills to people. And to come to this floor and to suggest this is simply a disservice to the obligations I think that we have to be open and honest about what our job is.

I urge my colleagues to understand the simplification of what this bill is about, to not try to twist it to have it become something that it is not. I hope my colleagues will vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 202 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Amendment in the nature of a substitute:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That 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. 1595) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the 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. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in the first section of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1350

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1406.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 198, I call up the bill (H.R. 1406) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 198, the amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce printed in the bill is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 1406

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 "Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. COMPENSATORY TIME.

Section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(s) COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR PRIVATE EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—An employee may receive, in accordance with this subsection and in lieu of monetary overtime compensation, compensatory time off at a rate not less than one and one-half hours for each hour of employment for which overtime compensation is required by this section.

"(2) CONDITIONS.—An employer may provide compensatory time to employees under paragraph (1)(A) only if such time is provided in accordance with—

"(A) applicable provisions of a collective bargaining agreement between the employer and the labor organization that has been certified or recognized as the representative of the employees under applicable law; or

"(B) in the case of employees who are not represented by a labor organization that has been certified or recognized as the representative of such employees under applicable law, an agreement arrived at between the employer and employee before the performance of the work and affirmed by a written or otherwise verifiable record maintained in accordance with section 11(c)—

"(i) in which the employer has offered and the employee has chosen to receive compensatory time in lieu of monetary overtime compensation; and

"(ii) entered into knowingly and voluntarily by such employees and not as a condition of employment.

No employee may receive or agree to receive compensatory time off under this subsection unless the employee has worked at least 1,000 hours for the employee's employer during a period of continuous employment with the employer in the 12-month period before the date of agreement or receipt of compensatory time off.

"(3) HOUR LIMIT.—

"(A) MAXIMUM HOURS.—An employee may accrue not more than 160 hours of compensatory time.

"(B) COMPENSATION DATE.—Not later than January 31 of each calendar year, the employee's employer shall provide monetary compensation for any unused compensatory time off accrued during the preceding calendar year that was not used prior to December 31 of the preceding year at the rate prescribed by paragraph (6). An employer may designate and communicate to the employer's employees a 12-month period other than the calendar year, in which case such compensation shall be provided not later than 31 days after the end of such 12-month period.

"(C) EXCESS OF 80 HOURS.—The employer may provide monetary compensation for an employee's unused compensatory time in excess of 80 hours at any time after giving the employee at least 30 days notice. Such compensation shall be provided at the rate prescribed by paragraph (6).

"(D) POLICY.—Except where a collective bargaining agreement provides otherwise, an employer that has adopted a policy offering compensatory time to employees may discontinue such policy upon giving employees 30 days notice.

"(E) WRITTEN REQUEST.—An employee may withdraw an agreement described in paragraph (2)(B) at any time. An employee may also request in writing that monetary compensation be provided, at any time, for all compensatory time

accrued that has not yet been used. Within 30 days of receiving the written request, the employer shall provide the employee the monetary compensation due in accordance with paragraph (6).

''(4) PRIVATE EMPLOYER ACTIONS.—An employer that provides compensatory time under paragraph (1) to employees shall not directly or indirectly intimidate, threaten, or coerce or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any employee for the purpose of—

''(A) interfering with such employee's rights under this subsection to request or not request compensatory time off in lieu of payment of monetary overtime compensation for overtime hours; or

''(B) requiring any employee to use such compensatory time.

''(5) TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT.—An employee who has accrued compensatory time off authorized to be provided under paragraph (1) shall, upon the voluntary or involuntary termination of employment, be paid for the unused compensatory time in accordance with paragraph (6).

''(6) RATE OF COMPENSATION.—

''(A) GENERAL RULE.—If compensation is to be paid to an employee for accrued compensatory time off, such compensation shall be paid at a rate of compensation not less than—

''(i) the regular rate received by such employee when the compensatory time was earned; or

''(ii) the final regular rate received by such employee,

whichever is higher.

''(B) CONSIDERATION OF PAYMENT.—Any payment owed to an employee under this subsection for unused compensatory time shall be considered unpaid overtime compensation.

''(7) USE OF TIME.—An employee—

''(A) who has accrued compensatory time off authorized to be provided under paragraph (1); and

''(B) who has requested the use of such compensatory time,

shall be permitted by the employee's employer to use such time within a reasonable period after making the request if the use of the compensatory time does not unduly disrupt the operations of the employer.

''(8) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) the term 'employee' does not include an employee of a public agency; and

''(B) the terms 'overtime compensation' and 'compensatory time' shall have the meanings given such terms by subsection (o)(7).''.

SEC. 3. REMEDIES.

Section 16 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''(b) Any employer'' and inserting ''(b) Except as provided in subsection (f), any employer''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) An employer that violates section 7(s)(4) shall be liable to the employee affected in the amount of the rate of compensation (determined in accordance with section 7(s)(6)(A)) for each hour of compensatory time accrued by the employee and in an additional equal amount as liquidated damages reduced by the amount of such rate of compensation for each hour of compensatory time used by such employee.''.

SEC. 4. NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall revise the materials the Secretary provides, under regulations published in section 516.4 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, to employers for purposes of a notice explaining the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to employees so that such notice reflects the amendments made to such Act by this Act.

SEC. 5. SUNSET.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall expire 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 113–51, if offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today we have an opportunity to make life a little easier for working families across the country. This legislation doesn't create a new government program or bureaucracy. It doesn't spend taxpayer dollars or add to the national debt. The Working Families Flexibility Act simply removes an outdated Federal policy that denies private sector workers the flexibility they need to better balance family and work.

For 75 years, the Fair Labor Standards Act has provided covered workers with basic wage and hour protections. Those covered by the law receive time-and-a-half in paid compensation for each overtime hour worked. The law plays a significant role in millions of workplaces; yet it does not reflect the realities of the modern workforce.

For example, in 2011, 59 percent of families with children had two working parents, compared to 37 percent 40 years ago. Meanwhile, 8.5 million workers today are single parents, and one in three undergraduate students also works full-time.

Behind each statistic, Mr. Speaker, are men and women trying to juggle family and work; a single, working mom that needs extra time to attend a parent-teacher conference, a dad hoping to leave work early to catch his son's Little League game, a married couple working two jobs while raising a family and caring for an aging relative.

Supporting a family is about more than providing an income; it's about being there for one another. We know there are a lot of workers who would seize the opportunity to earn a few extra dollars, but others may welcome additional paid time off to spend with loved ones.

Shouldn't workers choose what's best for their families? Shouldn't workers choose?

Unfortunately, Federal law denies many private sector workers this fundamental choice. The law assumes everyone would choose more money in the bank over more time with family. To add insult to injury, public sector employees have enjoyed this benefit for decades; yet we continue to treat those in the private sector differently.

That's not fair, Mr. Speaker. It's not fair to millions of hardworking Americans. The Working Families Flexibility Act will remove this unnecessary barrier and allow private sector employers to offer employees the choice to accrue paid time off, or comp time, for working overtime. The bill does not change the 40-hour work week, and comp time would accrue at the same time-and-a-half rate as cash wages.

The legislation includes numerous protections to ensure the use of comp time is strictly, strictly, Mr. Speaker, voluntary, such as requiring a written agreement between the employer and employee, allowing workers to cash out their accrued comp time whenever they choose, retaining all enforcement remedies available under current law, and adding new protections to prevent coercion and intimidation.

At the heart of the legislation is worker choice. Workers choose whether to accept comp time. Workers choose when to cash out their accrued comp time, and workers choose when to use their paid time off, so long as they follow the same standard public sector employees do. Same standard, Mr. Speaker.

Americans sacrifice a lot to provide for their families. Let's get the Federal Government out of the way and give workers the flexibility they need to thrive at home and at work.

I urge my colleagues to support the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to this legislation, which, again, is no stranger, sadly, to this Congress. This is the fifth time that the majority party has introduced it, going back to 1997; and each time, the huge flaws in this legislation have resulted in its complete collapse in terms of getting anything close to real support through both Chambers and through the executive branch. And once again, it doesn't deserve that support in this case.

Despite the representations made in its title, that it promotes workers' flexibility, that it gives workers choice, the fact of the matter is, a closer examination of the bill shows the opposite is true.

The better way to describe this bill is the More Work, Pay Less bill because what it does is take the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act, which created a bright line to protect people's right to a 40-hour work week, and make sure that that next hour after 40 hours is paid for with the time-and-a-half of wages. And, again, that created the weekend in America. That created the time off that families have taken for granted as middle class Americans for decades.

What this bill does is it blurs that line; it creates total chaos in terms of trying to come up with a system to set up ground rules with a case-by-case contract, written contract, that's mandated by the language of the bill, and

then leaves it to the enforcement of State Labor Departments Wage and Hours Divisions, which are totally incapable of going into the tens of thousands of workplaces all across America and trying to figure out whether or not, in fact, the rules have been followed.

A closer examination of the bill shows, on page 8 of the bill, in lines 7–10, that, in fact, all these representations that the worker gets to choose are, in fact, not correct. At the end of the day, the employer has the right to veto any comp time that this bill has allowed to accrue over any period of time. So the notion that somehow a person has that choice to accumulate comp time and then be able to use it for a family vacation, or a family emergency, in fact, does not meet the actual plain language of the bill that is before us today.

And that is why organizations that represent working families, organizations that represent women, organizations that have been part of employment law for years and years and years in this country have resoundingly come out in opposition to this legislation. Over 160 various organizations of every stripe representing religious groups, women's groups, labor groups, groups that, again, deal with employment law have basically looked at this legislation for the fifth time and given it thumbs down.

□ 1400

The fact is we should do that. There's no question, however, that workers do, in fact, need more help in terms of making sure that the wages that have stagnated over the last three decades get more support. And families, again, are strained by the fact that those stagnating wages have required second jobs and multiple spouses in the workforce.

But the fact is that there are much better solutions than this legislation, the More Work Pay Less Act. In fact, what we should do is set up a standard for paid sick leave in this country so that a single parent waking up with a child whose temperature is over 100 degrees doesn't feel that they have no choice in terms of how to deal with that situation, that they have some guaranteed opportunity without losing the pay that they need to put food on the table or put gas in the tank, that they, in fact, have that choice which so many of us here as Members of Congress and our staffs certainly take for granted. We should apply the same standards in terms of sick pay that we enjoy to the working people of this country.

This bill doesn't do it. This bill does not meet that test. Again, it sets up a system that is completely unworkable and unenforceable. It butchers the Fair Labor Standards Act's bright line that has protected the American weekend for decades and decades in this country, and in the name of workplace flexibility, in fact, tips the scales of power within the American workforce, once again against the worker, against the employee, who basically for far too long has suffered in this economy.

We need better solutions. This is not the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I'm very, very pleased right now to yield 3 minutes to the author of this terrific piece of legislation, a member of the committee, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota, my chairman, for all of the hard work on this bill and the committee, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to sponsor this bill. And I can tell you, as a working mom, my husband, Riley, and I certainly relate to and understand the pulls on families that are juggling so much between their work life and their home life. If you talk to any working mom or dad, you'll hear them say things like, wouldn't it be nice to have flexibility to attend my son's soccer game, coach a tee ball team, take care of my aging parent, or be there to support my children at a time when one of the spouses is being deployed by our military.

These are all things that working moms and dads want to be a part of. Those that have elderly parents want to be there for their parents in their time of need. We can't legislate another hour in the workday, but we sure can give moms and dads a little bit of relief when it comes to flexibility in their workplace.

Under this bill, no worker could ever be forced—despite the claims of my colleagues on the other side—no worker could ever be forced to take time off, paid time off, just like no business would ever be forced to offer it. For some people, having paid time off is far more valuable than money.

The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that under the current law, the private sector doesn't enjoy the same privilege to offer this benefit to their workers as the public sector does. And as my colleague was just talking about sick time, sick leave, and the benefits that we may enjoy in the Federal Government, I think that the private sector should enjoy the benefit that Federal employees have now, and that's compensatory time and the right to choose what to do with their time.

Our message to Americans, Mr. Speaker, is very clear. We must get Washington out of the way of how they use their time. It is your time to choose.

All existing enforcement remedies under the current law are retained; but this legislation goes above and beyond to incorporate additional protections that will prevent coercion and ensure utilizing comp time is truly voluntary, including a requirement of a written agreement, a voluntary written agreement between the employer and the employee, a cash-out provision entitling the employee to ask for their paid overtime at any time, and a provision requiring employers to be found in violation of coercion to pay double damages.

I want to read—I have lots of quotes from constituents, but there is one in particular that sums all of this up. I got a note from a young lady who lives a long way from Alabama's Second Congressional District, in California; and she writes:

> As a kid growing up with both parents who worked, I missed a lot of time with them. I am also an only child so I didn't really spend time with my actual family. I was either in daycare or a friend's house during the 5-day workweek. And if my mom took time off, she wouldn't get paid over that time period——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Mrs. ROBY.

> I didn't really spend time with my actual family. I was either in daycare or a friend's house during the 5-day workweek. And if my mom took time off, she wouldn't get paid over that time period, even though she would work overtime. So when I read about this bill, I was touched and compelled to tell you that if this bill passes it really would change people's lives and help families around America. Thank you for recognizing how valuable time is to people, and for giving us an option of how to use our time.

I thought that was compelling. Mr. Speaker, I think that sums up this bill in its entirety. This doesn't solve our Nation's debt problems or our deficit, but this provides some relief to working families in America, to those working moms and dads.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege now to yield 2 minutes to the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mrs. ROBY and I are friends, but we have a very substantial disagreement about this bill.

I call it the Pay Working Families Less bill because what it will result in is a cut in pay for almost everybody. Yes, there will be those who will volunteer who can afford to do comp time. Others will not be. And so they will not be able to earn overtime because the employer will invariably—not because they're bad people—but will invariably go to the person that will, in fact, do it for free.

I understand it's comp time, but they won't get paid. Most workers at this level need the pay. They need to pay their mortgage, they need to pay their car payment, and they need to send their kids to school. It would, of course, be cheaper to run a business if we didn't pay people at all. But it wouldn't be America.

Mr. Speaker, today in the House it's deja vu all over again. This bill has been here before. In 2003 it was pulled

from the floor. Why? Because at that point in time, there were a significant number of Republicans who thought this was a lousy idea and thought it would undermine the Fair Labor Standards Act and the pay of working people. Unfortunately, there aren't that number of Republicans left in this House.

It's deja vu all over again not only because this bill would send American workers back to the days before the 40-hour workweek, but we've also seen this same bill introduced and then, as I said, withdrawn. That's because it would eliminate the 40-hour workweek as we know it.

Now, I know my friends on the Republican side disagree with that premise. I've been an employer. I've seen employers. They're not bad people, but they're trying to maximize profits, and they wouldn't be paying minimum wage if they didn't have to; and very frankly, the minimum wage is way below what it ought to be.

This bill says that we would provide the workers with comp time, but permission as to when a worker could take accrued comp time would be entirely in his or her boss' hands.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. So that that letter, while a very nice letter, doesn't take that into consideration. The result would be longer hours for workers with no overtime pay and only the hope that their bosses will let them take their earned time off when asked. How we have skewed the rules and play against the middle working class of America. You ought to read the book ''Who Stole the American Dream?'' by Hedrick Smith.

Workers wishing to collect their overtime pay would be forced to wait until the end of the year, essentially granting employers an interest-free loan.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't fair, it isn't right, and it isn't going to become law; and everybody on this floor knows that—everybody. All 434 of us that are here today know that this bill is not going to become law. But we're wasting our time on it. Instead of wasting time on a partisan measure that would never make it through the Senate, we ought to be working on creating jobs and restoring fiscal discipline, not a partisan rollback of workers' rights, but a bipartisan compromise to help put more Americans to work.

Again, I say, if those Republicans who were Members of this House in 2003 were still here, this bill would not be on the floor.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I'm always interested to listen to the characterizations of a bill that simply aren't true.

It's my pleasure right now to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington, the chair of the Republican Conference, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

□ 1410

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. I want to recognize and express appreciation to the chairman of the committee and the author of the legislation, Mrs. ROBY, for their tremendous leadership on this important issue.

I'm proud to rise in support of the Working Families Flexibility Act because it is time for our labor laws to enter the 21st century, just like our workforce has.

I support this legislation because it is time for those in the private sector to have the same freedom and flexibility that those in the public sector have had for years. As a mom, a working mom, I have two young kids—Cole is six and Grace is two. I understand firsthand how important it is to have the flexibility to meet the demands of your job and still the obligation of your family. And I am so grateful, like millions of working moms in this country, that I do have flexibility. It's not easy, that's for sure, but the current law makes it way too hard for many hardworking moms and dads in this country.

The workplace today is not the workplace of the 1930s, when many of these laws and regulations were first written. In fact, the most significant economic and sociological change in our society in the last half century has been the entry of women into the workforce.

Today, 75 percent of women between the ages of 25 and 55 are in the workforce, and we've seen a significant growth in the number of working moms. In fact, today, 60 percent of moms with children under 6 are in the labor force. The workforce has changed, and it's time for the laws to change with it.

Most of our labor laws and regulations were drafted in the 1930s, at a time when most households had a single income. For too long, Federal laws and regulations have lagged behind, and it's time we bring them into the 21st century. This legislation does just that. It amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to allow the private sector to provide time off instead of overtime compensation if that's what the employee prefers.

Labor laws—written years ago—require that full-time hourly workers be paid time and a half if they work longer than 40 hours a week. For the most part, hourly employees who want to take occasional time away from their jobs either must take annual leave or leave without pay. These rules are particularly outdated given that we live in a world where people no longer need to be chained to their desk for precisely 8 hours a day, especially in light of cell phones and Internet connections, mobile offices and part-time work.

Current law doesn't provide any workplace flexibility for those in the private sector. This legislation changes that. It gives private sector employees the same choice as those in the public sector, while getting the Federal Government out of the way and putting decisions in the hands of people rather than Washington bureaucrats. That's why we must pass this law. It promotes freedom and choice, and it makes life easier for Americans all across this country.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, as somebody who was a private sector small employer for over 25 years, I just have to say that today, under existing law, employers already have the flexibility to give workers paid time off. The only new flexibility this bill gives is flexibility for employers to not pay people overtime. The fact is employers have that choice to give their workers paid time off.

With that, I would now like to yield 3 minutes to the esteemed chairman of our committee, who has led the fight for working families for over 30 years in this Congress, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a shell game. It's a trick. It's a Trojan horse. If an employer wants to give you time off, as the gentleman from Connecticut said, the employer can give you time off. He can give you comp time to go to your parent-teacher conferences, to take care of an ill member of your family, take care of yourself. But they don't do that. So they're going to dangle overtime here.

If you're willing to work overtime, sometime in the future they might give you that comp time. But it's not your comp time; it's the comp time that the employer will choose when and where you can take it. So if you work overtime this week and your child is very sick next week and you ask for the time and he says, no, we're busy, I can't give you the time off, you lose.

Your employer can bank up to 160 hours of your comp time before there's any obligation. That's almost 4 weeks of overtime. For many people, that overtime is really important. But this bill says your employer can go to you and say you can have the overtime—which may be very important to your family budget. It was when I was young and married and had children. I worked every hour of overtime I could get when I was in the Merchant Marines working on oil tankers. I worked every hour I could get in the canneries. I worked every hour I could get in the refineries because I needed that for my family budget. I didn't need comp time, I needed income.

But now the employer says you can have overtime, but I'm going to pay you back in comp time. If you say no, you have no protections. Your employer might say, okay, I'll find somebody else. Or your employer may offer it to you again and you say I can't do it, I need the overtime, and then you could be fired.

They want to keep saying you're protected and you have the same rights as people in the Federal employment system. You don't. There's nothing in the law that prevents your employer from

firing you because you can't work the schedules your employer wants. They can say it all day along, but it's not in this legislation.

If your employer goes broke before the time that they have to give you your comp time, you're out. And if you don't like the way your employer treated you and fires you because you couldn't possibly do the comp time or you couldn't do the overtime, you can go sue in court. How many middle class families can go sue their employer in court, have that kind of money?

This is what it has always been since 1997, when this bill was introduced—1997. Yes, the workplace has changed. States and cities and employers are giving people paid time off so they can take care of their families when they need to take care of their families. But that's not what this bill is. It's an assault on the 40-hour workweek. It's an assault on overtime. An employer can get the work and never really have to pay the overtime.

If you're in seasonal employment, if you're in an up-and-down business, you work like crazy and he says okay, things are slower in this part of the season, take that time off. You don't get to say, well, I don't really need that time off; I wanted to save that time for a parent-teacher conference. I'm sorry, we're going to be busy when that parent-teacher conference is.

You get what's going on here? This isn't women friendly. This isn't mom friendly. This isn't family friendly. This is friendly to people who want to get rid of overtime and break down the 40-hour week that protects families so they're not working overtime.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I now am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise today in this Chamber as the son of a working, single-parent mother who still works at the Delta Faucet factory in Greensburg.

I rise today in this Chamber as the son of a family who would have benefited from the flexibility and the time that is presented in the opportunity of the Working Families Flexibility Act.

I want to commend my committee chairman, Representative KLINE from Minnesota, and I want to commend my committee colleague from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for bringing forward this commonsense, family friendly legislation.

This bill is about freedom, the freedom to choose whether working overtime means more money in your pocket or more time to spend with your family.

This bill is about equality, the equality of giving private sector employees the same opportunities that their public sector counterparts have had for years. Despite the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle, this act provides private sector employees the same kinds of opportunities that public sector employees have had for years and used successfully.

This bill is also about time, the extra time workers will have to spend doing what they want to do or need to do if they decide that's more important to them than having a few extra dollars.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will make life a little easier for the working men and women of this great country by giving them the freedom to choose how they spend their time. That's something we all should support.

□ 1420

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1½ minutes to the Representative from Oregon, a colleague on the House Education and the Workforce Committee, Ms. BONAMICI.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1406, the so-called Working Families Flexibility Act, which would deal yet another devastating blow to working families who are already scraping by in these tough economic times. Let's look at the facts:

Approximately two-thirds of Americans are living paycheck to paycheck.

Since 2000, hourly wages have flatlined, but productivity has risen 23 percent.

Employee compensation as a share of national income is at its lowest in 50 years, but corporate profits are stronger than ever.

American families are putting in longer hours for less pay; and, colleagues, this bill makes things worse.

If this bill becomes law, which we know it won't, a single mom living paycheck to paycheck could work more than 40 hours a week and receive no overtime pay in her paycheck. She would still have to pay the babysitter that week for the extra hours she spent on the job with no guarantee she'll be able to take the comp time off when she needs it. She would have to accept the days off her employer offers—that might not match her schedule—or else wait up to a year to receive the pay that's rightfully hers. And if the business closes, she's out of luck and out of pay.

Instead of getting a paycheck that includes overtime, she'll be forced to decide between an interest-free loan to her employer, or time off when it's convenient for her boss, not for her. Under this bill, millions of working families who are already living on the edge would work longer hours and take home less pay. They would have less flexibility, not more.

Colleagues, if we really want to talk about flexibility, let's talk about paid sick leave. I urge my colleagues to take a stand for working people and oppose this bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Indiana, a member of the committee, Mrs. BROOKS.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support on behalf of moms and dads and those who aren't parents that would be possibly impacted by the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013. Currently, private sector employees do not have the same choice their public sector counterparts have enjoyed. Specifically, there are so many obstacles that prevent workers from being able to take comp time in lieu of cash wages. This commonsense piece of legislation removes those barriers and gives the private sector working moms and dads more flexibility.

We are getting ready to celebrate Mother's Day this weekend, and I wanted to make special note of the difficulties working moms have finding a job that respects their family choices and pressures. I recently finished a book—talking about books earlier—called ''Leaning In'' by Facebook's COO, Sheryl Sandberg. She says, ''Too many standards remain inflexible and unfair, often penalizing women with children.'' She notes that 50 percent of employed mothers are unable to take time off to care for a sick child.

She also discusses a Human Rights Watch study that found parents delayed having their babies immunized or dealing with their own health issues because they can't get time off. The study found parents believe ''there is virtually no protection for workers seeking flexible schedules.''

The bill on the floor now would give those working moms and dads the flexibility they want, need, and deserve. This empowers working parents to make the right decisions for their family. If dad can take work off for a doctor's visit, mom can choose to take cash if that's what she decides. If he can't, then she can choose to take the comp time. It gives them that flexibility.

As a woman and a mom who has worked in the public sector and the private sector, I know firsthand how this does help working parents, and it helps those government workers attain that flexibility they deserve. It's time we bring that flexibility to the private sector. It's the 21st century. We have to reform our workplace. This bill helps us accomplish that. I urge adoption.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's wretched Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 1406, the deceptively-named, Working Families Flexibility Act—or, as I call it, The Working Families to Death Act. This bill—which is really an old, recycled idea from 1997—would allow employers to provide hourly workers with comp time rather than paying time-and-a-half on wages for more

than 40 hours of work. Simply, for hourly workers, this bill equals more work for less pay.

Republicans have stated that ''hourly workers do not have the same rights that salaried employees and all federal employees have.'' And that they are ''trying to make equity and fairness.'' Further, they highlight that ''flexible work arrangements have been available to federal government workers since 1978'' and ''it is high time that the workers in the private sector of this country enjoy the same benefits.''

Can you guess when those statements were made? Not this week or last week but in 1997 and 2003. Today's latest attempt to pass this ''comp time'' bill is part of the GOP's rebrand to become more family-friendly. The bill's sponsor stated, ''time is more precious to [a working father] than the cash payments.''

In reality, this bill creates more flexibility for employers and places workers at risk of being fired if they choose overtime pay to help meet their obligations rather than comp time. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and work on policies that provide true, earned flexibility and fair wages for all workers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A Member asking to insert remarks may include a simple declaration of sentiment toward the question under debate but should not embellish the request with extended oratory.

The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I now yield to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. LOWEY. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's dubious Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members to confine their unanimous-consent request to a simple declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the measure. Further embellishments will result in a deduction of time from the yielding Member.

The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's reprehensible Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the ''GOP's Mothers'' Day Gift: More Work, Less Pay.''

This misnamed ''Working Families Flexibility Act'' only offers greater flexibility to employers and lower wages to workers. Under this measure, workers will not get paid for hours that exceed 40 hours per week. That compensation will instead go into a fund controlled by their employer.

Employers would be allowed to refuse a worker time off to deal with a family member or attend a parent-teacher conference. This is not real flexibility for workers. This proposal is simply another assault on working families and it should be defeated.

It is particularly ironic that House Republicans would offer this legislation in the week leading up to Mother's Day. As working women and mothers in New York and throughout the nation struggle with a tough economy, this ill-conceived measure would pull the rug out from under them, making them work more for less compensation.

It is time to focus on real solutions that help working families prosper. Vote down this bill so we can focus on creating jobs, speeding our economic recovery and addressing challenges faced by working men and women.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's shameful Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's deplorable Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working mothers. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, the Working Families Flexibility Act, more aptly called the ''Paying Working Families Less Act,'' would have a negative impact on families in Nevada and across the country. H.R. 1406 offers the empty choice of comp time in lieu of overtime wages without providing sufficient employee protections or real flexibility for workers to use their comp time when they need it the most. Nevadans are already struggling to make ends meet while caring for their families. I oppose H.R. 1406 because I believe that our nation needs legislation that will protect working Americans and strengthen the middle class. This legislation does the opposite.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentlelady from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's indefensible Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's thoughtless Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in opposition to H.R. 1406, the Republican More Work, Less Pay Act.

Hardworking American families deserve reasonable working hours and scheduling flexibility, livable wages, fair overtime pay and job security. Unfortunately, H.R. 1406 is a misguided policy which provides none of these. American workers need real choices in the workplace which put the interests of American families first. They don't need stunts like H.R. 1406.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's scandalous Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's vile Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1406. This bill should be known as the ''More Work Less Pay Act.''

Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) in 1938 to encourage a 40-hour workweek. FLSA also ensured that hourly workers would be fairly compensated for working over 40 hours a week. 75 years later, we are now debating a bill that will, in effect, eliminate overtime pay for millions of hourly workers.

Last year, nearly 60 percent of the workforce in this country aged 16 and over, were paid an hourly wage. This amounts to 75.3 million people in the United States according to the Bureau of Labor and Statistics.

Further, the Bureau found that 3.6 million of these workers earn wages at or below the federal minimum wage of $7.25 per hour. I represent the 43rd congressional district of California. In my home state, the minimum wage is 8.00 an hour. The impact of an $8.00 minimum wage is clear. We have one of the lowest percentages of workers who are earning at or below the federal minimum wage. There are several states that cannot say the same. Yet, like in all states, Californian's who earn overtime still rely upon that extra income.

The legislation before us today needlessly targets millions of workers. These workers have come to rely on their overtime to make ends meet. We are not talking about millionaires but everyday hard working men and women. They utilize their added income to pay their rent and mortgages. They are using their overtime to feed their families and clothe their children. Hourly workers in this country are working overtime to pay for gas for their cars or pay their bus fare to get to work.

H.R. 1406 provides absolutely no legitimate incentive for employers to give their employees time off. Under this bill, an employer could defer paying overtime for up to a year. This would, in effect, provide an employer with an interest free loan.

Under this "More Work Less Pay" bill workers are not guaranteed compensatory time, commonly known as "comp" time. An employer retains the right to refuse to grant comp time. Under current law, workers are required to receive their overtime pay in their very next check.

If an employer fails to pay overtime to their employee then the employee has a right to sue his or her employer. In 2011, the Labor Department recovered $225 million in back wages for employees. In that same year, there were 7,006 wage and hour suits filed in federal court. The numbers of employees suing their employers for back wages has steadily increased.

Today, thousands of workers are currently fighting to ensure they are receiving their earned income. This is not the time to add into the fray, "comp" time flexibility and overtime pay cuts. If this bill did as it claimed and provided hourly workers with flexibility then there would be thousands of workers marching to D.C. championing this bill, instead nearly 200 labor unions and women's organizations oppose this measure.

I believe we can all agree that working families do need flexibility. They need the flexibility that their extra earned income can afford them.

The Jobs Report released last Friday reflected that our economy added 165,000 new jobs in the month of April. Instead of focusing on legislation to create additional jobs, boost our economy, and increase the earning potential of workers in the United States. Republican leadership has chosen instead to focus on legislation that cuts the pay of working families.

A pay cut called flexibility is still a pay cut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's deplorable Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I join women Democratic Members in opposition to this H.R. 1406—a "more work, less pay bill."

Contrary to the title of this bill, it will take away the right workers currently have to overtime pay and instead authorize employers to substitute compensatory time to private sector employees. This bill is a smoke and mirrors proposal that sets up a deplorable false choice between time and money when working families need both.

H.R. 1406 allows employers to offer comp time in lieu of overtime to their hourly workers without guaranteed right to use the time when they need it, even in time of a personal or family emergency. The Republicans try to compare this benefit to federal employees but this is not a fair comparison. Hourly workers do not have the same rights that salaried employees and federal employees have. Compensatory agreements can be terminate at the will of the employer. This legislation shortchanges workers both financially and logistically.

This must not be done at any time, but certainly not at a time, when households are challenged by rising cost of living, they need cash for their time.

This idea did not work in 1997, 2003 and will not work in 2013.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's disrespectful Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1406, the misnamed "Working Families Flexibility Act." This bill would take away critical overtime pay from families still struggling from the effects of the Great Recession. It might provide more flexibility for some businesses, but it would create real hardship for everyone else.

Under this bill, employers could offer comp time to replace earned time-and-a-half wages for overtime. But workers who opt for that time off would not be guaranteed to get it when they want it—employers would have the right to deny comp time off requests, even if the request was needed for a personal or family emergency. Employers could dictate when you got your comp time—and they could make those decisions unilaterally. If you want to take comp time to care for a loved one or see your daughter in a school play, your employer can say no. And you have no right to appeal. And if the business closes or lays you off before you have a chance to use your comp time, you get nothing at all.

Under this bill, a worker would have the option of foregoing overtime pay and hoping that sometime in the future she can get time off when she needs it, not when it's convenient for her employer. That's option one—work more and get paid less. Or she can take option two: demand overtime pay and find out that another worker—one who is willing to accept the employer's offer of future comp time—is given the extra hours.

That unfairness is the reason that over 160 organizations representing working women oppose H.R. 1406—groups like Jewish Women International, the Coalition of Labor Union Women, the National Council of Women's Organizations, Wider Opportunities for Women, the National Women's Law Center, and the National Partnership for Women and Families.

The U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce also opposes this bill. Their CEO Margot Dorfman writes, "H.R. 1406 would reward those employees who agree to "comp time" in lieu of overtime payments. Employers incentivized by a reduced payroll might well give "comp time" employees the preferred shifts, the needed hours, and the promotions. There is no protection in H.R. 1406 against this kind of employer behavior."

The American Sustainable Business Council and Restaurant Opportunities Center United joins in opposition to H.R. 1406, because it "would create headaches for any employer who must track banked hours across multiple employees." They add, it "becomes a scheduling and accounting challenge when employees decide to trade in banked hours, requiring business owners to make unexpected shifts in personnel and paychecks. Obviously, small businesses with fewer resources and employees would be even harder hit by these enormous logistics than larger corporations."

It's true that working women and men need greater flexibility and the ability to balance family and job obligations. That's why today we should be debating the Healthy Families Act to guarantee paid sick leave. We should be debating expansion of the Family and Medical Leave Act to provide the paid leave needed to allow working women and men to address family needs.

Instead, the Republican majority has decided to bring this bill to the floor—a bill that threatens overtime pay and gives employers more ability to determine schedules for their workers. That is no solution for working families.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert

my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's appalling Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's dreadful Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's awful Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

□ 1430

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's revolting Mother's Day gift—more work, less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and unyielding opposition to H.R. 1406, the so-called "Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013." I thank Mr. COURTNEY for this opportunity to speak on behalf and in support of the working women and men in my District and against this terrible bill, which has been offered repeatedly over several Congresses, and each time it has found strong opposition and ultimate defeat.

This bill should it become law would take income out of the hands of workers and their families. When the economy is weak—workers and their families need more protection not less.

Under current law (the Fair Labor Standards Act), employers are required to pay workers time-and-a-half cash for hours worked in excess of 40 hours per week.

According to statisticians with the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics there is no survey to offer insight on the issues addressed in this bill—the desire of employees to receive "comp time" instead of cash for their work.

We do know that if the Education and the Workforce Committee had accepted Congressman JOE COURTNEY's amendment in the nature of a substitute when the bill was marked up in full Committee—workers would have something to be cheering about today. His amendment would have created 56 hours of paid medical leave for employees to use when they needed it.

The Administration along with many of my colleagues will not support H.R. 1406—and it will not become law for very good reasons. H.R. 1406 supporters say that it would not prevent employers from cutting the overtime hours and reducing the take-home pay of employees who currently have the right to overtime compensation. But will workers be in a position to assert this right given the economic climate and their own situations.

So-called "comp time" or the "company time" legislation would allow employers to pay workers nothing for overtime work at the time the work is performed—in exchange for a promise of time off in the future.

"COMP TIME" WOULD REDUCE NEW WORKER AND COULD JEOPARDIZE EXISTING WORKER TAKE HOME PAY

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics the average weekly overtime hours for manufacturing workers in 2012 was 4.2 hours or over 44 hours a week. In a year 4.2 additional hours of overtime, considering 2 weeks for vacation would total 210 hours.

The average income of a Boilermaker with less than 2 years of experience would earn $35,856.00 a year or about $18 an hour. In real dollar terms, a Boilermaker making $18 an hour, when working overtime would earn $27 an hour. Under H.R. 1406, the total forgone hours for the average workweek for a manufacturing worker over a year is 210 hours—if the worker is a Boilermaker it means a loss of $5,670 annually.

The bill's text suggests that existing workers will retain their right to receive overtime pay and that only new employees would fall under the "comp time" provisions. The bill attempts to divide existing workers and new workers by denying one group of workers something as basic as equal pay for equal work. This may lead some employers to prefer their workers who are not protected by wage laws.

The reality is all workers in this economy face the potential fallout from a change in labor laws that reduce protection of monetary compensation for work done.

"COMP TIME" WOULD HURT WORKERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Another clue that this bill may be way off the mark for what workers need—is the reaction of organized labor to it being brought before the House of Representatives for a vote. Labor is in strong opposition to H.R. 1406 because they know what this bill would mean to workers and their families, just as I and many of you know—it would mean forced labor hours without giving workers the guaranteed right to get paid for their work. The skill acquired by a worker is something they own and can bring to the market place in exchange for a fair wage. This is an important component of a capitalistic system that should be valued and respected.

The bill fails to mention that workers already have the right to ask for "comp time" within any 40-hour workweek when they need it. What is not allowed is an employer making the decision that workers must take "comp time" when they work overtime.

H.R. 1406 places unnecessary competitive pressure on employees to accept "comp time" because employers believe it is an easy way to reduce operational costs for their businesses. H.R. 1406 provides no meaningful protection against employers pressuring workers to enter into "comp time" agreements.

The first quarter of 2013 according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics recorded an increase of overtime hours worked to 4.3 hours per week for manufacturing jobs this is an increase over the last quarter of 2012. If Congress allows the free market to work then the numbers of employed persons will increase.

"COMP TIME" WOULD THREATEN THE PROTECTIONS OFFERED BY THE 40 HOUR WORKWEEK

The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) of 1938 established the 40-hour workweek to allow employees to spend more time away from work and encourage employers to hire more staff when workloads increase. The FLSA's only incentive for employers to maintain a 40-hour workweek is the requirement that they pay a time-and-a-half cash premium for overtime.

The cost of labor is a factor in helping to expand the numbers of employed persons in our nation. When employers see the cost savings associated with hiring more workers as the hours worked by existing employees increase labor cost due to overtime pay—they hire more workers.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics counts overtime as a benefit not as pay. If the result of the bill is to have employees work more hours, but without the guarantee of compensation—it is flawed.

The 40-hour workweek discourages employers from demanding overtime by making overtime more expensive.

This bill by contrast, encourages employers to demand more overtime by making overtime less expensive.

This gives all of the power to employers to demand their employees work longer hours without adequate compensation.

By making it cheaper for employers to demand overtime, "comp time" would lead to more mandatory overtime, longer hours, and more unpredictable work schedules for workers.

This bill also makes it harder for America's workers to have their rights enforced by the Department of Labor. Amending the law to weaken work for pay requirements would result in even more widespread violation of the overtime law and more workers working longer hours for less pay.

"COMP TIME" IS A PAY CUT FOR AMERICA'S WORKERS

Millions of workers depend on cash overtime to make ends meet and pay their housing, food, and other living expenses.

These workers would see a substantial reduction in their take-home pay if they were compensated with time off rather than cash up front.

It is true that "comp time" is paid leave, but most workers would have been paid anyway if they had not taken the time off, and under

H.R. 1406 they are paid nothing for their overtime work at the time they work it.

Again, H.R. 1406 takes the power out of the hands of the employees. H.R. 1406 does not ensure that workers' choice to reduce their income through ''comp time'' is truly voluntary.

H.R. 1406 provides no meaningful protection against employers assigning overtime work preferentially to employees who accept ''comp time''.

Under H.R. 1406, employers can schedule workers to work up to 160 hours of ''comp time.'' Workers will be cheated out of their accrued overtime earnings when their employer goes bankrupt.

I stand today with America's workers. We are united in opposition to H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013.

If Congress wants to do something for workers we should support the President's Budget for state paid leave programs. His proposal would not force workers to choose between taking time off for family needs and receiving income, or even risk losing their jobs. The President's minimum wage proposal would also support working families by making sure that all workers receive enough hourly income to make ends meet.

That is why I oppose H.R. 1406 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this terrible legislation.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's bill. It should be called the Fake Flexibility Act and should more aptly be named More Work For Less Pay For Working Mothers.

Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Majority's so-called Working Families Flexibility Act. The American people should not be deceived by this fake advertising.

True workplace flexibility should be a two-way street for both employees and employers.

I am a longtime sponsor of work-life balance legislation, including the original bill titled the ''Working Families Flexibility Act'' that provides both employers and employees with protections in discussing flexible work arrangements.

Over the last 50 years there have been tremendous changes to our workforce. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, more than 70 percent of children are raised in families that are headed by either a working single parent or two working parents. In addition, studies show that 60 percent of those who provide care to an adult or to a child with special needs are employed.

The numbers show the real case for flexibility in the workplace.

And yet, Americans must not be deceived about the recycled bill on the floor this week. The more aptly named ''More Work, Less Pay Act'' undermines the basic guarantees of fair pay for overtime work and time off from work under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I urge my colleague to bring to the floor true workplace advancement legislation and oppose the H.R. 1406.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield to the gentlelady from Arizona (Mrs. Kirkpatrick) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's miserable Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield now to the gentlelady from New Mexico (Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's dubious Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield now to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's unscrupulous Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working mothers. Happy Mother's Day to all mothers.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I now yield to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAPPS. Thank you to my colleague for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's appalling Mother's Day gift. Happy Mother's Day by giving more work and less pay to working moms.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I now yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. SPEIER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's ''shame on you'' Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms.

Is this really what we want to give mothers on Mother's Day?

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I now yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. MATSUI) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MATSUI. Thank you very much.

I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's heartless Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield to my neighbor and good friend, the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. DELAURO. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD in opposition of a sham bill that, in fact, takes money away from men and women, particularly from women, and that is in no way a way to ensure the economic security of women in this Nation.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I now yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's uncaring Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, if I could be given the time remaining, I'd appreciate it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 15¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. KLINE. May I inquire as to the time remaining on our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. KLINE. I want to thank my colleagues on the other side. It was an excellent show. It expanded the lexicon in the thesaurus.

I now yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, a subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1406, and I encourage my colleagues to support this.

In my previous life, I served as an employer for over 30 years, as a single parent and as a mayor of a city.

We had an issue several years ago with our fire department on compensatory pay versus overtime. We agreed with the firefighters. It worked out fine. The firefighters all understood they couldn't all be gone on the same day. They worked with us great, and it was not a problem. It works in the public sector. I don't know why it cannot work in the private sector.

All this bill does is leave the decision to receive comp time. It's completely voluntary. You don't have to do it. You can choose to do it if you want to. Number two, workers can withdraw from the comp time agreement whenever they choose. They can do that. It's not a problem. All existing protections in the Fair Labor Standards Act are maintained, the 40-hour workweek and how overtime compensation is accrued. It is up to the employee to decide when to use his or her comp time as long as there is reasonable notice to the employer.

I certainly have heard mentioned what happens if an employer goes bankrupt. Well, what happens when a city like Stockton, California, goes bankrupt?

I will finish by saying over and over that more work and less pay for working mothers doesn't make it true. I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. COURTNEY. I now yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. BASS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BASS. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the indefensible Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the reprehensible Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I now yield to the gentlelady from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Thank you.

I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's awful Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to yield 1½ minutes to an outstanding colleague on the Education and the Workforce Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. So it's Friday afternoon at the nursing home, and Debbie and Donna are approached by the boss.

The boss says, I have 5 hours of overtime this weekend. You can either have cash or comp time.

Debbie says, I'll take the cash. I need the money.

Donna says, I'll take the comp time.

Donna gets the overtime.

The next Friday rolls around—the same boss, the same request.

Debbie says, I'll take the cash. I'll take the overtime.

Donna says, No. I'll take the comp time.

Donna gets the overtime.

It doesn't take very long for people to figure out what the right answer is when you're asked for overtime. You might say, Well, Donna is going to be okay because she gets all this comp time.

Donna comes back and says, Next Friday is the pageant at my daughter's school for second grade. I want to take the morning off so I can go to my daughter's pageant.

The boss says, No, that's not convenient for me. No.

Now, I suppose in some theoretical universe Donna could hire a lawyer, sue her boss, and try to get to see her daughter's second grade pageant—not in the world that she lives in and the world we live in. The boss decides when she uses the comp time.

The end of the year comes, and she hasn't used it yet. The boss writes a check to Donna without interest. Donna has made an interest-free loan to her employer. If the employer goes bankrupt in that year, Donna is out of the money altogether.

This is not about flexibility. It's about the conversion of someone's wages and assets. This is an assault on the 40-hour workweek. It is not worthy of this institution. It's wrong for our country. We should vote ''no.''

□ 1440

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I need to inquire again as to the time remaining because as I listened to my colleagues come down for unanimous consent requests, it seems to me I heard the Speaker saying that the gentleman's time was going to be charged. How did that add up?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KLINE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's interesting math.

I'm now pleased to yield 2 minutes to a friend and colleague, the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the committee for all the hard work that you've done, and especially to my good friend and fellow Republican Women's Policy Committee member, Representative MARTHA ROBY, who introduced this very important bill because she realizes that as a mother of two children that the workplace must change to adapt to our increasingly stressful lives.

Americans are struggling to balance their lives, doing everything they can to maintain their careers while still spending time with their families. We in the Congress can help. If H.R. 1406 becomes law, a working mom and dad can choose to use the time and a half overtime he or she earns as actual paid time off instead of cash. They would be able to use this time to see their daughter's piano recital or their son's baseball game when they would otherwise have to be at work.

But, of course, even with this commonsense piece of legislation, there are detractors. Many myths have been spread about this bill. You've heard them here today. And the opponents refer to it as a ''pay cut for working moms,'' but this simply is not true.

Also, I've heard that it's the assault on the 40-hour workweek. It is not. However, what is an assault on the 40-hour workweek is ObamaCare, which will force job creators to cut back their employees from full-time to part-time in order to keep their doors open. The decision to receive comp time is completely voluntary.

This is not a partisan issue. In 1985, Ted Kennedy, HARRY REID, JOE BIDEN, and STENY HOYER all supported giving the public sector employees the flexibility to choose comp time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I cannot think of a better Mother's Day gift. This is something we can do right now to help families at a time when they need it most.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding and his leadership.

I rise in opposition to the Republican Party's Working Families Flexibility Act. It should be named the ''Fake Flexibility Act.'' It's a failure to advertise truthfully. If you were true, you would call it the ''More Work and Less Pay Act.''

Under this bill, workers would lose the basic guarantees of fair pay for overtime work and time off from work under the Fair Labor Standards Act. It would deprive hardworking men and women of their earned income and fail to guarantee them the right to use that overtime when they need to use it for a personal or family emergency.

Shamefully, the United States ranks among the least generous of industrialized countries when it comes to family-friendly policies. We are one of three countries that fail to provide paid leave for the birth of a child. True workplace advancement benefits both businesses and worker interests. Instead, the Republican bill hurts employees by giving them less pay at a time when American wages are stagnant.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and bring up the Democratic minority's alternatives for paid sick leave, paid leave for the birth of a child, and true flex time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I'm now very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman and I thank Mrs. ROBY for bringing this forward.

It's really about time, because on the deathbed, very few people say, Boy, I wish I had spent more time at the office.

I've got to tell you, from being in business all my life—and I think maybe that's the problem in Washington, not enough of you have actually been on the floor of a business because you think it's always about some kind of a fair treatment. But your definition of ''fair'' is not fair.

When I look at men and women, I don't look at them as men and women. I look at them as moms and dads and grandmas and grandpas and aunts and uncles. They love to go to soccer games. They love go to baseball games, and they love to go to all those Cub Scout meetings. But you know what? We want to just give them the flexibility, the same as we do in the public sector.

What an odd concept to actually give people the freedom to do what they want with their time and to work a little overtime so they can pick up extra time. My gosh, what a confusing concept that would be.

And this is not by gender, by the way. If you think this is about working mothers, it's also about working fathers. Do you know how many times people don't have that time to go see their sons and daughters in a school play or a baseball game? You want to take that away from them with some kind of phony act today, and you'll line up 15 deep? Talk about insincerity and inflexibility; that's your party.

You're supposed to be the party of the women. We're supposed to be the ones that don't like women. We're giving them a gift that you can never give: the gift of time. Nobody has the ability to do that.

This bill makes it possible for people to spend that precious time with those precious few that they want to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, again, as someone who was a private sector employer for over 25 years, there is nothing under existing law that prevents an employer from giving an employee paid time off. I did it many times.

Now it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to my colleague from the State of Florida, Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the real effect that the Working Families Flexibility Act would have on our families.

Contrary to its name, this bill does not protect working families. Many hourly workers in south Florida and across the country depend on the opportunity to collect their hard-earned overtime pay to support their families and make ends meet. This antifamily, antiworker bill would make it harder for employees to provide for their families and easier for employers to pay less for overtime work with hazy promises of time off later. The bottom line is that comp time doesn't pay the bills.

This legislation provides no guarantee that employees would get to use their time off when they need it; or if an employer goes out of business, workers may never get compensated at all.

I've heard no one on the other side of the aisle answer what happens when a boss says ''no'' to a request for comp time for that school play or taking their child to a doctor.

Employees who depend on overtime pay to put food on the table may be forced to compete with fellow employees who are willing to trade their overtime wages for comp time.

Passing this bill would deepen the financial insecurity of wage workers, especially Hispanic women who are more likely to be hourly wage workers, more likely to be responsible for family caregiving, and less likely to have negotiating power in their jobs.

There are other bills on the table that offer far more meaningful solutions, and I urge the Republican majority to take them up and take care of America's working families instead of giving them the short end of the stick as this bill does.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I'm now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this piece of legislation.

This Sunday is Mother's Day. It's a very bittersweet day for me. As a father of three children, I am constantly reminding my wife how important this day is and how important her job as a mother is. But it's 14 years ago this month that I lost my mother, my inspiration, my teacher, someone that I think about every single Mother's Day.

I ask myself what would my mom, Sally Davis, say when we give the option to provide more flexibility to working mothers. In Illinois alone, my home State, there are over 1 million single parents that need this flexibility to be able to make the decisions they need to raise their families.

As a father of three school-aged children, I've coached baseball games, I've watched my daughter cheer, and I've shuttled my kids to doctor appointments. It's part of raising kids and being a parent. However, more than 60 percent of employees feel they do not have enough time to spend with their families. Why not give these families the same flexibility that those in the public sector—many of my constituents in Springfield, Illinois, and throughout have the same opportunity to use? Why not to give them that flexibility? Just last year, employees at the IRS took more than 246,000 hours of comp time instead of additional government pay.

No legislation is perfect, Mr. Speaker, but this legislation gives families, gives mothers, gives fathers the opportunity to choose and work with their employers to do so.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to think of their mother and ask them what would they do.

□ 1450

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a champion for working families and my neighbor.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong opposition to the bill before us. It aims to end overtime pay, bring to an end the 40-hour workweek. This is another attempt by the House majority to accelerate a race to the bottom, strip workers of basic rights and protections, and undermine the foundations of the American middle class.

The Working Families Flexibility Act does exactly the opposite of what it describes. There is no flexibility. The legislation guts the 75-year-old statute guaranteeing overtime pay for work over a 40-hour workweek, overtime pay that those single moms need. Hardworking American families, they rely on it. It allows employers, if they so

choose, to provide comp time for all of this extra work, except there are no guarantees that workers can take the time when they need it, and there are no avenues for workers to file grievances if employers do not comply. This bill forces employees to work extra hours without overtime pay and get nothing in return.

Yes, we need serious economic solutions to the problems that families are facing. Wages have stagnated for decades. Forty percent of Americans make less today than what the minimum wage was worth in 1968. And in America today, unlike in every other competitive economy in the world, 42 million workers cannot take off time when they are sick, when they need to care for a sick child or an ailing relative.

We need legislation that provides employees with paid time off if they need it. The Healthy Families Act would allow workers up to seven job-protected paid sick days for each year. It builds on and reflects pro-family policies that have been passed in Connecticut; Seattle; Portland, Oregon; San Francisco; Washington, D.C. This majority has said ''no'' to an airing of this legislation. They want to eliminate worker protections and further undermine workers' paychecks and benefits.

And America's families, they sent us here to represent their interests and address their needs, not to further erode their economic instability. Vote against this bill. Support paid leave, minimum wage, and pay equity if you want to help Americans families.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I find it unbelievable to sit here and listen to the divisive, erroneous, fear-mongering information that's being put forth by the other side of the aisle. It's unbecoming. Today's workplaces are a lot different than they were just a generation ago. Technology continues to alter the way goods and services reach consumers, and cultural changes have transformed the nature of America's workforce.

This important legislation, this compassionate legislation, allows private sector employees to choose—and I say ''choose,'' Mr. Speaker—choose paid time off or comp time as compensation for working overtime hours, and this policy has already proven extremely successful.

For nearly 30 years, government sector workers have been able to earn comp time. In fact, last year employees at the IRS took more than 246,000 hours of comp time in lieu of overtime pay. No complaints. Yet working parents and individuals in the private sector are not afforded with this same choice.

This is simply not right. Certainly every employee faces a unique set of circumstances and challenges and responsibilities. For some, taking time at home is a good thing for them. Additional pay is not necessary for them at that point, but having the opportunity to spend time with their children, to go to parent-teacher conferences and do other things with family is more valuable than a few extra dollars in the bank.

Choice and flexibility helps employees meet the demands of their jobs and address the needs of their families. That's why I'm proud to support this bill, this pro-family, this pro-worker bill. This is what is meant for this time, and I encourage my colleagues to get off the divisive rhetoric and get to the unifying effect of saying, We will encourage people in their lives, their families, and their incomes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to my colleague from the State of Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013. The bill would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to authorize private employers to provide comp time or compensatory time off to private employees at the rate of 1.5 hours per hour of employment for which overtime compensation is required.

Essentially, workers would be promised comp time instead of overtime pay. Many families depend on overtime pay to make ends meet. The Fair Labor Standards Act guarantees workers will receive overtime pay for over 40 hours per week. The bill only promises the potential for future comp time without any real protections for the workers. Hardworking Americans would be unprotected against long hours and less pay without the guarantee of any compensation. H.R. 1406 falsely promises more time with their loved ones by allowing them to choose paid time off. Unfortunately, workers will only get more time with their families after they've spent long hours, for less pay, at the approval of the employer.

I stand with America's workers to oppose this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same. The 40-hour week has stood for 75 years, and it should continue.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his leadership in bringing this bill forward, as well as the bill's sponsor, the gentlelady from Alabama, a working mom whose inspiration is her kids at home and her husband that she is responsible for and with in order to make life work for them in Alabama. So I want to appreciate her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bill, the Working Families Flexibility Act. If you are a working parent in this country, you know from experience that there's hardly ever enough time to spend with your family.

Recently, I spoke with a constituent from Richmond. Her name is Nicole Lambert. She's a working mom who runs an early childhood education center. It's quite often that Nicole is approached by one of her employees requesting more flexibility with how they can use their overtime. Some of her employees need to take off to take their child to the doctor, some need to go and meet with a teacher. But under the current law, Nicole is not able to present her hardworking staff with this option. She understands that this bill would give her employees more flexibility to balance both work and their lives at home.

Mr. Speaker, for too long working families in the private sector have not been able to choose a more flexible schedule when working overtime; but for the past 30 years, government employees have been afforded this luxury. It's time for all of us to present all parents in America with this option.

As a father of three, I can tell you as a working parent I know that it is very necessary to be there for your children. And I bet no matter who you are as a working parent, if you asked a mom or a dad what they need more of, it's time. Washington should not be standing in the way of any employer voluntarily offering this benefit for any employee choosing more time. That's the bottom line, Mr. Speaker. Washington should not be in the way of more freedom in the workplace.

I know this policy will work, from speaking with local government employees who already enjoy this advantage.

Vicki is a working mom and a police officer in my district. She works long hours, and she raises her children.

□ 1500

She tells me her life is made a little easier because she's allowed to work a few extra hours, save it up in case there's a sick day or an after-school event that she must attend.

It's simply unfair for those who work for Nicole in the private sector to be prohibited from receiving the benefits that Vicki does, a government employee.

This is a bill that should easily garner bipartisan support because, frankly, it puts parents before politics and will give people more freedom to make their lives work. There's simply no good reason to deny hardworking parents the opportunity to take their children to the doctor or to attend a parent-teacher conference.

I want to thank my constituents for their relaying stories to me about their life story, about how this bill helps.

And again, I'm very grateful to the leadership and the role model that the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) and Chairman KLINE have set forth in this effort. This act will help parents all across America, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), my colleague from the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. COURTNEY for yielding, and for his leadership on this issue.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1406. I have a great many concerns about this bill, but let me focus on just one. There is little question that this bill will result in unjust actions being taken against employees who choose the traditional overtime pay option over the comp time arrangement.

Under this legislation, employers have the right to only schedule employees that have agreed to enter into comp time arrangements without consequence. Suddenly, workers who rely on overtime income to help feed their family or put a child through college will see their hours curtailed and instead given to workers who choose comp time arrangements.

There is not one word in this legislation that would protect a worker who needs cash for his or her overtime hours. They will clearly lose out to those workers who are willing to take paid time off or compensatory time off, as opposed to time-and-a-half overtime.

There are a great many workers, and I grew up in a family that had one of those workers, that rely on overtime to pay the bills, to put their kids through college, and to see to it that they get to live lives of dignity. This legislation will take away that ability from those families.

Republicans claim that this is somehow part of a new, family friendly approach to governing. Well, one of the first votes I cast as a member of the Education Committee, as a new Member of Congress in 2003, was against a bill called the Family Time Flexibility Act. The bill in front of us today is literally identical to that 2003 bill, minus the title.

I urge a ''no'' vote on H.R. 1406.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), my friend and colleague, a leader in so many areas.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his work on this effort. And I also want to say thank to you Mrs. ROBY from Alabama for the outstanding job that she has done on the Working Families Flexibility Act.

I have loved talking with my constituents about this issue. And it is absolutely amazing, when you say, tell me what you think about this. Would you like to have the option, the ability to control what your compensation method is going to be? And so many of my constituents, whether they're rearing families, whether they have teenagers that they're working with, whether they're caring for elderly relatives, say, this is a great idea. And it is so worthy of discussion, and it is about time for Congress to do something that's just plain old good common sense.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for this is, take a look at what is happening now. In 1975, when I was newly married and beginning to start a family, there were only 37 percent of all the families where both parents were working outside of the home.

Look at what is happening now that my children are having their careers, and my daughter has two children. You've got just under 60 percent where both parents are working outside of the home. On top of this, you have those of us who are caring for elderly relatives.

And as the majority leader just said, any time you run a survey and ask women what they want, they would love to have more time, and they also want more control over how they're able to manage their lives and the lives of their families. And this is a piece of legislation that does that.

I agree with what some of my colleagues have said. This Obama economy has really forced more families than ever to work more than one job. It has been very difficult. And having more options makes it easier for those families to manage.

I thank the leadership for the work on the bill.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire as to the time left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 4¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding and ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's shameful Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's deplorable Mother's Day gift—more work, less pay for working moms. No way to say Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday morning, millions of mothers nationwide will wake up to the excited faces of their children wishing them a "happy Mother's Day."

Mothers will receive gifts of all kinds from their sons and daughters—tokens of love and gratitude for all that moms do every day.

MORE WORK, LESS PAY

Yet today, House Republicans are offering up a different Mother's Day gift: more work, less pay.

House Republicans are putting forward the so-called "Working Families Flexibility Act."

The name may make it sound appealing, but don't be fooled—this bill is nothing more than smoke and mirrors meant to hide its true purpose:

To end the 40-hour work week;

To cut pay for women;

To undermine the economic security of the middle class.

This legislation claims the mantle of flexibility, yet only means greater flexibility for employers and lower wages for workers.

This proposal is simply another ideological assault on workers, another mean-spirited attack on workers' rights, and another Republican message bill that will never become law.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

More work, less pay—that's what this bill is about.

It guts protections for workers and removes flexibility for working families.

It amounts to an interest-free loan to employers—paid for by workers' wages and unused comp time hours.

It is nothing more than a mirage—claiming to give flexibility to workers to take time off to care for family or attend a parent-teacher conference while actually handing flexibility to their bosses to cut pay or call for more hours.

SAYING "NO" TO WORKERS

This legislation is brought to you by the same people who attack and undermine working families at every turn—the same people who say:

"No" to raising the minimum wage.

"No" to the Paycheck Fairness Act

"No" to extending unemployment benefits that strengthen our economy.

"No" to any measure that could expand the middle class.

The same people who will only say "yes" to more hardship for workers, to more pain for the middle class, to more work and less pay.

OPPOSITION

No wonder this bill is opposed by more than 160 women's organizations across the country, from Arkansas and Arizona to Washington and Wisconsin, who wrote a letter to Congress calling this measure "an empty promise [that] would cause considerably more harm than good."

No wonder President Obama has pledged to veto this bill, declaring that "this legislation undermines the existing right to hard-earned overtime pay, on which many working families rely to make ends meet, while misrepresenting itself as a workplace flexibility measure . . ."

CLOSE

The Republican proposal is the last gift anyone should give our families on Mother's Day.

That's why I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and to work together on steps to invest in working families, to bolster small businesses, to create jobs, and to build a strong, thriving middle class.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's callous Mother's Day gift—more work and

less pay for working moms. Not a Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BEATTY. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's appalling Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. And that's a Happy Mother's Day?

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, you've seen them, many, many women, hourly workers. You've seen them with their sneakers on, their rubber-soled shoes, standing at bus stops, getting on buses in order to get to work and to get back in time to be with their children.

But those workers need cash, Mr. Speaker. They need cash to make ends meet in housing, food and other living expenses. It's also our men as well.

These workers would see a substantial reduction in their take-home pay if they were compensated with time off rather than cash up front. We know that if H.R. 1406 was passed they would be paid nothing for their overtime work at the time they work.

We also realize that employers can schedule workers to work up to 160 hours of comp time. Workers will be cheated out of the accrued overtime earnings, these same mothers and many, many men who depend on this overtime pay. You've seen them.

The same mothers that will receive for their gift on Mother's Day a little outstretched hand with maybe a daffodil or a rose in it from a little 5-year old, mothers who need the cash.

Let me tell you that the U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce is against this legislation because they know that there will be preferential treatment. There will be pets, and the employers will pick those who have taken the comp time.

You've seen these mothers. They get the outstretched hand and the little flower. Pay them their money.

This is a bad bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and unyielding opposition to H.R. 1406, the so-called "Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013." I thank Ranking Member MILLER for this opportunity to speak on behalf and in support of the working women and men in my District and against this terrible bill, which has been offered repeatedly over several Congresses, and each time it has found strong opposition and ultimate defeat.

Under current law (the Fair Labor Standards Act), employers are required to pay workers time-and-a-half cash for hours worked in excess of 40 hours per week.

Workers can request "comp time" during any 40 hour work week if they need it.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics the average weekly overtime hours for manufacturing workers in 2012 was 4.2 hours or over 44 hours a week. In a year 4.2 additional hours of overtime, considering 2 weeks for vacation would total 210 hours.

A Boilermaker with less than 2 years of experience earns $35,856.00 a year or $18 an hour. A Boilermaker making $18 an hour working overtime would earn $27 an hour.

In 2012 manufacturer workers overtime averaged 4.2 hours a week that would be 210 hours for 50 weeks of work.

A Boilermaker over a year could accrue 210 hours in overtime—if this bill becomes law this could mean a loss of $5,670 annually.

The first quarter of 2013 according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics recorded an increase of overtime hours worked to 4.3 hours per week for manufacturing jobs this is an increase over the last quarter of 2012. If Congress allows the free market to work then the numbers of employed persons will increase.

Labor is in strong opposition to H.R. 1406 because—this bill would mean forced labor hours without giving workers the guaranteed right to get paid for their work.

Workers already have the right to ask for "comp time" within any 40 hour workweek when they need it.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics counts overtime as a benefit not as pay. If the result of the bill is to have employees work more hours, but without the guarantee of compensation—it is flawed.

If Congress wants to do something for workers we should support the President's Budget for state paid leave programs. His proposal would not force workers to choose between taking time off for family needs and receiving income, or even risk losing their jobs. The President's minimum wage proposal would also support working families by making sure that all workers receive enough hourly income to make ends meet.

That is why I oppose H.R. 1406 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this terrible legislation.

□ 1510

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding. I appreciate the committee's leadership on this important measure.

I rise today in support of the Working Families Flexibility Act, a House of Representatives initiative that will give families and individuals across the Fifth District the freedom of workplace choice and limit the Federal overreach in our daily lives. At a time when our economy is struggling, we must look for ways to help our hardworking families and individuals.

Under current law, public employees can choose between using overtime hours for pay or for paid time off. Unfortunately, this same option is not afforded to those who work for private companies. With small businesses and family farms being the engine of our rural economy, this option is therefore not available to many of my constituents.

This bill before us today changes all of that. By ensuring private workers can accrue paid time off instead of overtime compensation, we will provide Fifth District Virginians greater flexibility in balancing their work schedules with the demands of family life. And we will take these important decisions out of the hands of Federal bureaucrats and place them into the hands of hardworking Americans.

It is high time that this outdated regulation be replaced with the principles of individual freedom and individual choice. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

I thank Representative ROBY for sponsoring this important initiative.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, it's now my privilege to yield 1 minute to my colleague from the State of Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. This really is an insidious bill. I've been listening to the debate on the floor, Mr. Speaker, and I have to tell you there are some things I heard that I think need correcting.

First of all, median hourly wages in this country are $12.80 an hour. That's about $26,000 a year. And what that means is that for most workers, for some of our workers who are hourly workers, this bill really goes at the heart of the 40-hour workweek. In fact, what it does is it puts in jeopardy some of our most vulnerable in the workforce. Ninety percent of our hourly workers don't work under collective bargaining agreements, and that means that they don't have the protections that public sector workers have who get to enjoy comp time when it's available to them. They really do need the time and a half.

It's not like the other side is proposing that we have earned sick leave, earned vacation, earned maternity leave. Instead, they want to take away pay and get a no-interest loan from workers instead of paying them time and a half for their overtime. There's no flexibility. The power is only in the hands of the employer who gets to decide when the comp time can be taken, whether it can be taken, and how it should be paid.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, if I could just inquire through you, again, we have no further speakers, so I'm prepared to close.

Mr. KLINE. We have no further speakers, either.

Mr. COURTNEY. Could the Chair give me one last update in terms of how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

We've probably reached the point where enough has been said where the full 4½ minutes maybe isn't necessary, but again, I would just like to reiterate a few points. And again, as somebody who was an employer in the private sector for over 20 years, and, again, the notion that somehow existing labor law makes it impossible for employers to respond to their staff's family emergencies, to vacations is really just a myth.

The fact of the matter is that over the last 75 years under the Fair Labor Standards Act, which protects the 40-hour workweek, employers in tens of thousands of workplaces all across America have always made accommodations for their staffs with paid time. What is different about this bill is it's basically tying that flexibility to sacrificing your right under the Fair Labor Standards Act to time and a half for every hour earned over 40 hours. Given the fact that we're living in a time right now where the median income of this country has basically been as flat as a pancake for the last 30 years, that is basically tipping the scales once again against working families in an unacceptable fashion.

If you read this bill closely, you have to execute a written agreement every time you want to set up a comp time arrangement. Can you imagine small employers out there, basically, and their workers have to sit down and write like a mini labor agreement every time they want to come up with one of these arrangements? It doesn't allow for emergencies when you have a system like that.

The enforcement mechanism, which would be through the State Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division—if anybody has ever dealt with them before, they know that is mission impossible. There is no way that that unit—which, again, today benefits from a bright line system where you just check the payroll hours. If you hit 40 hours, you've got to pay the time and a half. Nobody has the time to go through and examine that agreement to see if it was free and voluntary and whether or not the exercise of comp time was done in accordance with it. You're basically creating a labor relations board in every State, in every workplace across America.

Careful what you wish for as employers if you read this bill closer.

But the fact of the matter is that at the end of the day, it does not empower employees or workers in terms of giving them the ability to basically support their family and have time to deal with the important family issues, whether it's the birth of a child, making sure you're there on important school dates, or making sure that they're there when they're ill or in need of family and parental assistance.

The fact of the matter is paid sick time is the way that you do that. That's the way you empower people. And that is what exists in the public sector. That's why comp time works in the public sector. Paid sick time is something that is part of every collective bargaining agreement in all 50 States in the public sector.

Small employers, is that what the majority really wants to impose on every private employer in this country?

The fact of the matter is that we need to scrap this bill which is before us for the fifth time since 1996 and go back and have a real dialogue in a real bipartisan collaboration in terms of coming up with real solutions for working families.

I actually am an optimist and believe we can do that. I respect the chairman. I respect my chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections. But the fact is we can do far better than this recycled, rehashed bill which, again, has been rejected by over 160 organizations which represent working families and women.

Again, let's vote this bill down, go back, and as a real body, deliberative body, come up with a better solution for working families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of our time.

I agree with some of the comments made by my colleague. The gentleman from Connecticut has talked about the years that we, Congress, have tried to extend the use of comp time to the private sector employees so they can access the same benefits that those in the public sector have enjoyed for almost 30 years. Yet powerful special interests have stood in the way through a constant campaign of misinformation.

We've heard a lot of those same, tired talking points from the other side today. We've seen some political stunts. We've heard divisive language, and we've heard just plain misinformation, things that this bill does not say.

We've heard, for example, that an employer could coerce an employee into taking comp time instead of overtime wages. That is simply not true. The bill specifically prohibits employers from doing that. An employer ''shall not directly or indirectly intimidate, threaten, or coerce or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any employee for the purpose of interfering with such employee's rights under this subsection to request or not request compensatory time off.''

There are extensive protections in this bill for employees and for employers. But we've seen the straw men, we've seen the accusations, and we've heard some things that, frankly, are just absolutely preposterous.

Let's go over some of the basics.

The Working Families Flexibility Act allows for the voluntary—the voluntary—use of comp time. Any worker who wants to receive cash wages is free to do so and can do so at any time, even if the worker has made an agreement, and not every time, and not some extensive legal document. It can be as simple as checking a block or just signing a piece of paper that says I would like to take comp time in lieu of cash overtime. And they can do it once a year.

Even after they've signed such an agreement, if the employee says, ''Do you know what? I really do need that cash. I wanted the time; now I need the cash. Another emergency has arisen,'' the employee can demand the cash and get it and must get it.

The Working Families Flexibility Act puts workers in control of their time. They get to take the time off when they want to. These are exactly the same standards that have been working almost 30 years in the public sector. They simply can't unduly disrupt the business. That's worked for almost 30 years in the public sector, and it will work in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, despite all the rhetoric, despite all the accusations and despite all the misinformation, we know that millions of mothers for Mother's Day would like to have time. Time is more important to them than money. This legislation would give them the option, the choice—the voluntary choice—to take that time.

We heard an example of a young, 5-year-old child coming forward with a flower. A lot of moms would like to take that time to spend with that 5-year-old. They can't do it under the current law. We want to give that mother and that father that time.

□ 1520

This is a commonsense proposal. It will help hardworking Americans balance the demands of work and family. We need to do that for them. This doesn't balance the budget, but it will help families.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 1406, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Redesignate section 5 as section 6 and insert after section 4 the following:

SEC. 5. G.A.O. REPORT.

Beginning 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and each of the 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress providing, with respect to the reporting period immediately prior to each such report—

(1) data concerning the extent to which employers provide compensatory time pursuant to section 7(s) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as added by this Act, and the extent to which employees opt to receive compensatory time;

(2) the number of complaints alleging a violation of such section filed by any employee with the Secretary of Labor;

(3) the number of enforcement actions commenced by the Secretary or commenced by the Secretary on behalf of any employee for alleged violations of such section;

(4) the disposition or status of such complaints and actions described in paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(5) an account of any unpaid wages, damages, penalties, injunctive relief, or other remedies obtained or sought by the Secretary in connection with such actions described in paragraph (3).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 198, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the chairman. And I thank the gentlelady from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for bringing the bill.

I have an amendment, but I first want to say that I support the underlying bill.

I take a look at the fact that almost 30 years ago, right here in these halls, in bipartisan work, Democrats and Republicans worked together here, led by the Democratically controlled Congress, and worked with the President—then President Reagan—to provide comp time for State and local workers. What we're doing today is taking that same concept and extending it out to the private sector.

I reflect on my constituents. I think about the busy lives that all our workers have, and I think about how challenging it is to bring balance to those lives. I think this is an important concept to bring forward, to think about those who are pursuing higher education, mothers and fathers that are looking to bring balance to the workplace, but also to raising their children, and how important that is for our families, for individuals, and for our country. So I think it's important that we extend this concept to the private sector.

Now, I have friends who have concerns, and we've heard some of the concerns here today. I have reflected very extensively on those. I will tell you that what I see in this bill—and the chairman actually, I think, summed it up very well just moments ago—is, first and foremost, that this is a choice for the worker on whether or not they want to join this program. I recognize that there are arguments that are concerning on that score. But also, if the worker decides to enter the comp time program and decides to take comp time and then something unexpected happens where they choose to change their mind, there are provisions in this bill where the individual can notify their employer, and within 30 days the business needs to pay the employee.

So as I reflect on the wording in this bill, I think there is a balance. But I also recognize that there are still concerns out there, and I want those voices to be heard. So this is the purpose of my amendment. I think we should hear from our government, hear from the GAO to talk about the implementation on how well it's going. This amendment says that after 2 years of implementation of this law, that the GAO would report out to us on how well that's going, and also provide us data if there are abuses and what's being done about those abuses.

So I see this as yet another protection to ensure that as we look to extend this concept from the State and local governments, that we have protections in there to ensure that our workers are having justice.

So I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I just want to again recognize my colleague's hard work. He is a person that I respect and admire greatly.

Again, I do not oppose the amendment. It's hard to oppose a GAO study of almost anything because the more we know and the more we learn, it's always a good thing. However, what I would say, just in observation, in passing, is that if you look at the scope of the study, which is to basically look at actual adjudicated complaints before the Secretary of Labor, and looking again at the scope of the U.S. economy in the private sector, the fact of the matter is it is not going to be a very accurate picture really in terms of the operation of this bill—again, an attempt albeit, but nonetheless not something that I think is really going to give us a very accurate picture in terms of all of the day-to-day sort of conflicts. Blurring the lines of the Fair Labor Standards Act and creating an almost chaotic system of executing written agreements in every instance where a person wants to negotiate an overtime comp arrangement really, I think, is even beyond the scope and great powers of the Government Accountability Office—which does do great work.

Because, again, will this study tell us how many workers were fired or discriminated against for their choices? No. Because there is no right to reinstatement or rescheduling under this bill. Will this study tell us how many times a worker was denied the precise day he or she asked for? No. Because the bill provides no right to use comp time on that specific day.

I want to go back to that point. If you go to page 8 of the bill, use of comp time is, again, under the veto power of the employer. The notion that somehow employees have unilateral choice or power over using that comp time is not the way this bill is written.

As far as the public sector is concerned, again, in all of those instances you have an elaborate grievance system which exists at State government levels, city government levels, which doesn't exist in the private sector. And it certainly doesn't exist in the Department of Labor's Wage and Hours Division—which, again, Mrs. ROBY and I, in all of our back and forth, fleshed out the fact that that ultimately is where complaints would go and reside.

So, again, a GAO study is fine, and I'm certainly going to join the gentleman in supporting his amendment, but this does not fix a flawed bill. Once we get past this amendment, I think all of the arguments that you've heard over the last hour or so in opposition to the bill still trump any benefit that Mr. GIBSON's good-faith amendment brings to the bill.

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

Mr. GIBSON. I just want to say that the gentleman from Connecticut is somebody whom I've very much enjoyed working with. I think he is a very thoughtful Member. I consider him a friend. I have listened very carefully to his comments and certainly will give him further consideration. I still believe that this amendment will be helpful.

At this point, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. I thank my friend, Representative GIBSON, for offering this amendment, which I strongly support.

Let me start by highlighting a provision of the Working Families Flexibility Act that is meant to ensure this policy works today and into the future.

Section 5 of the bill states:

This act and the amendments made by this act shall expire 5 years after the date of enactment of this act.

The intent here is clear: Congress has an opportunity and a responsibility to review the use of comp time by private sector employers and employees, if need be, to make adjustments in the law before authorizing its continued use.

Even though comp time has worked well in the public sector for decades, Congress should examine its use in the private sector to make sure that workers are protected. To further support this oversight of the law the Gibson amendment would require GAO to regularly review private sector use of comp time and provide information to Congress relating to changes that might be needed. This commonsense addition to the bill will help inform Congress as it continues to oversee the use of comp time by private sector employees.

The Gibson amendment is about transparency and accountability, and will help ensure the use of comp time in the private sector is a net benefit to employers and employees.

Mr. Speaker, the Working Families Flexibility Act will help more Americans balance family and work. Because the Gibson amendment would strengthen this important effort, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider H.R. 1406, inaccurately named the Working Families Flexibility Act. Instead of helping hard-working

Americans earn an honest wage and more flexible work hours, this bill makes it harder on folks already struggling to make ends meet. The reality is that under this bill, workers will lose personal control over their schedule and their pay. In addition, the system this bill imposes is ripe for potential workplace manipulation and abuse.

Under this bill, workers will not get paid more than 40 hours per week, no matter how much overtime they put in. Overtime earnings would become an interest-free loan out of workers' pockets. Workers' overtime pay will be held until the end of each fiscal year or allocated as time-off, all at the discretion of the employer. There is no guarantee in this bill that workers could even get the time off that they might need for a family emergency or doctor's appointment when they need it. Workers could even jeopardize their job security by refusing to go along with this new system.

Mr. Speaker, in Michigan, we believe that hard work merits fair pay. We believe that anyone who works hard and plays by the rules should get a shot at the American Dream. Last year, the average Michigan household income was $43,970. Adjusted for inflation, this is the same as the average household in 1989. This bill makes it harder for people who are already working hard and playing by the rules to make life better for their family by not allowing them to decide what's best for them and their family. If they work more, they should get paid more.

When I talk to folks in my district, I ask about the concerns they are raising around the dinner table. Michigan families worry about how to stretch work schedules and each dollar earned to meet the needs of their family. There is no part of that discussion where Michiganders want Washington to force them to sacrifice their personal decision-making about whether overtime pay or comp time is the right choice for them.

Too many families in my district and across our country are still trying to recover from the worst economic crisis in generations. Why then, instead of working towards commonsense ways we can ease the financial burden on working families, is Washington forcing a personal decision to forfeit their overtime pay? Why is Washington dredging up deeply flawed proposals that have already been rejected time and time again?

Now more than ever, we need ways to support our middle class so families in Michigan and across the nation can thrive. We can develop solutions that make raising a family easier for everyone. We have a lot of work ahead to rebuild our economy and strengthen our middle class, but this bill does neither.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1406, the so-called ''Working Families Flexibility Act.''

This bill, which might more accurately be titled the ''More Work, Less Pay Act,'' would undermine the right to overtime pay and further weaken worker protections. Instead of actual money, employers would be authorized to provide compensatory time off at a rate of 1.5 hours per hour of overtime worked.

While this might sound like a good deal in theory, it's a raw deal in practice. First, it could end up denying countless workers the opportunity to earn extra money they may desperately need to pay their mortgage, cover medical bills, or provide a good education for their children. Just as unfairly, there is no guarantee that a worker will be able to take off the comp time they accrue. This bill would allow employers to claim that a request for time off—time that the employee has worked extra hours to earn—is ''unduly disruptive,'' and the request would be denied without any follow-up. We all know that you can't plan for medical emergencies and sometimes parent-teacher conferences don't fit easily into the workday. But unless your employer agrees to allow you to use the comp time you've earned, you're out of luck.

The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) implemented the 40-hour work week to allow workers time to be with their families; and to increase demand for workers when a firm has larger workloads. This bill would effectively put an end to the 40-hour work week without any guarantee of proper compensation for extra time worked, and would strip employees of the flexibility to meet workplace and family needs.

Instead of making life more difficult for hard-working American families, we should be considering legislation to establish a fair minimum wage, equal pay for women, or the Healthy Families Act, which makes earned paid sick days available to millions of workers.

American workers deserve better than this misleading and misguided bill, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act. It outrages me that my Republican colleagues continue to clothe despicable bills in inventive titles. In point of fact, H.R. 1406 offers no flexibility to working families. It does, however, grant employers the flexibility not to pay their employees overtime.

The Working Families Flexibility Act is nothing short of an assault on American working families. It will put an end to the 40-hour work week that my father fought so hard to enact in the Fair Labor Standards Act. The bill will force employees to work longer hours without guarantee of fair pay. It contains no provision to allow employees to contest employer decisions not to grant time off for personal or family emergencies. In short, the bill's sole purpose is to empower employers and disenfranchise the American middle class.

I urge my colleagues to recognize H.R. 1406 for the evil it is and call on them to stand up for working families by voting it down.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act. A more accurate name would be the Employer Flexibility Act, because the bill would give employers the flexibility to deny their workers overtime pay.

H.R. 1406 would overturn a key provision of the landmark 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) that ensures workers who work beyond the 40 hour standard work week are to be paid overtime—a rate that is set higher than the normal rate in order to keep the number of hours workers are asked to work reasonable. H.R. 1406 would undo this important provision so that an employer could, in lieu of making overtime payments to an hourly worker, make the promise of some future time off.

And this legislation goes one step further. The time off promised in lieu of overtime payment would be up to the discretion of the employer. The employer could deny requests for time off for up to a year before the legislation would require employers pay out the equivalent in wages. This is great for bosses, but it doesn't do much for working families.

Let's call this effort what it is: it is an anti-worker bill. Its effect would be to harm our nation's hourly workers: housekeepers, fast food workers, store clerks and other vulnerable members of our community. These individuals need their overtime wages the most.

This bill would also have a disproportionate impact on women, who have increasingly become the breadwinners in American families. A Center for American Progress study demonstrates that in more than two thirds of our families, women earn at least a quarter of the family income, and in many cases earn as much or more than their spouse. Among families with children in 2011, some 40 percent were headed by two working parents. Our federal policies must take this reality into account and meet our families half way by granting genuine flexibility while maintaining the important protections, like overtime pay, that help families thrive.

Unfortunately, this is not the first time that Republican Party leaders have sought to roll back worker protections. The past few years we have seen Republican Governors attempt to break up public sector unions and more recently, House Republicans repeatedly offered legislation to eviscerate the National Labor Relations Board.

If House Republicans wanted to help working families have more flexibility, they could start by undoing earlier efforts to make life harder for American workers and join Democrats in calling for a vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act so that women are paid the wages they deserve, or the Healthy Families Act so that families struggling with a child's illness or other crisis could get time off to deal with those challenges without jeopardizing their families' future. Another important improvement for working families Republicans have refused is to increase the minimum wage of $2.13 per hour for tipped workers—a wage that has not been increased in nearly twenty years.

H.R. 1406 has no chance of becoming law. It will not be taken up in the Senate, and the White House has promised to veto it. Why are we wasting valuable time on it? I urge my colleagues to take action for U.S. workers now, and support family friendly policies that will help our workers, restore the economic vitality of our middle class, and strengthen the social and economic bonds that knit us together as a people.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1406, the so-called ''Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013.'' After reviewing the text, I must confess I am confused about how the Majority came up with the name for this bill. The ''Pay Working Families Less Act of 2013'' certainly does not have the same ring to it—but it would be a fair title for legislation that undermines the rights that workers have struggled for generations to secure. By repealing overtime protections in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, this legislation offers flexibility for bosses eager to exploit their workforce and roll back pro-family reforms that 21st century families need. In their place, is the illusion of flexibility wherein an employee can take overtime compensation in time rather than pay—but only when the employer decides it is convenient.

However, just giving employers more flexibility is not what this bill is really about—H.R. 1406's ultimate goal is the systematic evisceration of overtime laws and all the benefits

they guarantee. No longer will employers have an incentive to boost employment by hiring enough workers to do the job. No longer will employers be forced to do something as basic as treat employees equally. No longer will employers be forced to pay every employee time-and-a-half for working more than 40 hours a week. Instead, they can shuffle overtime hours to employees who agree to take time rather than compensation.

Of course, this bill purports to protect against such manipulation. H.R. 1406's sponsor has said that the bill addresses these concerns because it bans employers from intimidating, coercing, and threatening workers. However, she also very clearly and very tellingly failed to include protections against discrimination. This lets employers force their employees to compete against one another for who will do the most work for the least amount of compensation.

If my friends across the aisle were serious about being friendly to families, they would find a way to help them without gutting important wage and hour protections that middle class families need to survive. If my friends across the aisle were serious about workers' familial responsibilities, they would support Representative DELAURO's Health Families Act. If they wanted to ensure that an illness did not bankrupt a family, they would help working families save by supporting the Fair Minimum Wage Act. If they cared about working mothers, they would support the Paycheck Fairness Act so that women aren't receiving 77 cents for every dollar a man earns.

Unfortunately, they simply are not serious—at least not about helping working class families find the stability and security that a flexible work environment offers.

I urge my colleagues to provide working families with legislation that provides real workplace flexibility and oppose this flawed and disingenuous bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the so called "Working Families Flexibility Act," which more accurately should be called the "Less Pay for Middle Class Families Act." I voted against similar legislation in 1997 and continue to strongly oppose this policy. In effect, this bill takes pay from the pockets of American families and loans it to their employers, with no condition that they pay it back for up to a year. If enacted, this policy would make life even more difficult for millions of middle class Americans. Even the bill's promise of flexibility is only true for the employer, which can determine on its own when the employee could use any accrued compensatory time. Enactment of this bill would translate into less money for American workers, more power for their employers, and breaks the time-honored tradition that extra work means extra pay.

This bill is an affront to middle class families across America. I oppose it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my strong opposition to the egregiously misnamed Working Families Flexibility Act. It should be named the Working Families Inflexibility Act. This bill takes all of the control and choice out of the hands of workers and hands it right over to employers!

H.R. 1406 denies workers their earned overtime pay and deprives them of any promise of future compensation. It strips them of any guarantees of time off for personal or family emergencies. It would, however, guarantee them longer work hours and less control over their own schedules.

H.R. 1406 would also mean a pay cut for the millions of workers who need cash overtime to help pay their housing, food, and medical bills. Middle-income and low-income workers living paycheck to paycheck are already struggling to make ends meet and have come to rely on their overtime pay. After all, time off does not pay the bills.

The Fair Labor Standards Act and the 40-hour work week has been extremely successful for decades, why does the Majority want to change that other than to cater to employers and continue their war on the working American?

Mr. Speaker, under the guise of family-friendly public policy, the Working Families Flexibility Act is simply another assault on workers' rights. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by allowing employers to deny overtime pay, by substituting compensatory time off for overtime at the discretion of employers and by denying guaranteed time off for workers when they need it, the Republican attempt to give the nation's mothers a Mother's Day bill gets jeers instead of cheers. This same bill has died in committee or failed three times since 1996 and the President has pledged to veto it this time. We need new ideas for hard-pressed working mothers, not a redux that takes more than it gives. This was a message bill, not a serious attempt to help working mothers. The Senate won't touch it. So, happy Mother's Day. We can and will do better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 198, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 5 p.m.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2013—Continued

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1406) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pending is the demand of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for the yeas and nays on the question of adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON). Those in support of the request for the yeas and nays will rise and be counted.

A sufficient number having risen, the yeas and nays are ordered. Members will record their votes by electronic device.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on a motion to recommit H.R. 1406, if ordered; passage of H.R. 1406, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 202; and adoption of House Resolution 202, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 42, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—384

Aderholt	Chaffetz	Fleischmann
Alexander	Chu	Fleming
Amash	Cicilline	Flores
Amodei	Clarke	Forbes
Bachmann	Clay	Fortenberry
Bachus	Cleaver	Foster
Barber	Clyburn	Foxx
Barletta	Coble	Franks (AZ)
Barr	Coffman	Frelinghuysen
Barrow (GA)	Cohen	Fudge
Barton	Cole	Gabbard
Bass	Collins (GA)	Gallego
Beatty	Collins (NY)	Garcia
Becerra	Conaway	Gardner
Benishek	Connolly	Gerlach
Bentivolio	Cook	Gibbs
Bera (CA)	Cotton	Gibson
Bilirakis	Courtney	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Cramer	Goodlatte
Bishop (NY)	Crawford	Gosar
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Black	Cuellar	Granger
Blackburn	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Blumenauer	Cummings	Graves (MO)
Bonamici	Daines	Grayson
Bonner	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Boustany	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Griffin (AR)
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Griffith (VA)
Bridenstine	DeGette	Grimm
Brooks (IN)	Delaney	Guthrie
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Gutierrez
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Hahn
Buchanan	Denham	Hall
Bucshon	Dent	Hanabusa
Burgess	DeSantis	Hanna
Bustos	DesJarlais	Harper
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Calvert	Doggett	Hartzler
Camp	Duckworth	Hastings (FL)
Campbell	Duffy	Hastings (WA)
Cantor	Duncan (TN)	Heck (NV)
Capito	Edwards	Heck (WA)
Capps	Ellison	Hensarling
Capuano	Ellmers	Herrera Beutler
Cárdenas	Engel	Higgins
Carney	Eshoo	Himes
Carson (IN)	Esty	Hinojosa
Carter	Farenthold	Holding
Cassidy	Farr	Holt
Castro (TX)	Fincher	Horsford
Chabot	Fitzpatrick	Hoyer

Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
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
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—42

Andrews
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Enyart
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Garamendi
Garrett
Grijalva
Honda
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kaptur
Kildee
Lowenthal
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
Moore
Nadler
Nolan
Palazzo
Perlmutter
Pocan
Rahall
Schakowsky
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Takano
Wasserman Schultz
Waters

NOT VOTING—6

Gohmert
Jordan
Markey
Pearce
Royce
Webster (FL)

□ 1728

Messrs. CROWLEY, BRADY of Pennsylvania, DUNCAN of South Carolina, and SMITH of Washington changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NEAL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. ELLISON, LEVIN, BARBER, ENGEL, LARSEN of Washington, and MCDERMOTT, Ms. SINEMA, and Messrs. KEATING, LARSON of Connecticut, and WHITFIELD changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Shea-Porter moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1406, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 8, after line 9, insert the following:

''(8) GUARANTEED EMPLOYEE CHOICE FOR USE OF COMP TIME FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—An employee may not be denied use of earned compensation time for the specific date and time requested by the employee for the following family or medical purposes:

''(A) To attend a medical appointment, including a medical appointment for a family member.

''(B) To care for a sick child or other family member or because the employee is sick.

''(C) To attend counseling or rehabilitation appointments in relation to injuries sustained by the employee as a member of the Armed Forces.

''(9) EXCLUSION OF EMPLOYERS THAT VIOLATE EQUAL PAY PROTECTIONS FOR WOMEN.—An employer that has been found to have violated section 6(d) (as added by the Equal Pay Act of 1963) shall not be eligible to replace monetary overtime compensation with compensatory time under this subsection.''.

Page 8, line 10, strike ''(8)'' and insert ''(10)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill and to offer the final amendment, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

The amendment I offer today would reject this bill's attack on workers and their families. The base bill brought to the floor today effectively ends the 40-hour workweek and offers comp time in lieu of overtime pay.

The Republican bill boils down to this: more work, less pay. This continues the House Republican no jobs agenda that undermines American workers, weakens worker checkbooks, and harms the middle class. This legislation does not guarantee that workers will be able to use the time they have earned when they need it the most. Instead, the comp time earned by workers would go into a pot that would be controlled by their employer. This is not more flexibility for workers; it's less pay for workers.

Under this bill, employers could schedule excessive overtime hours and only offer overtime work to workers who agree to take comp time instead of overtime wages. An employer can refuse to allow a worker to take time off to deal with a family member or to attend a parent-teacher conference. And under this bill, if employers choose not to allow the time off, workers will get paid at the end of the year, having kindly provided their boss with an interest-free loan. And let's hope the year's worth of accounting is accurate.

So this amendment presents the House with a choice: support hardworking Americans and their families, or side with interest groups and corporate lobbyists.

This final amendment says that workers may not be denied use of earned compensation time to attend a medical appointment, care for a sick child or a family member, or for veterans to attend counseling or rehabilitation appointments for injuries suffered in combat. Finally, if you are an employer that has violated the Equal Pay Act, my amendment ensures that you can't cut workers' overtime pay also. That's just common sense.

Today, as the gap between the very wealthy and middle class Americans is widening, a pay cut is the last thing that hardworking Americans who are struggling to provide for their families need. That's why President Obama has pledged to veto this legislation, and that's why more than 160 organizations oppose it, including women's organizations, labor organizations, and civil rights organizations.

Now, I'm passionate about workers' rights because that's where I come from. I worked on the floor of a manufacturing plant to pay for college. I took all the overtime I could work, second and third shifts, and I needed that money. I remember the tough conditions in that plant. Workers were afraid to question management. Anyone who thinks this won't happen to many workers who try to get comp time when they need it is fooling themselves.

Workers need the guarantees provided in this final amendment in order to make sure they're not trading overtime pay for comp time they might

never be able to use. Instead of asking employees to work more and get paid less, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and protect veterans, women, and working families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. My friends on the other side of the aisle are again refusing to work with us to help American families. Instead, they are spending their time taking political shots and, in fact, politicizing Mother's Day in order to do it.

Despite having taken the underlying bill through the committee process before bringing it to the floor, my Democratic colleagues have made no real attempt to engage in meaningful conversations on this bill. In fact, while they originally offered a related provision as an amendment to floor consideration, it was quickly withdrawn. I guess they've decided they score more political points by waiting until now, when the process is about to conclude, than offering up meaningful suggestions during the months we've been debating this issue.

Americans are tired of this game. They're tired of watching us fight each other when we should be fighting for them. That is why it is time that we pass the Working Families Flexibility Act. Our bill gives private sector employees the same choice government workers have enjoyed for decades: the choice to receive comp time instead of wages for overtime.

Again, this is something that the public sector has engaged in for many, many years—decades, in fact. If it's good enough for the Federal Government, it ought to be good enough for the private sector.

I'm a mom. Riley and I have two beautiful children, Margaret and George. Margaret is 8 and George is 4. I understand the pulls on working families as we balance our workplace and our home time. This is about helping working moms and dads. This is about providing the ability to spend time at home that's so needed in today's hectic time. I know this firsthand. And this is important and will provide help for many working families. This could change lives.

It is time to do the right thing for working families. It is time we do the right thing for American families. Let's pass the Working Families Flexibility Act. I encourage my colleagues to defeat this motion to recommit, 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. 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 200, noes 227, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

AYES—200

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
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
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
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
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
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
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—227

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

NOT VOTING—5

Markey
Pearce
Richmond
Royce
Webster (FL)

□ 1746

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. ANDREWS. 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 223, noes 204, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

AYES—223

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton

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

NOES—204

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

NOT VOTING—5

Gutierrez
Markey
Pearce
Royce
Webster (FL)

□ 1753

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 137, I am not recorded because I was absent from the House of Representatives for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 807, FULL FAITH AND CREDIT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 202) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 807) to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 199, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

YEAS—227

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

NAYS—199

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

NOT VOTING—6

Huelskamp
Markey
Pearce
Royce
Speier
Webster (FL)

□ 1800

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 199, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—226

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

NAYS—199

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
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
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Bachus
Gohmert
Markey
Moore
Pearce
Royce
Webster (FL)

□ 1812

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding my recent absence from the House on Wednesday, May 8th. During this time, as Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I travelled back to Southern California to participate in the official visit of President Park Geun-hye of South Korea. Because of this absence, I missed several important votes on the House floor, and would like to submit how I would have voted had I been in attendance. The votes were:

Rollcall No. 135, on Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 1406, the Gibson of New York Amendment No. 1. I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall No. 136, on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 1406 with instructions, I would have voted "no."

Rollcall No. 137, on Passage of H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act, I would have voted "aye"

Rollcall No. 138, on Ordering the Previous Question for H. Res. 202, To Provide for Consideration of H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall No. 139, on H. Res. 202, Providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act I would have voted "aye."

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1286

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1286.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING JOSEPH FANDINO

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in memory of Mr. Joseph Gregory Fandino, a resident of south Florida and a hero who lost his life while serving our Nation in Vietnam in 1972.

Last Friday, on Foreign Affairs Day, Joseph was honored by the Department of State and the American Foreign Service Association, who commemorated their colleagues who died in the line of duty overseas.

Joseph was one of the first Hispanic-born service officers who, despite being told by classmates that he had the wrong kind of ethnic background, served the United States valiantly for many years.

Joseph also served in the Air Force during the Korean war and as a Foreign Service officer in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Spain and Canada where he worked with large numbers of refugees fleeing Cuba.

Joseph put himself in harm's way, choosing to sacrifice his safety in order to assist others and advance freedom and peace around the world.

His commitment to our American ideals, his courage and his good humor during difficult times will be forever remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to salute our heroes.

FOSTER YOUTH MONTH

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Foster Care Month and on behalf of the foster youth across this country.

I'd like to commend Representatives KAREN BASS, TOM MARINO, JIM MCDERMOTT, and MICHELE BACHMANN for their leadership of the bipartisan Foster Youth Caucus and for their work on this important issue.

Foster youth are some of the most at-risk children in our society. They are often the victims of abuse or neglect, and too many face trials and tribulations beyond their years.

So much of what we take for granted—a stable home, living with our siblings or returning to the same school year after year—are constant obstacles for these children.

However, the month of May and, in fact, every day should serve as a reminder of the opportunities that we all have to make a positive difference in their lives.

Growing up, my parents welcomed many foster children into our family and provided them with a loving, stable and nurturing environment.

Mr. Speaker, these children belong to all of us, and we are all responsible for them.

HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of serving as co-chairman of the Congressional Natural Gas Caucus, a bipartisan group working to identify challenges and further utilizing this clean, abundant energy resource.

One of these challenges has to do with the swarm of misinformation that surrounds the process of hydraulic fracturing, the extraction process which is stringently regulated at the State level.

On April 29, after a 16-month investigation, regulators in my home State of Pennsylvania found that hydraulic fracturing, contrary to highly publicized claims, is not to blame for high methane levels found in drinking water in the town of Franklin Forks. Instead, it was due to naturally occurring methane. The same incident was used by environmentalists as an example of the dangers of fracking and the subject of numerous media reports.

Mr. Speaker, science and facts—not rhetoric and scare tactics—must guide our energy policy. The fact of the matter is that there has been no confirmed reports of groundwater contamination from hydraulic fracturing. Even former EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson has testified to this fact.

□ 1820

HONORING AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM AT UC DAVIS

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the University of California, Davis. This historic land grant university excels in a wide range and variety of fields, including medicine, physics, law, and agriculture.

Today, the University of California, Davis, agriculture and forestry program was recognized as the best in the world by QS World University Rankings, a respected firm that measures publications and citations in scientific journals and the program's reputation among both academics and employers in the field. I offer my highest congratulations to the school's faculty, students, and staff.

For decades, the University of California, Davis, has developed cutting-edge farm practices, research, and local partnerships. Right now, they're studying genetics, nutrition, milk, wine grapes, and so much more. As epitomized by the mechanical tomato harvester and other inventions developed there, this work directly boosts agricultural production and profits.

As we write the new farm bill, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting agricultural studies and research.

VICTOR FROM HUFFMAN, TEXAS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Victor from Huffman, Texas, writes me this:

> I work. I pay my taxes. In order to earn that paycheck, I work on construction projects. Every morning we file into a job site like cattle. We are searched, scanned and tested. But the government hands out our money to those who don't work for free houses, cars, food, and the list just gets longer. I work 84 hours a week just to make ends meet. The more I work, the more I get taxed. We have families that we only see at night, if at all. We work outages, turnarounds, and shutdowns. If I don't pay my taxes, I go to jail. If I don't do my job, I'm fired. We work extra to have extra, not so we can pay for more government programs.

Mr. Speaker, workers are tired of their taxes going up just so the government can get more people dependent on government.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING HIGH TECH HIGH

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my colleague, SUSAN DAVIS, I rise in recognition of the High Tech High robotics team, nicknamed the Holy Cows, who recently won a world championship robotics competition. High Tech High is located in the Point Loma neighborhood of San Diego in the 52nd District.

The team beat out more than 10,000 other students to win the prized Chairman's Award at the For Inspiration Recognition of Science and Technology event.

This group of talented young students has used their expertise to develop a smart phone app for robotics, and they even took time to help other San Diego robotics teams along the way.

I'm proud that High Tech High and local high-tech companies in San Diego, including Qualcomm, SAIC, and Nordson Asymtek, have supported these scholars as they won multiple regional championships on the road to their world title. The success of these students demonstrates what can be done in a school culture that celebrates STEM education. Investments in the field of science, technology, engineering, and math education must continue to be at the forefront of our national school priorities.

With that in mind, I congratulate the High Tech High team, and look forward to their future successes.

HONORING POLICE OFFICERS' SERVICE AND SACRIFICE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this week marks Police Week, an annual tribute to those serving in law enforcement, with May 15 set aside as Peace Officers Memorial Day, as designated in 1962 by President Kennedy.

We honor those who dedicate their lives to safeguarding their fellow citizens, with May 15 the day to remember the fallen with deepest gratitude and prayers. We cherish the memory of all heroes and public servants, and especially for Pennsylvanians, Montgomery County police officer Brad Fox who lost his life last September on the eve of his 35th birthday.

Prior to becoming a police officer, Brad Fox was a United States Marine staff sergeant who served his country for 10 years, including tours of duty in Iraq. We join those who hold these honorable individuals in the highest esteem as we, again, acknowledge the service and sacrifice of all law enforcement officers throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and this great Nation.

HONORING HIGH TECH HIGH

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, Mr. PETERS, and rise to congratulate the remarkable achievement of San Diego's very own High Tech High robotics team.

This past week, the team participated in the largest and more prestigious school robotics world championship, and then came home taking the event's biggest prize. On behalf of San Diegans, we couldn't be any more proud of these remarkable and talented students, who are destined to change our world with their ideas and innovations.

High Tech High represents all that is possible in K–12 education. Some of these students never envisioned themselves in a STEM field, and now they have internships at some of the top STEM companies in the country.

I was able to visit and see the robotics team in action, and it was clear to me that the spirit of teamwork and cooperation I witnessed will make them successful in STEM fields and beyond. These students represent the best and the brightest in our Nation, and we stand and congratulate their hard-earned win and know that there is more to come.

HONORING RAYMOND CLARK THOMPSON

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that on Sunday, Vietnam war veteran Raymond Clark Thompson's name is being added to the Vietnam War Memorial Wall where he will be remembered for his valiant service in the Army and extraordinary sacrifice for our country.

A native of Indiana and the oldest of six children, Ray served in the Vietnam War as a radio specialist.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to waive my time, and I will try again in a few minutes.

ACCESS TO EDUCATION AND TRAINING ACT

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a commonsense bill that I will be introducing to give more flexibility to students eligible for the Pell Grant program.

Last month, I had the privilege of spending a week on the road, touring and meeting with educators, students, business people, and others at the seven community colleges that serve my congressional district. On this tour I learned more about the ways local community colleges and businesses are coming together to address the skills gap, increase American manufacturing, and put people back to work.

However, the one disappointment I learned during this tour is that the Pell Grant program doesn't give students who want to go to school year-round enough flexibility. Due to senseless changes in 2011, Pell Grants are no longer available for use during the summer semester under too many circumstances.

The bill I am introducing, called the Access to Education and Training Act, would give more flexibility to the Pell Grant program to allow students to receive assistance year-round. This is important because many of the students I've met are interested in accelerated training courses that take place over the course of an entire year. Many of those who would benefit most are nontraditional students who want to complete their courses faster, simply so they can get back to the workforce. I want to make sure that community colleges are accessible and affordable for all Americans who want to get an education, learn a skill, and acquire the training they need to excel in today's economy.

Giving more flexibility to the Pell Grant program would help ensure success for hardworking students simply looking to get ahead.

□ 1830

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Nurses Week and to support one of the most important nurses I know, my wife, Shannon.

Shannon is the mother to our three children and has been a nurse for 18 years. She now teaches our next generation of nurses in Springfield, Illinois, at St. John's College.

It's important for us to recognize the more than 3.1 million nurses across this great country. They are truly the backbone of our Nation's hospitals, clinics, and doctors' offices.

I know firsthand that nurses work every day to ensure that their patients are receiving the quality care they need and deserve. In fact, most of the time, they are the first and last contact patients and their families receive. This is not always an easy task, but one that has greatly contributed to making our health care system one of the greatest in the world.

This week we celebrate all of our nurses who work long, hard hours and go the extra mile to provide safe, high-quality care to their patients and pave the way for a more innovative and efficient health care system.

Thank you, Shannon, and thank you to all the nurses who care for our families each and every day.

RECOGNIZING THE 2013 WOODHAVEN SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor eight exceptional students from my hometown of Fort Worth, Texas, who are all Woodhaven Scholarship recipients.

Ambar Aguilera from Amon Carter-Riverside High School, Carolyn Estrada and Rasheda Bellat, Eastern Hills High School, Maria Barragan at Nolan Catholic High School, Ta'lor at Dunbar High School, Kimberlee Sims at Temple Christian School, David Detrick at Polytechnic High School, and Sierra Wilson at Northside High School.

Created in 1998 to support the educational needs of the East Fort Worth community, the Woodhaven Scholarship helps students who are looking to pursue their dream of higher education.

Woodhaven Scholarships are given to East Fort Worth high school seniors who plan to attend Texas colleges and universities. Scholarships are awarded to students attending 4-year institutions as well as those attending 2-year colleges. The funds can be used for college tuition, educational fees, equipment, supplies, as well as on-campus housing expenses.

The eight students chosen will spread their talents across different prestigious institutions in the great State

of Texas. I'm sure they will continue to succeed in their pursuit of higher education.

Mr. Speaker, again I would like to congratulate these students on their accomplishments and the honors presented to them.

THE END OF THE 40–HOUR WORKWEEK

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today was one of the saddest days this House of Representatives has probably ever seen. The 40-hour workweek, a great part of our heritage since 1938, destroyed. Don't get overtime, get comp time. Employer decides if you get comp time, when you get it, when he wants you to have it.

Assuming that everybody around here that's working is working 40 hours and wants to get some extra time is well-heeled and got time to take off and doesn't need that extra money, that time-and-a-half overtime, and they've got time to go out and play 18 holes of golf or something.

Most hardworking Americans need that overtime to take care of their families and to get through from day to day. But today this House voted to take away that opportunity for employees to have the 40-hour week and overtime thereafter. It was a shameless day.

We need to look out for our workers and preserve American rights, not give more to the 1 percent, more control and more money away from the 99 percent.

HONORING RAYMOND CLARK THOMPSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Without objection, the first 1-minute speech of the gentlewoman from Florida is vacated.

There was no objection.

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

I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that on Sunday, the Vietnam War veteran, Raymond Clark Thompson's name is being added to the Vietnam War Memorial wall, where he will be remembered for his valiant service in the Army and the extraordinary sacrifice for our country.

A native of Indiana and the oldest of six children, Ray served in the Vietnam War as a radio specialist. On June 6, 1969, rockets were fired into Raymond's base camp, causing shrapnel to explode into his body from head to toe as he showered.

Despite suffering severe wounds, Raymond, at age 21, persevered and went on to have a full life, later marrying his wife, Patricia, and fathering three children. And he later worked as a health technician in the VA Medical Center in West Palm Beach, my hometown, where he gave back to veterans like himself. Sadly, he fell ill in recent years to old war injuries and passed in October of 2010.

With Raymond's name joining all the other valiant men and women at the Vietnam War Memorial, we're reminded every day of the bravery of the men and women who serve in our military and who are willing to sacrifice their lives for our own freedoms.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here and rise today on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus for a Special Order hour on a topic. However, before we start that Special Order hour, I would like to yield to the lady from the Ninth District of Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

THE STEADY ACT

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud college instructor of over a decade and perhaps, most importantly, a proud Sun Devil from Arizona State University in Tempe, Arizona, the largest and, yes, the brightest public university in our country.

May 9 is Graduation Day for many of my students, and while I cannot be with them on their special day, I introduce a bill today in their honor, in honor of their hard work and their future contributions to our community and our economy.

Today, I have introduced the Stability to Ensure the American Dream for Youth Act, the STEADY Act. The STEADY Act extends the 3.4 percent for Stafford student loans until June 30 of 2017.

As we all know, if Congress fails to act by June 30 of this year, the interest rate on student loans will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. This will have an enormous impact on the cash flow and economic participation of students entering the workforce, starting a family, planing for the future.

In college communities like the one I have the pleasure of representing, the economics of higher education are directly linked to every part of our daily economic activity. Consumer spending, home ownership, and employment opportunity are inexorably tied to the cost of education.

My bill ensures that those who are in college or planning for college can continue to do so without worry of cutting their paychecks by an additional $1,000 of interest a year paid to the Federal Government.

The STEADY Act ensures that they can plan for their future, plan for their family's future, and continue to contribute to our local economy. It allows added stability to get the education they need and find the job they want.

Our communities sent us to Congress to fight for them and get things done. Today I'm thinking of my students who need a voice in this Congress. It's my hope that we will get this done for them.

I think about Ariel Carlos, my student in ASU's School of Social Work. Ariel hopes to give back to our community as a social worker for seniors. He wants to help seniors who have worked and contributed their entire lives, help them continue to do so with health and support.

Ariel and his wife, May, have kids, and they support each other by working hard. Ariel has had to work for a paycheck. He worked hard through his entire college career, taking out student loans along the way so that he and May could care for their family while he studied. At the end of his college career, Ariel found himself with a student loan debt of $45,000.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention that a new social worker in Arizona is likely to start his career making about $30,000 a year or less. For Ariel and his family, an added expense of $1,000 a year means less money for child care, less money for school books, less money for groceries.

□ 1840

$1,000 a year from his family's budget—to pay to the Federal Government—means less spending in our local economy and less savings for the future.

The New York Federal Reserve recently noted that student loan debt is slowing our economy. Those with large student debt participate less in their local economies, delaying home ownership and family planning while forgoing long-term job opportunities. Students who should be planning their lives are instead nervous about their future and concerned about debt impeding their ability to get ahead.

We have the opportunity to set things right for Ariel and May, to maintain a steady road for our economic future, and to make certain that the hard work that goes into our community stays in our community and pays off in our community.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in support of the STEADY Act of 2013.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you. And thank you for introducing that important bill to help students and families across the country.

Today during the Special Order hour for the Progressive Caucus, we are here to specifically talk about the issue of income inequality in America and the growing gap between the wealthiest and the average person.

Just today, Mr. Speaker, while we voted on legislation, we voted on a bill,

the ironically titled Working Families Flexibility Act, which, in reality, would mean more work and less pay for hardworking Americans in my State of Wisconsin and across the country.

As many of my colleagues have spoken on the floor this week, what this bill will do is to deny workers compensation for overtime—any hours that they would work over 40 hours a week. This is, in essence, an attack on workplace flexibility and an attack on the hard-earned wages Americans rely on.

But what makes this bill even more onerous, though, is a topic of importance to our caucus, the Progressive Caucus, and to workers across America: the growing income inequality in our country.

Mr. Speaker, it's hard to imagine why some of our colleagues are interested in reducing wages for Americans when multiple reports this week show that despite the fact that stock markets and corporate profits are close to all-time highs, wages in this country are stagnant at best.

In fact, according to the St. Louis Fed, wages as a percentage of the economy have hit an all-time low. What does that mean in real dollars? Well, adjusted for inflation, an average worker who was paid $49,650 at the end of 2009 makes $545 less now, even before taxes and deductions. Meanwhile, because companies have slowed down hiring to control costs, many are operating with fewer employees, meaning there's more work for those with a job, even though their wages aren't moving upward. To summarize, Americans are working harder while getting paid less, even before the bill the Republicans put on the floor this week.

Mr. Speaker, given that our economy is still recovering from the recent recession, and close to 12 million Americans are still looking for work, it would make sense if all areas of the economy were facing tough times. But that's not the case. In fact, the stock markets and corporate profits are breaking records. Standard & Poor's 500 corporations hit a record in the first quarter of the year; and last week, including today, the blue-chip Dow Jones Industrial Average crossed 15,000 for the first time in quite a while.

The wealthiest Americans only are getting richer. According to tax expert David Cay Johnston, in the first 2 years of our recovery, from 2009 to 2011, close to 150 percent of the increased income in this country went to the top 10 percent of earners. Why? Because incomes fell for the bottom 90 percent of Americans.

If you dive deeper into those numbers, the increasing inequity becomes even more staggering. Just in the past 2 years, the top 1 percent saw 81 percent of all this country's increased income. Almost 40 percent of the increased income since 2009 went to the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent, or those making at least $8 million a year. What does that mean? Our country, our Nation, has 158.4 million households, and only about 16,000 of those households have accounted for 40 cents of every dollar of increased income in this country in the last the 2 years.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this trend of a growing income inequality can be traced back to more than just the 2 years following the recession. You can go all the way back to 1966 to find the last time the average adjusted gross income was lower in this country than it was in 2011. In between this time, 45 years, the bottom 90 percent Americans saw their income increase by an average of $59.

What about the top 10 percent? Well, from 1966 to 2011, their income increased by an average of approximately $116,000. And what about the top 1 percent? Their income increased by an average of $629,000. And the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent, the wealthiest in this country, have seen their income rise $18.4 million on average in the last 45 years.

Let me say that again. In the past 45 years, since 1966, the vast majority of Americans, 90 percent, have seen their average incomes increase by an average of $59, and the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent have seen their incomes increase by an average of $18.4 million.

It's almost impossible to comprehend, but Mr. Johnston found a way. If you represented these increases in a line chart, and 1 inch is equivalent to $59, the top 10 percent's would go to over 163 feet. The top 1 percent's line would go to 884 feet, and the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent would go for 5 miles. One inch of increase, 5 miles of increase for the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent.

So while the majority of us have gained only an inch over the last 40 years, the uberwealthy have gained not just inches but miles. Put another way, for every extra dollar of annual income earned by the top 90 percent of Americans, an extra 311,000 went to the households in the top 1 percent of 1 percent.

This growing income disparity, what does it mean? Well, it's bad for the economy. It's bad for our deficit, and it's bad for the most vulnerable in our society, and, of course, that's bad for the American Dream.

As Mark Zandi, chief economist for Moody's Analytics recently said, for the economy to thrive, we need everyone participating: When a majority of Americans are left behind in the recovery, our economy will never truly thrive. In fact, there have been a number of studies that have said that the way to get the economy going is to make sure those who have the least have the money because they'll spend it. They'll put it immediately into the economy. When the wealthiest have the extra income, it often goes into savings. But for the average person, that 90 percent, when they get the money, it goes right back into the economy and stimulates the economy. But when the average 90 percent of Americans only see a $59 wage increase in 45 years, that just doesn't put money back into the economy.

Consumer spending, which constitutes 70 percent of our economy, is strained when wages decrease. This is particularly acute when low- and moderate-income workers spend nearly all of their paychecks as those studies have shown us. And when there's a lack of demand, there will be a lack of economic growth, which means a lack of jobs, which means a lack of opportunities for Americans.

When we have vast income inequality, reducing our debt and our deficits becomes nearly impossible. When people are making less, we collect less in revenue. And at that point, the only way to balance our budget would be to drastically reduce funding for programs that primarily serve those with, guess what, decreasing incomes. It is a lose-lose proposition, and we shouldn't pursue it.

What else is this bad for? Well, it's bad for college affordability. It's bad for health care costs, and it's bad for programs that help the elderly, including programs like Social Security. Multiple studies have shown us that huge income inequality makes Americans more pessimistic and less likely to believe that they have little in common with anyone else unlike themselves.

The basic tenets of the American Dream are at risk when the income gap is so wide. When 90 percent of the country is so far behind the top tiers of the country, it's hard to make the case that if you work hard, you can get ahead. In fact, studies have demonstrated that the higher the income inequality gets in this country, the harder it is for people to move up and make a better life for themselves and their parents.

□ 1850

Let's just look at CEO pay, just to give you an idea how CEO pay has increased. In the last three decades, CEO pay has skyrocketed at a rate of 127 times faster than worker pay. In fact, from 1978 to 2011, CEO compensation increased more than 725 percent—faster than the stock market, and painfully faster than the 5.7 percent growth in worker compensation in the same period.

The ratio of CEO-to-worker pay has increased since 1950 by 1,000 percent, according to data from Bloomberg. And the AFL–CIO, the American Federation of Labor, has found that CEO pay has reached a high of 354 times that of the average employee. Just decades ago, that ratio was in the 20 to 30 times average for the lowest paid employee, and now 354 times. CEO pay has absolutely taken off, while everyone else's pay has been stagnant now for decades.

I've recently started reading a book, ''Who Stole the American Dream?,'' by Hedrick Smith, a book that our whip, Mr. HOYER, has often referred to for our caucus to read. It details exactly

how the middle class has been under attack for the last 40 years largely due to a corporate takeover of our culture. I highly recommend this book to every American.

This is a book that says Americans are willing to accept inequality in our society, to a degree. They understand that if you work harder, you should be able to get ahead. But they want it within a percent that makes sense and that we've had in this country for so long.

This massive wealth gap in our country—where the top 1 percent captured 93 percent of the Nation's gains in 2010—undermines our social fabric and our ideal of equal opportunity. This has been caused by the way corporate interests have taken over our lives, our laws and our elections in the last several decades.

According to ''Who Stole the American Dream?,'' up until the seventies, the middle class had thrived as increases in productivity were matched by increases in wages. When prosperity was shared, there was a stable relationship between business and government and labor. Everyone pitched in, and everyone benefited and gained.

Then, around the time President Nixon was in—when he put in place some very good business regulations—corporate interests decided to fight back. And we've seen over these decades how they fought back.

One, they started importing cheap foreign workers for a wide range of occupations.

They've moved jobs offshore, so many of our Nation's previously unionized blue collar jobs—even calling centers—have been sent overseas.

And they've changed our laws, from bankruptcy laws to Tax Code changes, so that just in Tax Code changes alone workers could supplement existing pension plans with individual retirement accounts. But the result is corporations got rid of the robust pension programs to help people when they retire. Now workers cover 50 percent of their retirement costs, compared to 11 percent in the 1950s.

Finally, there has been a race to the bottom. We compete now with Asian sweatshops, we import cheap foreign goods that undermine American small businesses, and there are major U.S. business operations that have moved overseas.

So the bottom line is we need to have a thriving middle class, not the inequality of a $59 increase in the last 45 years for the bottom 90 percent of the population, and the top 1 percent have an increase of $628,000. And the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent received an increase that's the equivalent of 5 miles to the 1 inch of increase that the bottom 90 percent have made.

So what do we need to do? I think the Center for American Progress has noted a strong middle class can help promote the development of human capital and a well-educated population. It can create a stable source of demands for goods and services. One of the key findings of that book is that people, when they had that income matched by their productivity, it went back into buying more goods and kept the economy stable. When those changes took place, since the Nixon administration, that's what has helped to create the strong inequality.

It incubates the next generation of entrepreneurs and supports inclusive political and economic institutions to make sure we have solid economic growth.

So what do we need to do differently? One, we need to have tax rules that are fair for everyone. We need to make sure that everyone pays their fair share. We don't incentivize companies to ship jobs overseas. And we promote the creation of jobs here at home.

We look at things like capital gains like any other way we would tax, not differently for those with the most money, who make money off of money rather than off of their hard work. But we need to make sure there is equal tax treatment for everyone under the laws. And those companies that want to outsource their headquarters overseas to avoid paying taxes aren't allowed to do that. It's an important part of changing our Tax Code to get the equality back that we need to.

Next, we need to invest in American workers. That means investing in education, investing in research and development, and investing in job training. Especially at a time that we have 12 million Americans out of work, we need to get people the skills so they can get back to work and work at jobs back here in America.

We need to establish a livable—not a minimum, but a livable—wage so that people who are in that 90 percent, who are making so little gains right now, can put that money back into the economy and stimulate the economy from the bottom up, from the grassroots. That's what we need to do.

Bottom line, we need to have trade policies that reward jobs in America and not reward jobs overseas. We've lost way too many jobs through many of our trade agreements overseas.

And fundamentally, we need to change the way we finance our elections in Wisconsin and across the country. I can tell you from my practical viewpoint of spending 14 years in the Wisconsin Legislature and my time here, there is no question that we have seen a lurching of corporate influence and big-dollar influence in our elections that have influenced the bottom-line policies that have created this sort of inequality.

So to summarize, we need prosperity over austerity in this country. And those are some of the things that we need to move toward.

I could talk more about income inequality, but I just want to address for a minute if I can another part of this inequality, which is going specifically to the sequester.

The sequester we have talked about now for a number of weeks, the ill effects on the economy of the sequester. We know 700,000 jobs between now and September 30 are at risk, including almost 36,000 jobs in the State of Wisconsin. The verdict on the sequester is clear and predictable, as we said. These mindless, reckless cuts are slowing our economic growth and taking away valuable resources to get the economy up and going.

Congress continues to defy logic in this area. We're dealing with the sequester piece by piece. During the continuing resolution, we fixed meat inspectors. A few weeks ago, we fixed people who wait in line at airports. But what we haven't done is addressed those who aren't as well connected in this country and the problems that they're seeing on a daily basis with the sequester. That means for Wisconsin seniors, they're receiving fewer Meals on Wheels that help seniors—for many of which 50 percent of their daily nutrition comes from the Meals on Wheels program, those who receive that program.

Close to 1,000 Wisconsin children and families will lose access to Head Start services. Just last week, I was in Beloit, Wisconsin, which is in a county, Rock County, that Representative PAUL RYAN and I share. While we were down visiting that Head Start program, they told us that they were going to have to have fewer students in the program next year. And they already have a waiting list for low-income families to participate in these programs to give them a fair start in education.

In the Bayview neighborhood of Madison, Wisconsin—one of my very first county board district and local governments—this neighborhood center, one of their very first programs was the Head Start program. That program will be closing because of the sequester and what we've done to that.

Cancer patients and HIV patients are being turned away from cancer clinics and other clinics because of cuts to Medicare payments caused by the sequester. And nearly 125,000 low-income Americans will not receive rental assistance. In Dane County, that means people are going to lose that critical assistance right back in my district.

Finally, over the Easter break I visited with people at UW-Madison, one of the world's premier research institutions. They're going to see a $35 million cut in funding—$17 million just in research alone—from NIH cuts.

So that FAA solution that we did a few weeks ago was anything but a solution—it was barely a bandaid. In fact, that bandaid will only get us through September 30, and we're going to be back to long lines in airports and not having meat inspectors for companies that need to have meat inspectors to have people go to work every day.

The bottom line is we need to fix the sequester now holistically, and we need to deal with that in this House.

This piecemeal approach is irresponsible, it's inadequate, and it's offensive

to the people of Wisconsin and the country who are caught in the political cross-fires of Washington, D.C. And it does nothing to help our economy or create jobs—in fact, just the opposite; it will be shrinking the economy between now and September 30.

□ 1900

The people of this country deserve a comprehensive national budget. I don't know why we can't get the Republicans to appoint conferees so we can have that budget. But until they do, we're going to continue to have the squabbles that you find all too often in Congress that don't address the sequester and don't give this country a roadmap for our finance's budget. Once again, we are likely not to have a national budget.

I would urge my Republican colleagues to appoint the budget conferees immediately so that we can not only pass a budget, but we can replace the sequester cuts for everyone, not just those who are the most well connected.

I would like to talk just briefly in closing about the income gap that we have. There's another way of talking about this chart. When you talked about the bottom 1 percent being an inch to the 5 miles represented by the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent, let me share another statistic that was shared with me.

If you talk about that 1 inch being a football field, the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent is equivalent to 86 football fields. So 1 inch of a football field to 86 football fields. That's the gap in wages that we have with this inequality.

With that, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Caucus was glad to be able to talk tonight about income inequality.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of his participation in the official visit of President Park Geun-hye of South Korea to Los Angeles County.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1071. An act to specify the size of the precious-metal blanks that will be used in the production of the National Baseball Hall of Fame commemorative coins.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 9, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2013 pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Paul Terry	1/10	1/15	Germany		1,363.59						1,363.59
	1/15	1/17	Sweden		845.24						845.24
	1/17	1/19	United Kingdom		1,013.14						1,013.14
	1/19		United States		8.60						8.60
Commercial Airfare							5,298.78				5,298.78
Miscellaneous Transportation Costs							154.14				154.14
Hon. Jack Kingston	1/25	1/26	Israel		498.00		(3)				498.00
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh		294.94		(3)				294.94
	1/27	2/2	India		1,982.19		(3)				1,982.19
	2/2	2/3	Portugal		278.00		(3)				278.00
Miscellaneous Embassy Costs							(3)		4,322.12		4,322.12
Hon. Adam B. Schiff	1/25	1/26	Israel		498.00		(3)				498.00
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh		294.94		(3)				294.94
	1/27	2/2	India		1,954.48		(3)				1,954.48
	2/2	2/3	Portugal		264.00		(3)				264.00
Miscellaneous Embassy Costs									4,322.12		4,322.12
John Bartrum	1/25	1/26	Israel		498.00		(3)				498.00
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh		294.94		(3)				294.94
	1/27	2/2	India		1,954.48		(3)				1,954.48
	2/2	2/3	Portugal		264.00		(3)				264.00
Miscellaneous Delegation Costs									4,322.12		4,322.12
Tom O'Brien	1/25	1/26	Israel		498.00		(3)				498.00
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh		294.00		(3)				294.00
	1/27	2/2	India		1,954.48		(3)				1,954.48
	2/2	2/3	Portugal		264.00		(3)				264.00
Miscellaneous Delegation Costs									4,322.12		4,322.12
Betsy Bina	1/25	1/26	Israel		498.00		(3)				498.00
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh		294.94		(3)				294.94
	1/27	2/2	India		1,954.48		(3)				1,954.48
	2/2	2/3	Portugal		264.00		(3)				264.00
Miscellaneous Delegation Costs									4,322.12		4,322.12
Hon. Jo Bonner	2/21	2/23	Philippines		474.00		(3)				474.00
Miscellaneous Delegation Expenses									28.35		28.35
Hon. Frank Wolf		2/17	United States								
	2/18	2/20	Lebanon		84.00						84.00
	2/20	2/22	Egypt		184.00						184.00
	2/22		United States								
Return of Unused Per Diem					−151.00						−151.00
Commercial Airfare							9,123.00				9,123.00
Committee total					18,920.35		14,575.92		21,638.95		55,135.22

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Ed Whitfield	1/25	1/26	Israel		498.00		(3)		1,724.08		2,222.08
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh		294.93		(3)		224.03		518.96
	1/27	2/02	India		1,954.48		(3)		1,904.26		3,858.74
	2/02	2/03	Portugal		278.00		(3)		469.75		747.75
Committee total					3,025.41				4,322.12		7,347.53

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Kevin Fitzpatrick	3/23	3/25	Cambodia		424.00		16,754.00		[4] 288.52		17,466.52
	3/25	3/28	Vietnam		967.00				[4] 70.49		1,037.49
Priscilla Koepke	3/23	3/25	Cambodia		419.00		16,754.00				17,173.00
	3/25	3/28	Vietnam		964.00						964.00
Hon. Edward R. Royce	1/25	1/26	Japan		361.00		(3)				361.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		426.00		(3)				426.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		300.00		(3)		[4] 5,156.10		5,456.10
	1/30	2/1	China		458.00		(3)				458.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		316.00		(3)				316.00
Hon. Eliot Engel	1/25	1/26	Japan		416.00		(3)				416.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		556.00		(3)				556.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		490.00		(3)				490.00
	1/30	2/1	China		538.00		(3)				538.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		330.00		(3)				330.00
Hon. Matt Salmon	1/25	1/26	Japan		436.00		(3)				436.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		576.00		(3)				576.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		510.00		(3)				510.00
	1/30	2/1	China		558.00		(3)				558.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		350.00		(3)				350.00
Hon. Tom Marino	1/25	1/26	Japan		436.00		(3)				436.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		576.00		(3)				576.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		510.00		(3)				510.00
	1/30	2/1	China		558.00		(3)				558.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		350.00		(3)				350.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	1/25	1/26	Japan		436.00		(3)				436.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		576.00		3,016.00				3,592.00
Nien Su	1/25	1/26	Japan		361.00		(3)				361.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		426.00		(3)				426.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		410.00		(3)				410.00
	1/30	2/1	China		458.00		(3)				458.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		275.00		(3)				275.00
Melissa Medina	1/25	1/26	Japan		334.00		(3)				334.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		566.00		(3)				566.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		491.00		(3)				491.00
	1/30	2/1	China		499.00		(3)				499.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		322.00		(3)				322.00
Elizabeth Heng	1/25	1/26	Japan		330.00		(3)				330.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		576.00		(3)				576.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		490.00		(3)				490.00
	1/30	2/1	China		523.00		(3)				523.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		302.00		(3)				302.00
JJ Ong	1/25	1/26	Japan		436.00		(3)				436.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		576.00		(3)				576.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		510.00		(3)				510.00
	1/30	2/1	China		558.00		(3)				558.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		350.00		(3)				350.00
Gregory Simpkins	2/16	2/21	Kenya		1,575.00		5,201.02				6,776.02
Worku Gachou	2/16	2/21	Kenya		1,575.00		5,236.12				6,811.12
Jacqueline Quinones	2/16	2/21	Kenya		1,575.00		4,703.02				6,278.02
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	2/16	2/18	France		1,074.00		(3)		[4] 6,550.00		7,624.00
	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		502.00		(3)		[4] 10,747.16		11,249.16
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		898.00		(3)		[4] 2,242.33		3,140.33
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		1,104.00		(3)		[4] 3,000		4,104.00
Hon. Ted Poe	2/16	2/18	France		761.00		(3)				761.00
	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		376.00		(3)				376.00
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		749.13		(3)				749.13
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		868.00		(3)				868.00
Hon. Brian Higgins	2/16	2/18	France		1,074.00		(3)				1,074.00
	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		498.00		(3)				498.00
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		898.00		(3)				898.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		1,073.77		(3)				1,073.77
Hon. Paul Cook	2/16	2/18	France		1,074.00		(3)				1,074.00
	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		502.00		(3)				502.00
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		898.00		(3)				898.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		1,104.00		(3)				1,104.00
Paul Berkowitz	2/16	2/18	France		1,074.00		(3)				1,074.00
	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		498.00		(3)				498.00
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		898.00		(3)				898.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		1,104.00		(3)				1,104.00
Jesper Pedersen	2/16	2/18	France		1,074.00		(3)				1,074.00
	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		458.00		(3)				458.00
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		873.00		(3)				873.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		1,104.00		(3)				1,104.00
Hon. Albio Sires	2/17	2/19	South Korea		470.00		13,537.00		[4] 1,235.64		15,242.64
	2/19	2/21	Vietnam		376.00				[4] 568.62		944.62
	2/21	2/22	Cambodia		227.00				[4] 459.78		686.78
Hon. Ted Poe	1/24	1/26	Germany		340.16		(3)				340.16
	1/26	1/28	Israel		704.35		(3)				704.35
	1/28	1/30	Turkey		402.28		(3)				402.28
	1/30	1/31	Italy		139.00		(3)				139.00
Hon. Ted Deutch	2/1	2/3	Germany		1,359.74		(3)				1,359.74
Hon. Tom Cotton	1/31	2/3	Germany		1,054.44		(3)				1,054.44
Hon. Karen Bass	2/18	2/19	Senegal		167.09		(3)				167.09
	2/18	2/18	Mali				(3)				
	2/19	2/22	South Africa		1,538.81		(3)				1,538.81

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	2/22	2/24	Democratic Republic of the Congo		396.00		(3)				396.00
	2/24	2/25	Morocco		171.43		(3)				171.43
Eric Williams	2/18	2/19	Senegal		167.09		(3)				167.09
	2/18	2/18	Mali				(3)				
	2/19	2/22	South Africa		1,538.81		(3)				1,538.81
	2/22	2/24	Democratic Republic of the Congo		396.00		(3)				396.00
	2/24	2/25	Morocco		171.43		(3)				171.43
Committee total					56,511.53		65,201.16		30,318.64		152,031.33

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Delegation costs.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Jeff Miller	2/21	2/22	Philippines	474.00	(3)						474.00
Hon. Gus Bilirakis	2/21	2/22	Philippines	474.00							474.00
Hon. Michael Michaud	2/21	2/22	Philippines	474.00							474.00
Hon. Timothy Walz	2/21	2/22	Philippines	474.00							474.00
Helen Tolar	2/21	2/22	Philippines	474.00							474.00
Jian Iza Zapata	2/21	2/22	Philippines	474.00							474.00
Committee totals					2,844						2,844.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. JEFF MILLER, Chairman, Apr. 18, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Darren Dick	1/08	1/16	Asia		224.00		(3)				224.00
Chelsey Campbell	1/08	1/16	Asia		224.00		(3)				224.00
Hon. Mike Rogers	2/01	2/01	Africa		280.91						
	2/01	2/03	Europe		1,763.12		(3)				2,044.03
Hon. Mike Thompson	2/16	2/19	Middle East		1,494.00						
Commercial Air							9,321.87				10,815.87
Linda Cohen	2/16	2/19	Middle East		1,494.00						
Commercial Air							8,656.87				10,150.87
"In accordance with title 22, United States Code, Section 1754(b)(2), information as would identify the foreign countries in which Committee Members and staff have traveled is omitted."											
Committee total					5,480.03		17,978.74				23,458.77

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MIKE ROGERS of Michigan, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2013.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1411. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's annual report for 2012 on Voting Practices in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1412. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-632, ''Local Budget Autonomy Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1413. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No: FAA-2012-0413; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-257-AD; Amendment 39-17441; AD 2013-08-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1414. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0000; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-271-AD; Amendment 39-17425; AD 2013-08-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1415. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1127; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-035-AD; Amendment 39-17423; AD 2013-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1416. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1105; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-137-AD; Amendment 39-17406; AD 2013-07-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1417. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0630; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-010-AD; Amendment 39-17409; AD 2013-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1418. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0809; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-135-AD; Amendment 39-17361; AD 2013-04-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1419. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1087; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-32-AD; Amendment 39-17424; AD 2013-08-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1420. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30893; Amdt. No. 3528] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1421. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Grob-Werke Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0013; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-046-AD; Amendment 39-17421; AD 2013-08-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1422. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30894; Amdt. No. 3529] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1423. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Caldwell, NJ [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0609; Airspace Docket No. 12-AEA-10] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1424. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Reading, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1270; Airspace Docket No. 12-AEA-16] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1425. A letter from the Aeronautical Information Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30895; Amdt. No. 506] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1426. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tariff of Tolls (RIN: 2435-AA32) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1427. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the Commission's 2012 Annual Report on operations under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2008 and 22 U.S.C. 1622a; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

1428. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR) April 2013 Quarterly Report; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 1867. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the Uniform Code of Military Justice related to sex-related offenses committed by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 1868. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to establish joint resolutions on the budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 1869. A bill to establish biennial budgets for the United States Government; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 1870. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for a legislative line-item veto to expedite consideration of rescissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. WOODALL (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1871. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reform the budget baseline; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. HENSARLING):

H.R. 1872. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to increase transparency in Federal budgeting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1873. A bill to require greater accountability in discretionary and direct spending programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RADEL, Mr. REED, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BARR, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. YODER, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 1874. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of legislation; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 1875. A bill to support evidence-based social and emotional learning programming; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 1876. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. ESTY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WALZ, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 1877. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 1878. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to enhance existing programs providing mitigation assistance by encouraging States to adopt and actively enforce State building codes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 1879. A bill to provide for the safe disposal of Federal Government-owned transuranic waste for the benefit of all Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. HORSFORD):

H.R. 1880. A bill to prohibit an agency or department of the United States from establishing or implementing an internal policy that discourages or prohibits the selection of a resort or vacation destination as the location for a conference or event, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 1881. A bill to stimulate the economy, produce domestic energy, and create jobs at no cost to the taxpayers, and without borrowing money from foreign governments for which our children and grandchildren will be responsible, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 1882. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to prohibit the Department of Agriculture from entering into partnerships with foreign governments to promote enrollment in the supplemental nutrition assistance program and to terminate the current Partnership for Nutrition Assistance Initiative between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deduction for the purchase of secure gun storage or safety device for the securing of firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. COOPER (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KIND, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. BARBER):

H.R. 1884. A bill to provide that Members of Congress shall be paid last whenever the Treasury is unable to satisfy the obligations of the United States Government in a timely manner because the public debt limit has been reached; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 1885. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow eligible veterans to use qualified veterans mortgage bonds to refinance home loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan):

H.R. 1886. A bill to prohibit land border crossing fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1887. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny certain tax benefits to persons responsible for an oil spill if such person commits certain additional violations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1888. A bill to make payments by the Department of Homeland Security to a State contingent on a State providing the Federal Bureau of Investigation with certain statistics, to require Federal agencies, departments, and courts to provide such statistics to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to require the Federal Bureau of Investigation to publish such statistics; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. LATTA (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. WITTMAN, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 1889. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to recognize the dependent children of members of the Armed Forces who are serving on active duty or who have served on active duty through the presentation of an official lapel button; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. KIND, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 1890. A bill to modernize the conservation title of the Food Security Act of 1985, protect long term taxpayer investment, increase small and midsize farmer's access to programs, and prioritize modern-day conservation needs through management practices, local engagement, and stewardship; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BERA of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 1891. A bill to establish a position of Science Laureate of the United States; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 1892. A bill to amend section 1201 of title 17, United States Code, to require the infringement of a copyright for a violation of such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POLIS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 1893. A bill to prevent and reduce the use of physical restraint and seclusion in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1894. A bill to establish an Office of Tribal Relations in the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1895. A bill to respond to the extreme fire hazard and unsafe conditions resulting from pine beetle infestation, drought, disease, or storm damage by declaring a state of emergency and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately implement hazardous fuels reduction projects in the manner provided in title I of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 1896. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure that the United States can comply fully with the obligations of the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WOLF, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 1897. A bill to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1898. A bill to protect the child custody rights of deployed members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:

H.R. 1899. A bill to prohibit business enterprises that lay off a greater percentage of their United States workers than workers in other countries from receiving any Federal assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FINCHER (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. STUTZMAN):

H. Res. 206. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress and the States should investigate and correct abusive, unsanitary, and illegal abortion practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H. Res. 207. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the first ascent of Mt. Everest by United States citizens; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MORAN:

H. Res. 208. A resolution expressing opposition to the use of carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, nitrogen, nitrous oxide, argon, or other gases to euthanize shelter animals and support for State laws that require the use of the more humane euthanasia by injection method; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. ELLISON):

H. Res. 209. A resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen, and congratulating the members and officers of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen for the union's many achievements; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

22. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 4 urging the Congress to maintain operation of the 179th Airlift Wing at Mansfield-Lahm Regional Airport; to the Committee on Armed Services.

23. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 31 urging the President and the Congress to preserve full funding and support for the Department of Defense STARBASE youth science and technology program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

24. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Senate Resolution requesting the Federal Government provide sufficient funding and personnel to process veterans' claims in a more timely manner; to the Committee on Veterans' 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 Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 1867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Military Regulation: Article I, Section 8, Clauses 14 and 18

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; and

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 1868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 1869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WOODALL:

H.R. 1871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 1874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution which provides that, ''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.''

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Defines social and emotional learning (SEL) and amends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to allow funding for teacher and principal training and professional development to be used for SEL programming.

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 1876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the general welfare of the United States; as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 1878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 1879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution states ''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. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 1881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 1882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress under Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution bestows upon Congress the authority ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.'' Congress is within its constitutionally prescribed role to reform, limit, or abolish programs maintained by the United States Department of Agriculture, a body which has regulated interstate commerce under the auspices of Congress continue

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 1883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 1884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sections 8 and 9 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 1886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause)

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4, section 4 of the United States Constitution: The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding federal agriculture programs and public expenditures in support of those programs.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 1893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1894.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which delegates power to Congress ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 (relating to the power to enter into foreign compacts on behalf of States).

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 1898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Military Regulation: Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:

H.R. 1899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 45: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. RADEL, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. HALL, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. YOHO, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. YODER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BARTON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. AMASH, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 164: Mr. BERA of California and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 176: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 177: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 241: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 311: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 318: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 335: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 351: Mr. COLE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 357: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 401: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 419: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 483: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 500: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 508: Mr. RUSH and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 523: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 525: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 543: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 569: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 612: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 627: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 630: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 631: Mr. JONES and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 647: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 666: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 676: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 689: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 698: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 714: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 721: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 724: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 725: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 744: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 755: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 760: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 761: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 763: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 792: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 809: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 833: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 836: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 846: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 847: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 850: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 855: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 900: Mr. VELA and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 904: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 935: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 979: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 991: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 992: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1020: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 1024: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1026: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1029: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 1038: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1072: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1074: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HALL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1093: Mr. COBLE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1143: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 1144: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1146: Mr. ROKITA and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1148: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1151: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1155: Mr. RUSH and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1173: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 1179: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1209: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1219: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1240: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1247: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1250: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HARPER, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1288: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GRIMM, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1298: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1304: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1313: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1351: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1354: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1386: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1405: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LANCE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1416: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1427: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1440: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 1449: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LONG, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1451: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1472: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1474: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1492: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1494: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1496: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana

H.R. 1498: Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1499: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1507: Mr. KLINE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LONG, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania,

Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. CHU, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1521: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1528: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 1551: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1560: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1572: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1591: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1595: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NEAL, and Mr.GALLEGO.

H.R. 1598: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1623: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1638: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1667: Mr. JONES and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1693: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1699: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1701: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1727: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1731: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1735: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1740: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1749: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1762: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1763: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. POLLS, Mr. SIRES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1764: Mr. COLE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H. R. 1780: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1781: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1795: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SIRES, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1796: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. WALZ, Mr. COOK, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1797: Mr. TERRY and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1809: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1814: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1825: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1826: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1830: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1847: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BARTON, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1851: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1857: Ms. NORTON and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Con. Res. 16: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. MARCHANT.

H. Res. 30: Mr. MARINO and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H. Res. 36: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. ROKITA.

H. Res. 78: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H. Res. 132: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. SABLAN.

H. Res. 134: Mr. BERA of California.

H. Res. 160: Mr. ROKITA.

H. Res. 167: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 170: Mr. COTTON.

H. Res. 174: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. VELA.

H. Res. 182: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 190: Mr. PERRY.

H. Res. 195: Ms. NORTON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of May 7, 2013]

H.R. 632: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. POMPEO.

[Submitted May 8, 2013]

H.R. 1286: Mr. WELCH.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2013 No. 64

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable WILLIAM M. COWAN, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Creator and sustainer, whose almighty hand leaps forth in beauty all the starry band, thank You for the gift of freedom that You have given our Nation. Make us responsible stewards of Your bounty.

Guide our lawmakers in the way of peace, as Your liberating love is seen in their lives. Lord, give them tough faith for troubled times. May they submit to Your guidance and strive to faithfully serve You. Give them the serenity to accept the things they cannot change, the courage to change the things they can, and the wisdom to know the difference.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable WILLIAM M. COWAN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable WILLIAM M. COWAN, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. COWAN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 888

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that S. 888 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 888) to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

THE BUDGET

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for years Republicans have been singing the praises of regular order, week after week, month after month. It has gone into years now. Even though they may not have been correct, they did it anyway. They said how they missed the days of committee markups, how they longed for an amendment vote-arama, amendments, and how they pined for a budget resolution.

As the junior Senator from Texas said just before the election:

Senate Democrats have not even had a budget in 3 years. They are not pretending to try to fix these problems. I think that is irresponsible.

But then Republicans got what they wanted 46 days ago. Forty-six days it has been since the Senate passed its budget, but Republicans are standing in the way of moving forward in the conference. They got what they asked, and now they no longer want what they asked for.

Remember, 46 days ago, under regular order, after a thorough committee markup, an all-night session—we ended at 5 a.m. in the morning—the Senate passed a budget resolution. Over the last 46 days, Republicans have stunningly and repeatedly blocked attempts to name budget conferees. If we did that, we could start down the path to compromise.

That is what legislation is all about. Legislation, by definition, is the art of compromise.

It is Republicans who, as Senator CRUZ put it, aren't even intending to fix these problems.

Republicans often have said the regular order of the budget process is the only way to get long-term sound fiscal policy. Democrats and Republicans will not find common ground if they don't sit down and talk. Obviously, if we can't talk, it doesn't do any good. We need someone to talk to. Here is what we are trying to accomplish. Move legislation forward.

Don't take my word for it. This is what the Speaker of the House of Representatives said just a few weeks ago:

Here is the process. The House passes a bill. The Senate can pass a bill. And if we disagree, we go to conference and work it out.

What Speaker BOEHNER and Senator CRUZ have said is that they used to love the idea of regular order, but they don't like it anymore. They got what they wanted, but they don't like what they got.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

This is what my friend, the minority leader, said in January of this year in praise of the conference committee:

If the Senate version is different than the one the House sends over, send it off to conference. That's how things are supposed to work around here. We used to call it legislating.

That is what the Republican leader said.

A few days later, Senator MCCONNELL extolled the virtue of regular order by saying this:

Remember, regular order is how the Senate is supposed to function. . . . The public is supposed to have a chance to scrutinize the proposals before us.

Here we have the junior Senator from Texas, the Speaker of the House, and the Republican leader saying we should have regular order. We should pass legislation, as we have done and the House has done, and then work it out in conference.

So we agree. I agree with those three people. Do you know something else. The American public agrees.

They suddenly don't like what they wished for. We passed our budget; the House Republicans passed theirs. The next step under regular order is to move to conference to negotiate a compromise.

I can't understand—maybe I do. I think I understand why Republicans don't want to debate their budget in the light of day.

You see, the Ryan budget, which they extol to each other, which passed the House, would turn Medicare into a voucher program—the end of Medicare as we know it.

The Ryan Republican budget would lower taxes for the rich while the middle class foots the bill. That is in their budget.

The Republican budget would rip the safety net from under the elderly, the middle class, veterans, and the poor. No wonder they don't want to go to conference. No wonder they don't want transparency.

The Democratic budget, by contrast, would preserve or protect Medicare for our children and grandchildren. The Democratic budget would ask the wealthiest Americans to contribute just a little bit more to help reduce the deficit. The Democratic budget would balance smart spending cuts with new revenue from closing loopholes.

It is obvious, then, why the Republicans don't want to compare the sensible Senate budget with the extreme House budget. The extreme House Republican budget was resoundingly rejected by the voters in November. That is what Governor Romney touted. Remember, Congressman RYAN was his Vice Presidential candidate. They ran together.

Now it is time for each side to stand for what it believes. As the junior Senator from Texas said late last year, we have ''got to go on record and say this is what we want to do, this is our budget.''

Democrats aren't afraid to debate our principles in the light of day. We aren't afraid to try to resolve our differences in a conference committee instead of behind closed doors. This has been the custom in the Senate and House of Representatives for more than 200 years.

Why are Republicans so afraid? Why are they blocking us from continuing this process in public?

We heard from the junior Senator from Texas: Republicans will only go to conference if Democrats agree ahead of time to give in to every one of their demands. That is a strange one. Sure, we will go to conference, but before we go you have to agree to everything we want.

If Republicans can't rig the game in their favor, he said, there will be no game, no conference, no legislating at all. Democrats want to put deadline-day negotiations and last-minute fixes behind us. We want to engage in a responsible legislative process under regular order, and we will keep pushing the process forward. Passing a budget in each Chamber is a good step to restoring regular order. It is only a first step. The next step is to sit down and resolve our differences.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate will be in morning business until 10 a.m. At 10 a.m., the Senate will recess until 11:30 to allow for the joint meeting of Congress with the President of the Republic of Korea. When the Senate reconvenes, we will resume consideration of S. 601, the Water Resources Development Act. At 2 p.m. there will be three rollcall votes in relation to amendments to the bill.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

WELCOMING THE PRESIDENT OF SOUTH KOREA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Later today we will welcome the President of the South Korea to address both Houses of Congress. President Park is a truly extraordinary woman, the first female chief executive of her country and, I might add, a conservative.

She is a strong leader too. I suppose that is because she endured so much in her own life; the assassination of her mother when she was only 22, the assassination of her father a few years after that, and the violent attack she herself endured in 2006.

Yet beyond a scar on her face, you would not know. She didn't recoil in fear. She threw herself right back into the rough and tumble of public life. So she is tough. I know this tenacious leader is committed to the United States-South Korea alliance which is so important to both of our countries. The transition from her predecessor, President Lee, could not have been smoother. Both his administration and hers have been true partners, especially at a time of high contention.

We welcome President Park and look forward to hearing what she has to say later today.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS PEREZ

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning I would like to say a few words about the nomination of Thomas Perez as Labor Secretary.

The Perez nomination has generated a fair amount of controversy. For those who haven't tuned in yet to the debate surrounding his nomination, I would like to take a few minutes this morning to explain why.

The first thing to say about this nomination is that neither I nor anyone else on this side of the aisle has anything against Mr. Perez personally. As a graduate of Harvard Law School, there are a lot of things he could have done other than advocate for those struggling on the fringes of our society.

Yet when it comes to a vote such as this, we have to weigh a lot more than a nominee's intentions. We have to look at how those intentions square with the higher obligation that any nominee, but especially a Cabinet nominee, has to the rule of law. It is on this point where this nomination becomes so controversial and where the deference that Senators of both parties generally grant Presidents when it comes to picking Cabinet nominees begins to break down.

By all accounts, Tom Perez is not just a man with a heart for the poor, he is a committed ideologue who appears willing, quite frankly, to say or do anything to achieve his ideological end.

His willingness, time and again, to bend or ignore the law and misstate the facts in order to advance his far-left ideology leads me and others to conclude he would continue to do so if he were confirmed to another and much more consequential position of public trust.

Take, for instance, his efforts while on the Montgomery County Council to get Canadian drugs imported to the United States. According to the Washington Post, Perez tried to get the county to import these drugs even after—even after—a top FDA official said doing so would be, in his words, ''undeniably illegal.''

What was Perez's response? ''Federal law is muddled,'' he said at the time. ''Sometimes you have to push the envelope.''

Think about that statement. ''Sometimes you have to push the envelope.'' Is that the kind of approach to Federal law we want in those we confirm to run Federal agencies? Folks who think if a Federal law is inconvenient to their ends they can simply characterize it as

unclear and use that as an excuse to do whatever they want?

If that is not a red flag for those of us who have to review a Presidential nominee, I don't know what is.

Now, again, someone might say everybody in politics has to make judgments about how a given law is to be interpreted. Those who disagree with those judgments call it pushing the envelope. Mr. Perez, however, does not merely push the envelope. All too often he circumvents or ignores a law with which he disagrees.

Here are a few examples: As a member of the Montgomery County Council, Mr. Perez pushed through a county policy that encouraged the circumvention of Federal immigration law. Later, as head of the Federal Government's top voting rights watchdog, he refused to protect the right to vote for Americans of all races, in violation of the very law he was charged to enforce.

In the same post at the Department of Justice, Perez directed the Federal Government to sue, against the advice of career attorneys in his own office. In another case involving a Florida woman who was lawfully exercising her First Amendment right to protest in front of an abortion clinic, the Federal judge who threw out Mr. Perez's lawsuit said he was ''at a loss as to why the government chose to prosecute this particular case'' in the first place.

This is what pushing the envelope means in the case of Mr. Perez—a flippant and dismissive attitude about the boundaries everyone else has to follow for the sake of the liberal causes in which he believes. In short, it means a lack of respect for the rule of law and a lack of respect for the need of those in positions of power to follow it.

Just as troubling, however, is the fact that Mr. Perez has been called to account for his failures to follow the law, and he has been less than forthright about his actions when called to account. When he testified that politics played no role in his office's decision not to pursue charges against members of a far-left group who may have tried to prevent others from voting, for instance, the Department's own watchdog said ''Perez's testimony did not reflect the entire story.'' And a Federal judge said the evidence before him ''appear[ed] to contradict . . . Perez's testimony.''

Perez has also made misleading statements about this case under oath—under oath—to Congress and the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. Perez's involvement in an alleged quid pro quo deal with the city of St. Paul, MN, also fits the pattern. Here was a case where Perez was allegedly so concerned about a potential Supreme Court challenge to the legality of a theory he championed in housing discrimination suits known as ''disparate impact,'' he quietly worked out a deal with St. Paul officials whereby they would withdraw their appeal to the Supreme Court of a disparate impact case if he arranged for the Federal Government to throw out two whistleblower complaints against St. Paul that could have recovered millions of dollars for the taxpayers that had been falsely obtained. The two whistleblowers' complaints were dropped, and the Supreme Court never heard the disparate impact case.

Perez told investigators he hadn't even heard of the disparate impact case until the Court initially decided to hear it. But that has been contradicted by HUD Deputy Assistant Secretary Sara Pratt, who told investigators she and Mr. Perez discussed the case well before that.

Taken together, all of this paints the picture, for me at least, not of a passionate liberal who sees himself as patiently operating within the system and through the democratic process to advance a particular set of strongly held beliefs but a crusading ideologue whose conviction about his own rightness on the issues leads him to believe the law does not apply to him. Unbound by the rules that apply to everyone else, Perez seems to view himself as free to employ whatever means—whatever means—at his disposal, legal or otherwise, to achieve his ideological goals.

To say this is problematic would be an understatement. As Secretary of Labor, Perez could be handling numerous contentious issues and implementing many politically sensitive laws, including laws enforcing the disclosure of political activity by labor unions. Perez's devotion to the cause of involuntary universal voter registration is also deeply concerning to me personally, and I would imagine many of my colleagues in the Senate also believe in the absolute centrality of maintaining the integrity of the vote.

Americans of all political persuasions have the right to expect the head of such a sensitive department, whether appointed by a Republican or Democrat, will implement and follow the law in a fair and reasonable way. I do not believe they could expect as much from Mr. Perez.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each and with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Ms. WARREN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. WARREN pertaining to the introduction of S. 897 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF SOUTH KOREA, HER EXCELLENCY PARK GEUN-HYE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 11:30 a.m. for the purpose of attending a joint meeting with the House of Representatives to hear the President of South Korea, Her Excellency Park Geun-hye.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:59 a.m., recessed until 11:31 a.m. and the Senate, preceded by its Secretary, Nancy Erickson, Drew Willison, Deputy Sergeant at Arms, and the Vice President of the United States, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address delivered by Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of South Korea.

(The address delivered by the President of South Korea is printed in today's RECORD of the House of Representatives.)

At 11:31 a.m., the Senate, having returned to its Chamber, reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. HEITKAMP).

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 601, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 601) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Boxer/Vitter amendment No. 799, in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, what is the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of debate prior to votes in relationship to S. 601.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, how much time is going to be controlled by Senator COBURN, the opposition to his amendments, and Senator WHITEHOUSE?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma controls 40 minutes. The majority controls 75 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. How much time is there as far as Senator WHITEHOUSE is concerned?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no specific time agreement for Senator WHITEHOUSE.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much. I wanted to get the order squared away so I could share the information with colleagues before Senator COBURN is heard on his amendments.

Madam President, we are on the Water Resources Development Act—it is a great day for the Senate—because we have received a D-plus rating on our infrastructure. This is the greatest Nation in the world. If we cannot move people or products, if our ports need to be deepened—and because they are not deepened, we cannot move commerce in and out—we have problems.

As we move into periods of extreme weather—there is some debate as to why, and I will not get into that because it is almost like a religious debate, so I will not go there. The fact is we have extreme weather, and now that we have some rules in place, this bill will make it a lot easier for people in the State of the Presiding Officer to deal with the corps after an extreme weather event. For the first time they will not have to come back for new authorizations. They can do some moves right then and there to improve the situation, and that is a reform I think is very necessary.

I certainly thank Senator VITTER, my ranking member, and every member of the Environment and Public Works Committee. I want to thank all the organizations that have come to support this legislation. We have them listed, and I am just going to read a few of those.

Madam President, may I speak for approximately 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. We have the American Association of Port Authorities, the American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association, the American Council of Engineering Companies, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Foundry Society, the American Public Works Association, the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, American Society of Civil Engineers, American Soybean Association, Associated General Contractors of America, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Clean Water Construction Coalition, Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute, Construction Management Association of America, International Liquid Terminals Association, International Propeller Club of the United States, and the International Union of Operating Engineers.

I will not read all of these as there are too many.

We received a letter today from the chamber of commerce, which I will talk about in a few minutes.

We also have listed the Laborers International Union of North America, surveyors, real estate people, Grain and Feed Association, the Retail Federation, the National Waterways Conference, National Stone Sand & Gravel Association, Portland Cement Association, the American Institute of Architects, the Fertilizer Institute, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, the Waterways Council.

This is just a sample. America is behind this bill. This is important. Everything we do here is important, and this is as important. It will, in fact, support over half a million jobs—not doing things we don't need but doing things we need and must do.

We have some very important letters. One letter is from the American Association of Port Authorities and the American Road and Transportation Builders Association. They talk about how it is important that this legislative progress should not be slowed or jeopardized by amendments that are not germane to the bill.

This is their language: If enacted, this long overdue legislation will ensure critical investments are being made.

They say nice things about Senator VITTER and me, which I will not read because it is too self-serving, but I am very proud to have it in writing. I will put it on my wall when I get back to the office.

There is another letter from the Transportation Construction Coalition, and it basically says: This bill will remove barriers to realizing the benefits of water resources projects. It needs to be bipartisan and bicameral. Let's swiftly pass this.

That is a very important message for us.

We have the Associated General Contractors of America, and they say: Please don't slow or jeopardize this bill.

We have a letter coming from the chamber of commerce, and it is going to say the same thing.

I know Senator COBURN feels very strongly about his amendments, and we have agreed to take them up and vote on them. Every Senator has the right to do anything they want. I just want to lay it out here for the American people: This is a public works bill dealing with water infrastructure. It is not a bill about guns, it is not a bill about a woman's right to choose, it is not a bill about gay rights or gay marriage, it is not a bill about those very hot button issues we know divide the American people.

I will have more to say after Senator COBURN talks about his amendment. I am just going to make a plea to my colleagues: We are trying so hard to accommodate everybody but, speaking for myself, I hope we can avert and avoid controversy on this bill. We have so much controversy every minute of every day. There have been terrible arguments on this floor about issues as to whether we should extend the debt ceiling, whether to default, do background checks. These issues are tough. I am not saying they should be avoided. We have to confront them. Every once in a while I hope we can take a pause from this controversy and do something for this country and come together without the rancor, without the upset, and without the divisiveness of some of these issues.

We will proceed to deal with these issues that Senator COBURN has brought forth on guns. After we dispose of these, I hope we will not have this kind of divisiveness on a bill that is so needed.

I thank the Presiding Officer very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, first of all, I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to have regular order in the Senate. The ranking member of the committee would like to have 2 minutes before I start.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, through the Chair, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I briefly want to say two things: No. 1, I too am very supportive of this bill, which I do think is a strong bipartisan and a reform-oriented effort. I think the best proof of that is that it came out of our EPW committee 18 to 0. We have a committee that reflects the wide spectrum of opinion of the entire Senate. The waterway infrastructure bill is important, so I am very supportive of it.

No. 2, I am also very glad we have this open amendment process. I think it reflects a lot of work and goodwill on a lot of folks' part, including the Chair and myself. I welcome this debate and vote. We want to take up and vote on amendments.

With that show of good faith, I hope Members can focus on germane—or at least relevant—amendments, and that is what we will be turning to in our next set of amendments.

I hope this open process and show of good faith engenders that response. I look forward to all of these amendments and debates and votes.

With that, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for the time.

AMENDMENT NO. 805 TO AMENDMENT NO. 799

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The chairman—Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. The only thing I am chairman of, Madam President, is my dogs at home, but I thank the Presiding Officer for that misquote.

At this time, I call up Coburn amendment No. 805.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment No. 805 to amendment numbered 799.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To protect the right of individuals to bear arms at water resources development projects administered by the Secretary of the Army)

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 20___. PROTECTING AMERICANS FROM VIOLENT CRIME.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Second Amendment of the Constitution provides that ''the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed'';

(2) section 327.13 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations provides that, except in special circumstances, ''possession of loaded firearms, ammunition, loaded projectile firing devices, bows and arrows, crossbows, or other weapons is prohibited'' at water resources development projects administered by the Secretary;

(3) the regulations described in paragraph (2) prevent individuals complying with Federal and State laws from exercising the Second Amendment rights of the individuals while at the water resources development projects; and

(4) Federal laws should make it clear that the Second Amendment rights of an individual at a water resources development project should not be infringed.

(b) PROTECTING THE RIGHT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BEAR ARMS AT WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall not promulgate or enforce any regulation that prohibits an individual from possessing a firearm, including an assembled or functional firearm, at a water resources development project covered under part 327 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), if—

(1) the individual is not otherwise prohibited by law from possessing the firearm; and

(2) the possession of the firearm is in compliance with the law of the State in which the water resources development project is located.

Mr. COBURN. A couple of years ago I added an amendment in our deliberative process that gave Americans their constitutional rights in the U.S. National Forest. There were two main reasons I did that.

No. 1, the amount of murders, rapes, robberies, and assaults were rising; and No. 2, there is some confusion with the conceal and carry State laws.

We have 35 or 36 States that have conceal and carry State laws, but when someone accidentally walks onto U.S. forest land, they are actually violating Federal law even though they might not know they are on State land versus Federal land.

I would note that since that time the amount of crime in our national parks has declined. So since then, we now have, throughout the country, the same approach we have in national parks on the Bureau of Land Management areas, the Forest Service, the National Park Service, and the National Wildlife Refuge.

The reason this is important for the Corps of Engineers is because after we passed those amendments, the corps proactively stated that none of this applied to them. Well, the fact is the corps has more visitors every year on their 422 lake and river projects, 11.7 million acres, 95,000 camp sites, and 6,500 miles of trails, and they have more than 370 million visitors. Corps projects are the most visited of any single Federal agency sites—even more than the 280 million annual visitors to our national parks.

Americans who camp, hunt, or fish on these federally managed lands are prevented from exercising their Second Amendment rights that have been guaranteed by the Supreme Court, but also are under the jurisdiction of their State laws.

The purpose of this amendment is so law-abiding citizens who are granted the authority in their State will not be vulnerable to criminals or dangerous wildlife while on Army Corps land, and we, in fact, will ensure they have their rights guaranteed. This does not include an exemption for Federal facilities, Army Corps headquarters, research facilities, lock or dam buildings, or any other significant infrastructure associated with the corps. This amendment would simply require the Corps of Engineers to follow State firearm possession laws on lands and waters managed by them—the same approach the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, the National Parks, and the National Wildlife Refuges use.

It is a simple issue. This is the only area of Federal lands now where we put people in double jeopardy if they are accidentally on corps land; they are violating Federal law even though they are complying with their State laws. They are totally in compliance with the State laws, but if they step one foot onto corps land, they are violating corps regulations. This amendment makes it consistent across all government lands—we have already done it everywhere else—the corps land, which is the most visited, the most utilized lands we have in the country. It is straightforward.

I am very appreciative of the chairman of this committee for her cooperation in allowing this amendment. As a matter of fact, I am so cooperative I am not going to offer the other one so I can help move her bill forward. I congratulate her on the bipartisan work she has done on her committee.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. I think this is a principled stand. The question is, Why should we not have the same policy everywhere, No. 1; and No. 2, Why would we dare deny the rights we give everywhere else on Federal Government-owned land—why would we do something different on corps land?

I actually wouldn't even be offering this had the corps not proactively stated that what we passed did not apply to them. We actually intended for it to apply and, technically, they could get out. All we are saying is let's make it the same everywhere, so you can follow State law, be a good, law-abiding citizen; but if a person happens to walk onto corps land, they are violating a Federal statute according to the corps. Not on BLM lands, not on Forest Service lands, not in the Parks, but if a person walks up to a lake in Oklahoma that is run by the corps, they are violating Federal law but they are not violating State law. So we ought to have consistency with our law. This is about consistency, good government, and common sense. Wouldn't it be a tragedy—and it happens all the time—that a person is on a campsite in Oklahoma and because there is no law allowing that person to carry their weapon onto that campsite, they are vulnerable to the prey of people who are going to violate that law. That is exactly what was happening in the national parks. We were having women raped, we were having people murdered, we were having people accosted and robbed. Guess what. That has all markedly declined since we allowed gun owners to carry their guns. There has not been, to my knowledge, one case of an inappropriate use by a law-abiding citizen of their weapons in those areas. So it is common sense.

My hope is we will pass this amendment and have a consistent law on all Federal lands so people can be protected under the Second Amendment, people can follow their State's law and do it adequately and accurately and be great law-abiding citizens.

With that, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I wish to thank my friend from Oklahoma because it was tough for me on this bill to face the first amendment being a gun amendment. The Senator from Oklahoma has very strong emotions about it. So do I. We just come down on different sides. But I believe we want to show our good faith. I am also pleased we are not going to vote on the study amendment because, as I researched it, it looks as if there is already a study underway and I look forward to looking at the results of that study with the Senator from Oklahoma in terms of the buying of ammunition. I thank the Senator for that. It means a lot.

I ask the Chair, since Senator COBURN is now not going to take up one of his amendments and we only have one more, what is the status of time? How does that change things?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority controls 65 minutes, the Republicans control 64 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair. Madam President, I am going to answer a question that was posed rhetorically by my friend, which is a fair question. Why make a difference as far as who can carry a gun on Federal land versus national park land? My statement will address this directly to my friend.

Coburn amendment No. 805 would make it legal for anyone to carry weapons on critical water infrastructure property managed by the Army Corps of Engineers. My view of this is it is a dangerous amendment. He and I just see it very differently.

I believe this amendment would put our national security at risk by making the Nation's dams, reservoirs, hydroelectric powerhouses, navigation locks, major river systems, levees, and other flood risk management features vulnerable to attacks.

Current law on Army Corps property is this: Army regulations prohibit the private possession of loaded firearms, ammunition, loaded projectile firing devices, and other weapons on Army Corps property unless—and this is important—unless the weapon is being used for hunting, fishing, or target shooting in designated areas. So let's establish that, yes, people can bring a gun onto corps property, but it needs to be for hunting, fishing, or target shooting.

I don't know what other usage there would be. I guess one could argue that a person wants to defend themselves, but they could argue that anywhere. So I don't know what more my friend wants. We have hunting, fishing, and target shooting in designated areas so we don't have these weapons near this critical infrastructure.

Similar to the regulations that govern private gun possession on military bases, corps regulations require guns to be unloaded when transported to and from these designated hunting, fishing, and target-shooting areas. In addition, under current law, the regulations allow for permission to be given to private individuals by the district commander of the corps. So if somebody has a need to do this, they can get permission to do it. As I look at the current rules, I see it very differently. I see the Army Corps cooperating, making sure people can take their weapons onto corps land, but making sure the uses are the recreational uses. If they have a special problem or a special issue, they can get permission to carry a gun for other circumstances.

So the law already allows for the transport of guns on and off Army Corps property when used appropriately for hunting or sport. I guess we would have to say why would we have an amendment here that I believe will put our critical water infrastructure installations and millions of Americans who visit corps land at risk? I think it is a public safety issue.

Why do I oppose this Coburn amendment and why do I say it is dangerous? First of all, Army Corps rangers are not trained or equipped to be law enforcement officers. That is quite different from the national park lands. Second, Army Corps facilities are infrastructure that is critical to national security, the economy, and the safety of the American people. Third, the amendment ignores significant increases in the budget deficit, and I know my friend is, if not the biggest deficit hawk, certainly one of the biggest deficit hawks in history—ever since I have been here, which is a long time. So we have costs—notifying the public of the change in law and somehow hiring security guards to protect dams and reservoirs and other critical infrastructure.

I have sat in on numerous discussions, both classified and unclassified, that talk about the need to protect the critical infrastructure of this world in which we live. In this world we live in, we may well see more homegrown terrorists who know our land and who know where these dams are, and who know where these reservoirs are, and who know where these locks are.

The Army Corps rangers are not trained or equipped to be law enforcement officers. They have no authority to carry firearms, to make arrests, or execute search warrants. Corps rangers are tasked with resource management and recreation maintenance. They are not law enforcement officers.

The Coburn amendment would allow individuals to carry loaded or concealed weapons on all corps land as long as the individual's possession is in compliance with the State law where the property is located. By the way, I appreciate the fact the Coburn amendment does that, because some others have offered amendments where if a person is in a State that allows conceal and carry, they can go to any State. The Coburn amendment doesn't do that. I appreciate that very much.

Now in the 49 States that allow concealed carrying of loaded weapons, the corps would not be able to prevent visitors from carrying concealed loaded weapons on corps campsites and hiking trails. Yet the corps has no employees who perform law enforcement duties. I have said this now three times. It is a very important point. We are putting our corps people in a situation where they are unarmed and people coming on the property are armed. So if someone carries a weapon onto corps land—and I agree with my friend that 99-something percent of the people are wonderful and would never think of committing any type of felony, but we know violent crime happens every day. Good Lord, all one has to do is read the paper. We know there are—how many deaths every day from guns? There are 87 deaths a day from guns. A lot of that is suicide and a lot of that is violence toward another person. So let me tell my colleagues what the corps can do in the case where there is a felony on the land there—someone doing something violent. They could write a ticket or call for backup. Since they have no weapons and no authority to arrest suspects, it is a dangerous situation. If this were to pass, we would have to spend a whole lot of dough making sure we train the corps personnel or allow them to hire law enforcement. We are talking about a lot of funds we don't have.

I don't know what the problem is. Honestly, maybe my friend has heard from colleagues or friends or people who are upset about this. But the fact is people can have weapons on corps land for all kinds of reasons pertaining to recreation, which is the point. Yes, one has to get them to the site not loaded and so on, and there are rules and regulations, but I don't think that is a problem. Some of the hunters I know are extremely proud of the safety record they have had and what they teach their kids.

Now let's talk about the facilities that I think are being put at risk—facilities important to our national security, to our economy, and to our public safety. The Department of Homeland Security under President Bush took action in 2003 to list—and I am quoting—this sounds funny—''dam''—D-A-M—''assets.'' Those include navigation locks, levees, and water retention facilities, as a sector that is critical to the function of the economy, to the government, to our society, to the well-being of our people. The inspector general notes that these assets are especially important because one catastrophic failure at some locations could affect populations exceeding 100,000 people and have economic consequences surpassing $10 billion. So we are talking about changing the law on corps land that would expand the right to carry a gun, which people now have on corps land as long as it is for recreation purposes—expanding it in a way that could threaten critical infrastructure. This is in a situation where there are no armed guards. One catastrophic failure could affect 100,000 people and could have economic consequences surpassing $10 billion.

This is a report from the Bush administration, folks.

A 2011 DHS Inspector General report indicated there were numerous security gaps already at critical dam assets across the Nation. So I do not know why we would allow anyone to bring firearms to those critical infrastructure facilities. They can use them for hunting and fishing, but we should have some rules that protect this infrastructure.

Just notifying the public of the change in law that my friend wants to see happen will cost an enormous amount of money—millions of dollars. The Coburn amendment does not address the costs, and normally he would do that in an amendment: address the costs the corps would incur in order to train their workers to carry weapons or to hire outside security for that.

I appreciate and respect the views of my friend, but I also think this is something we should not do today on this bill now, especially when we are seeing a lot of talk about more homegrown terrorism. We want to protect our infrastructure. It may be that the corps ought to look at more protection for these facilities. I am willing to look at that. But I do think we are making a problem where there is not a problem. People can go on corps land and use their guns for hunting and fishing, recreation and target shooting, and I think that is working out fine. This seems to be an amendment that is solving a problem that, frankly, does not exist.

I have 38 million people in my State. That is a lot of people. I asked: Do we

have a lot of letters on this? I, at this point, do not know of any. But I may have some now that the Senator has brought this up. We probably have it on both sides now. But I hate to see us do this because I think it is going to put critical water infrastructure at risk.

This is not the national parks. These are not facilities where we have armed guards. If something were to happen to a reservoir, to a dam, the Bush administration tells us it could be quite devastating to communities.

So I hope we will oppose this amendment. Again, it is with respect that I say these things. I say them because I truly do think this is misguided. I hope we can get on with the underlying bill.

I thank my colleague and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, first of all, our amendment exempts the areas the chairman talked about—locks and dams. All those areas are exempt from this amendment. As ranking member on Homeland Security, I know more about these issues than probably anybody other than our chairman and the past chairman and ranking member in terms of the safety.

The people the chairman talks about do not care what the law is now. They do not care what the law is. So the people about whom we are going to be worried—Boston has pretty tight laws. They did not care what the laws were. They broke multiple sets of laws, as we saw what happened in Boston. We have to prepare for that regardless of whether this amendment goes through.

I would also note, in several of our national parks we have corps land where we have hydroelectric facilities and we have these things. We have not had any problem with that. What we have had is a marked decline in the number of rapes and a marked decline in the number of murders in national parks since we instituted the State laws in national parks for guns.

On campgrounds we do have problems with rapes, with accosts, with assaults, with robberies; and we do have murders on corps land and campgrounds. So the point is, standardizing where you can go—I would also make the point, we only allow State law to apply. If Oklahoma law is different than California law, it is not Oklahoma law, it is whatever California law is and recognizing that individual right so we do not put people in jeopardy when they accidentally get on corps land.

I understand her inhibition toward it, toward any expression of the Second Amendment generally. But the fact is we ought to have a common policy in all areas. We already do it in Bureau of Land Management, we already do it in the Forest Service, we already do it in national parks. So we should not exempt the corps.

The fact is, the people who are going to violate our laws are not the law-abiding citizens. They are not the law-abiding citizens. It does not matter what we do; they are not going to pay attention to what we do. The one thing we have proven in the National Parks is, when we allowed people the ability to carry and follow their own State's law in terms of their Second Amendment, we saw rapes go down, we saw murders go down, we saw assaults go down, and we saw robberies go down in the national parks.

The same thing will happen on corps land. Most of the people will not carry. Most of the people will not come in. But to deny the ability to do that, that is what this amendment is about.

I will be happy to debate the Senator further. The fact is, there is a big difference in our view of what the Second Amendment should be about in this country and our trusting of law-abiding citizens to do the right things. Her issue on critical infrastructure—we are doing everything we can do to protect that now and building toward the ultimate goals of where we need to be, and this is not going to change our approach. It is not going to change it at all. So I would dispute the fact that it is going to change our approach.

As we look at critical infrastructure and the protection of it, we are going to do the same whether or not this amendment passes. It is not going to have any impact on it.

My hope would be that since I actually have withdrawn the other amendment we would yield back the time and move to Senator WHITEHOUSE's amendment as soon as we can.

With that, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I wish to ask my friend to show me where he excludes the areas that have the critical infrastructure because we have a report from CRS that says they are not excluded. The dams are not excluded.

Mr. COBURN. I will be happy to get it for the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. No problem.

Madam President, I think the point is, the Senator tries to say what I think about the right to bear arms. He does not know my views. It is very clear the Supreme Court has stated the Second Amendment—that there is a right to bear arms. But just as any other right—free speech, freedom of the press—rights are not unrestricted. We all know the story: You have free speech, but you cannot go into a theater and yell ''fire, fire'' unless there is a fire because you could be charged for causing a riot. So there is no absolute right.

The corps has stated on their land you can already bring a gun as long as it is about hunting, it is about fishing, it is about recreation. But they say, if it is near their critical infrastructure—which the Bush administration says is a homeland security necessity to protect—you cannot carry a loaded weapon.

My friend says he excluded these areas. I am telling you—you can read this—there is no exclusion. And if you read the CRS——

Mr. COBURN. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I will in 1 second. I want to read what CRS says:

> Proposed legislation does not explicitly provide the Corps with authority to restrict firearms at Corps facilities (e.g., dams) or in specifically designated areas.

I am happy to yield.

Mr. COBURN. I will get the Senator the actual statute.

Federal structures are covered under another statute and I will get that statute for it. The reason we did not specifically represent that is because they are already covered. We did not exclude those structures. We said: Corps land. We did not specifically say that, and we will get you the code where Federal structures are excluded.

Mrs. BOXER. Well, if I could say to my friend, through the Chair, fine, get me the code. But the Senator said his amendment specifically excluded it, and it does not. I am researching now that part, but there is no question there is no explicit prohibition here.

So now you get into a circumstance where you have one Federal law that says one thing, another Federal law that says something else, and we know where that leads, folks. That leads to court.

I think my friend wanted to exclude being able to carry weapons near levees and dams and so on. He ought to like the status quo because that is the status quo. The status quo is, if you want to use a gun for hunting, fishing, recreation, fine, the corps already allows it. You just cannot use it on critical infrastructure. He says that is his point. What is the problem? What is the problem?

As I discuss this with my friend, I do not see why his amendment is necessary. I hope he will withdraw it, frankly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I do not have any intention of withdrawing the amendment. There is a Federal statute that already prohibits the carrying of firearms in Federal buildings and structures, and we will get the Senator the statute. That is very clear. We were advised by legislative counsel we did not have to put that in there because it is already prohibited. I will challenge the statement of the CRS and will give the Senator the section of the code that provides that.

Again, the point is, this critical infrastructure is already being beefed up. We are going to be doing that in Homeland Security. We are doing that in Homeland Security, and it has no bearing whatsoever on the Second Amendment right to unify our policies across all government-owned land in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the CRS report summary that was done on this identical bill, which clearly states in their analysis that this would allow individuals to carry firearms—loaded—on to levees, dams, near reservoirs, and the rest. It is clearly stated here:

Proposed legislation does not explicitly provide the Corps with authority to restrict firearms at Corps facilities [like dams]. . . .

And it goes on to say that is their decision.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Congressional Research Service, July 12, 2012]

FIREARMS AT ARMY CORPS WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS: PROPOSED LEGISLATION AND ISSUES FOR CONGRESS

(By Nicole T. Carter)

SUMMARY

As part of its civil works mission, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers manages water resource projects. Reservoirs lying behind Corps dams, and Corps navigation locks and their pools, are popular recreation sites, attracting 370 million visits annually. Corps projects include some of the most densely used federal recreation lands. Currently, 36 C.F.R. Section 327 sets out the regulations for public use of Corps projects. Section 327.13 generally prohibits possession of loaded firearms by private (i.e., non-law enforcement) individuals at Corps-administered projects unless they are being used for hunting at designated sites (with devices required to be unloaded while transported to and from the sites) or at authorized shooting ranges. The regulation applies at projects regardless of their location in states allowing open or concealed carry of loaded firearms.

Proposed legislation—the Recreational Lands Self-Defense Act (H.R. 1865, S. 1588), and Section 111 of H.R. 5325, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of FY2013 (which are all substantively similar)—would bar the Secretary of the Army from promulgating or enforcing regulations that prohibit individuals from possessing firearms (including assembled or functional firearms) at Corps projects. The bills would require that firearms possession comply with state law. Supporters of the proposed legislation see it as a partial remedy to a current patchwork of regulations restricting firearms on federally managed lands, as a means to provide consistency for open and concealed firearms possession within a state, and as facilitating self-defense. They argue that enactment would establish Corps policies consistent with Section 512 of P.L. 111–24, which made it legal for individuals to possess firearms at National Park Service (NPS) and National Wildlife Refuge System (NWRS) units of the Department of the Interior (DOI). Other stakeholders are concerned that the proposed legislation may produce unintended public safety and infrastructure security issues at Corps projects.

The issue for Congress is not only possession of loaded firearms by private individuals but also how to maintain public safety and infrastructure security at Corps projects.

- Critical facilities security: Proposed legislation does not explicitly provide the Corps with authority to restrict firearms at Corps facilities (e.g., dams) or in specifically designated areas.
- Public safety and law enforcement: There are no armed federal law enforcement officers commissioned for public safety and security purposes at Corps projects. Unlike DOI, the Corps does not have authority to perform most law enforcement functions at its projects. Corps rangers are limited to issuing citations for regulatory violations and are not allowed to carry firearms. Most law enforcement is provided by local and state law enforcement personnel; the Corps' authority to contract for this assistance is $10 million annually.

A safety and security assessment of the proposed legislation for Corps projects has not been performed. DOI's Bureau of Reclamation is faced with similar safety and security issues at its water resource projects. It allows possession of firearms on Reclamation lands and waterbodies (e.g., reservoirs behind dams) when such possession complies with federal, state, and local law. The regulations restrict firearms at Reclamation facilities (e.g; dams, buildings). DOI and Reclamation also use multiple authorities and mechanisms to provide for armed and unarmed law enforcement and public safety and security. Whether the Corps, given its current authorities, could similarly provide for safety and security at its projects if the proposed legislation is enacted has not been assessed.

Mrs. BOXER. CRS did a big study of it. I appreciate my friend says he covers this. It is not in his legislation. It is just not in there. He does not refer to that other law. He does not say anything about the other law.

My point is that the corps already allows you to bring a loaded gun onto the premises. You can even get a special permit if you want to bring it to other areas. It is already the law.

So this is an amendment that, in my reading of it, would allow you then to go onto these other areas—the levees, the reservoirs, the critical infrastructure. CRS agrees. I have put it in the RECORD. My friend says no.

I will tell you something, I do not think we should move forward with this—he is—and we will see where the votes fall.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I would yield back the remainder of my time if the chairman of the committee would do as well.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I do. I yield my time back as well and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. May I ask further consent that time during all of the quorum calls be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, for the interest of all Senators, we are moving forward with our bill. We have a first vote on an amendment at 2 o'clock. At this time we are determining whether Senator WHITEHOUSE will offer his amendment. If he does, there will be a vote on one of the two Coburn amendments—he has withdrawn the other—and then a vote on the Whitehouse amendment if, in fact, he offers it.

I would like say for the benefit of all Senators that this is a WRDA bill; this is a water bill. This is about dredging our ports. This is about making sure we have restoration of our wetlands. This is about making sure we have flood control protection. This is about the infrastructure of our country, the ability to move goods, and the ability to have an infrastructure that is much better than the D-plus it is rated at this time.

This is not a gun bill. I beg my colleagues, whatever side you are on, we cannot turn this bill into a gun bill because that is not going to happen. I hope my colleagues will look at the Coburn amendment and decide that the best course is not to have it on this bill. It doesn't belong on this bill, and it shouldn't be on this bill. It is nongermane, and, more important to me, it is very controversial.

I wish to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question. I know the Senator has a wonderful amendment that deals with the protection of our oceans on a water bill. Guess what—an amendment about water on a water bill. This is good. I would ask my friend if he intends to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, through the Chair, I will tell the distinguished chairman that I, with great enthusiasm, intend to offer my amendment. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support it.

You should support it if you are from a coastal State because the coastal problems that coastal States face are so often overlooked. If you are not from a coastal State but you visit coastal States to go to the beach, if you like to eat fish or, frankly, if you like imported products that come through our coastal ports, you too have an interest in this legislation. I hope you will support it.

Finally, this is a piece of legislation that was agreed to before by this body in the form of the RESTORE Act. In the RESTORE Act, we literally sent billions of dollars to our colleagues along the Gulf States for remediation, repair, and economic reconstruction after the two disasters of Hurricane Katrina and the explosion of the oil

well. Those two disasters. So for reasons that don't merit further discussion here today, that part of the agreement was left unaccomplished.

Whether you are from a coastal State or whether you enjoy coastal products or visits, I would urge my colleagues, for the sake of the Senate being a place in which a bargain once struck is honored, that we owe a vote strongly in support of the authorization—and this is only an authorization, no funding whatsoever—of a national endowment for the oceans that will allow coastal and Great Lakes States to at least be able to compete for funding to be obtained later through existing structures—no new bureaucracies—so we can do what we need to do to protect our coastal economies.

I thank the chairman.

Mrs. BOXER. Retaining my time, I would like to ask through the Chair if Senator WHITEHOUSE has to actually send his amendment to the desk and ask for the yeas and nays. Because, if so, I think it would be an appropriate time to do that since we intend to vote at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be offered at this time.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. If I may seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 803 TO AMENDMENT NO. 799

(Purpose: To create the National Endowment for the Oceans to promote the protection and conservation of United States ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes ecosystems)

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. At the Chairman's suggestion, and with her permission, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WHITEHOUSE], for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. CANTWELL, proposes an amendment numbered 803 to amendment No. 799.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Tuesday, May 7, 2013, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mrs. BOXER. Does the Senator need to ask for the yeas and nays or are the yeas and nays ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays would have to be requested.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask for the yeas and nays, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a sufficient second at this time.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I am very confused. Yesterday there was an agreement there would be a vote. What is my colleague's understanding?

OK, we just need to have some more time. So I recommend the Senator stay on the floor so we can get a colleague on the floor. That would be great. After we do that, I am going to encourage my friend to take some time and go into why it is so critical we pay attention to the oceans of our country, what is happening to the state of our oceans, and what is happening to the quality of our oceans, given so many factors, including the changes we are experiencing in climate, because he is a great expert on that.

Does my friend want some time now? I would like to see if I can get us to the yeas and nays.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, while the chairman goes about the parliamentary task of organizing a sufficient second on the national endowment bill, I do wish to describe some of the changes our coastal and Great Lakes States are seeing and need to deal with.

Probably the most obvious of all are the storms we have been seeing—the unprecedented and extreme storms we have been seeing—along our coasts. Whether it was Hurricane Katrina or Superstorm Sandy, we have seen unprecedented damage done at the merger of land and sea, where driven by these powerful storms the sea can wreak such havoc on the land. But it goes well beyond the damage of extreme storms. If we go out into the Gulf of Maine, we can see the cod catch, which is a historic fishery going back centuries, has now collapsed to the point where the Draconian measures that must be applied to that fishery actually risk extinguishing the fishing industry for cod in some of our Northeastern States.

We can move down the coast to the Carolinas, where highway departments are raising the bridges out to the Outer Banks in order to prepare for higher seas and stronger storm surges. We can go further south, to the Florida coast, where in some parts of that ocean—the Caribbean ocean nearby—as little as 10 percent of the coral remains alive. That is actually a pretty big industry for Florida. I think they do 15 million scuba dives a year for recreational purposes—15 million scuba dives—which are not just economically valuable for the dive boat owners and operators but for the people who travel, who have meals and who stay in hotels and buy equipment. They are not going to come to do scuba diving there as much if the famous Caribbean reefs and coral reefs off of Florida continue to die at the rate they are.

We can go all the way across the country to the West Coast, where we see the oyster fisheries in Washington and Oregon threatened by the acidification of the oceans. There have been oyster hatcheries that have had massive die-offs within the hatchery when acidified water from the sea welled up and came into the intakes of these, in many cases, multigenerational family operations and were too acidic to allow the larval oysters to develop their shells, resulting in massive die-offs and economic loss.

I can tell two stories about my home State of Rhode Island that are very current. In Rhode Island, the biggest storm we have seen, worse even than Superstorm Sandy in recent decades, was the famous hurricane of 1938, which did immense damage along our shoreline at a time when our shoreline was far less developed than it is now. Between the 1930s, when that hurricane took place, and now, the sea level at the Newport tide gauge in Newport, RI, has actually climbed 10 inches. So when the next hurricane of 1938 comes—or perhaps even a bigger one, as our current experience of storms would seem to suggest is possible—it will be driving a higher ocean against the shore and probably not just 10 inches higher, because a storm surge will stack that 10-inch increase as it crashes against our Rhode Island shores, and that can be a game changer.

States such as Rhode Island have to do a lot of work to reconfigure where the so-called velocity zones are, where it is safe to build or not safe to build, what is actually now vulnerable in a 100-year flood or a 500-year flood as things change along our coasts. That is something that is a little hard to debate. It is actually a measurement. It is a measurement of 10 inches on a tide gauge. This is not some theory. This is what has happened. That water lying out there 10 inches higher is a terrific risk to our State and something we have to prepare for. Given the way State budgets are, we would like to be able to compete, once we have found some Federal funding, for the ability to figure things out so investors and people living along coastal communities can have a solid and fact-based appreciation of what the risks are to them from this worsening condition of stronger storms and higher measured sea levels.

Another Rhode Island-specific example is the winter flounder. The winter flounder is a major catch species in Narragansett Bay—or at least it was. We can go back to the earliest Native American settlements and find winter flounder bones around the settlements. For many years the winter flounder was the biggest catch in Narragansett Bay. I know a certain amount about it because when my wife did her Ph.D. thesis, she studied the winter flounder in Narragansett Bay and what was happening to it and how its life cycle interacted with another bay creature called the sand shrimp—or the Crangon septemspinosa, which is the technical name. In the time between when she wrote her thesis and now, the catch of winter flounder in Narragansett Bay has crashed more than 90 percent. It is no longer an active direct fishery in Narragansett Bay.

I can remember not that many years ago, it doesn't seem, driving over the Jamestown Bridge or the Newport Bridge or the Bristol Bridge and looking down and seeing trawlers working the upper bay trawling for winter flounder. We don't see that any longer because that fishery has crashed.

It has crashed for two reasons. One is the bay is warmer in the winter. I am

having a dispute with PolitiFact right now, but I stand by my assertion it is 4 degrees warmer in the winter. They think it is more like 3 degrees warmer in the winter than it was 30 years ago. Four degrees in water temperature may not seem like much to us humans, but we don't live in that environment. If that is your environment, 4 degrees sends a signal to certain species they don't belong there any longer and to move to cooler waters.

The other thing it has done is it has allowed this other bay creature, the sand shrimp, to move in earlier to the bay when the larval winter flounders are still small enough to be eaten by the sand shrimp. It used to be the sand shrimp would come in and they would feed on the larval winter flounders, but enough of them would get big enough soon enough that they got too big to eat for the sand shrimp. In fact, as they got bigger, they would turn around and eat the sand shrimp. That was the cycle of life. Now the sand shrimp come in earlier. There are fewer winter flounder because of the temperature, and because they are getting in earlier, it is a much more dangerous environment because the larval winter flounder are smaller and remain prey longer. So for all those reasons, there goes what once was a very key fishery.

These are just individual examples. Every coastal State, every Great Lakes State could come and have their Senator give the same speech with at least two examples of things that are changing and making a dramatic difference in the coasts. The phrase I use is: The faster you drive, the better your headlights need to be. These changes are coming fast. Things that used to happen across centuries are happening in decades; things that used to happen over decades are happening in years. We need to have better headlights as we see these changes coming at us, and the headlights are the science, the research, the information, and the ability to do this kind of work.

I hope my colleagues, on the merits, will support my amendment. I hope even if they do not particularly care, even if they are from an inland State and don't have a great interest, that simply in the interest of the spirit of the Senate they will respect an agreement once it has been reached and will make an effort to make sure agreements, when struck, aren't broken and that I will get my partisan support.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I rise today in support of the 2013 Water Resources Development Act, or WRDA. I agree with my colleagues who believe that moving forward with a bipartisan WRDA bill is important for our communities.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I believe we need to address the issues facing the Army Corps and the country. Today we have problems with aging infrastructure, with a lack of transparency, and with fiscal accountability—all of which impact the public health, the safety, and the economic welfare of our communities.

My staff and I have worked with our colleagues on the full committee and the subcommittee to create a bipartisan product to address these concerns. We may have our differences on a number of the issues, but the bulk of what we have accomplished is about protecting our States and protecting our constituents, not about partisan politics.

For example, issues such as flood mitigation are very important to my State. In 1984 the town of Baggs, WY, faced a major flood. The entire town had to be evacuated, and there was over $1 million worth of damage done. In mid-May of 2008, Baggs faced another major potential flood. The Wyoming National Guard was called in to assist, as well as the Department of Homeland Security. At the request of the Department of Homeland Security, the Army Corps Sacramento office sent an official who was able to oversee the reinforcement of existing berms and the construction of new ones. This time Baggs did not need to be evacuated and the damage was minimal.

Baggs is not the only town in Wyoming to need assistance to protect itself from the threat of flooding. Predicting floods and being better prepared for them is a major component in keeping Wyoming communities safe. That is why I proposed and successfully included language in this bill, with the help of the chair and ranking member, for an authorization for Upper Missouri Basin flood and drought monitoring. This program will restore the stream gauges and snowpack monitors through the Upper Missouri Basin at all elevations. These gauges are used to monitor snow depth and soil moisture, to help inform agencies such as the Corps as to potential flooding and also drought in the future. This type of monitoring will protect communities and save lives. The language is supported by the Upper Missouri Water Association.

I am also pleased that the language I have authored for technical assistance to help rural communities comply with environmental regulations was included in the bill. Rural communities often do not have the expertise or the funding to make important upgrades to their water systems. Dedicated professionals, such as the folks at the Wyoming Rural Water Association, use this funding to go into these communities and provide the critical assistance they need. I thank Subcommittee Chairman BAUCUS for his help in working with me to get this important language included in the bill.

As I mentioned, transparency and fiscal responsibility are also important components to tackling the issues that need to be addressed with the Army Corps. That is why I offered language to create an Army Corps project deauthorization process. It is one that mimics the Base Realignment and Closure Commission—you know, the BRAC Commission—that the Department of Defense uses to close or reconsolidate military bases.

Under my language, an independent commission appointed by the President would identify projects for deauthorization based on established criteria and then submit those projects as one package for an up-or-down vote by the Congress. There are many of these projects that are on the books. They are authorized for millions of dollars, and they are going nowhere. The backlog of Army Corps projects is currently about $60 billion according to the National Academy of Sciences. It is time for the Corps and Congress to clean the books, cut the waste, and bring fiscal responsibility to the WRDA process.

I am specifically thankful to Chairman BOXER and to Ranking Member VITTER and Subcommittee Chairman BAUCUS for supporting my language. I am also grateful to my colleagues for the bipartisan process under which this bill was considered. Our staffs worked well together. We put together a good product. I specifically want to thank a member of my staff, Brian Clifford, who worked diligently on this process and worked in a unified way. We see the results in the Senate.

The bill unanimously passed the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.

Although the bill is not perfect and there is always room for improvement, I believe we have achieved a compromise, a solution that is substantive, effective, and in the public interest. This is a product that will save lives, will maintain the flow of commerce, and will protect communities for years to come.

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. COONS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EDUCATION EQUALITY

Mr. COONS. Madam President, as the son and grandson of classroom teachers, as a father myself, as someone for whom education played a central role in my life, and as a passionate believer in the power of education to change others' lives, I rise today to talk about a bill that is one of the most important to me that I have moved as a Senator.

The fact is if we look at the American national condition, the lack of access to higher education as well as the

lack of an opportunity for a quality education is one of the greatest problems we face. Inequality in having some real hope, some real promise of a shot at college defines and distinguishes the drivers of social inequality in America in ways it has not in decades. If we want to ensure going forward that American workers can compete in the global economy, if we want to ensure a country that is capable of living up to our promise of liberty and justice for all, if we want to deal with one of the biggest civil rights issues in our country, then we have to ensure every child has an equal chance for high-quality education regardless of the ZIP Code they are born into.

Long before I was elected to public office, I spent years working with a nonprofit education center called ''I Have A Dream'' Foundation. In my role there, I visited schools all over the United States. More often than not, these were schools in very tough communities and neighborhoods, schools that were in public housing developments or that were in some of the most forlorn and troubled neighborhoods in all of America.

What struck me over and over when I would go into an elementary school and talk to a group of young kids and ask: What do you dream of? What do you hope to be when you grow up? They would raise their hands, and none of them said: I dream of being in a gang; I dream of being in jail; I dream of being a drug dealer; I dream of dying before I turn 20. They would say: I dream of being a Senator or a lawyer or owning my own business or being a star in the NBA or being a success. The dreams we hear from kids in elementary schools are the same regardless of the community in America. Yet the outcomes are so desperately different.

What I saw in the nearly 20 years I was active with the ''I Have A Dream'' Foundation was that the young people who came from a community, family, or school where there was little or no experience or expectation of a college education sent a powerful, persistent, and negative message at a very early age—that college is not for them. They are told indirectly that it is not affordable, it is not accessible, it is not part of the plan for their future. Those messages have a cumulative, powerful, and consequential impact.

Very few of the 50 ''Dreamers'' from the east side of Wilmington that my family and I worked very closely with had any expectation of a college education. In 1988 when our chapter of ''I Have A Dream'' Foundation promised them the opportunity for a higher education through a scholarship, we could see the change. First we saw the change in their teachers and parents, then in their mentors and classmates, and ultimately we saw it in them. We saw a change in their hopes and their expectations.

The most powerful thing the ''I Have A Dream'' Foundation did in our chapter, and in dozens of chapters around the country, was to hold up a mirror to young people of their future that was a brighter and more promising future than they had ever dreamed of on their own. They were challenged to walk through that open door and make college not just a distant dream, not something they heard of or watched on TV, but something that became a part of their lived life, and to change their outcomes.

That experience has inspired the bill I introduced in the last Congress, and I am most personally connected to in this Congress.

Last year I found a Republican partner who shares my passion for expanding access to college and for making it more affordable. That partner is Senator MARCO RUBIO of Florida. Some folks have noticed that here in the Senate we don't always get along and we don't always agree and sometimes partisanship divides us. I have been very pleased to have this strong and able partner in moving forward a bipartisan bill which we named the American Dream Accounts Act. This is a bill that bridges the opportunity gap by connecting students, teachers, parents, and mentors to create a new generation of higher education achievers.

There are too many American kids today who are cut off from the enormous potential of a higher education. The numbers are grim. If someone comes from a low-income family, the chance that student will complete a college degree by the time that person turns 25 is about 1 in 10 at best.

In order to have the prospect of employment and opportunity of accumulating wealth and providing an education and security for our family and kids, a college education is essential these days. We in the Federal Government spend billions of dollars on making higher education affordable through Pell grants, yet do almost nothing to make it clear to children at the earliest age that this funding will be available to them.

In my home State of Delaware, our Governor Jack Markell and our first lady Carla Markell have done a wonderful job of incorporating the power of this insight and lesson. They are ensuring there is a State-funded scholarship and network of engaged mentors and real reform in our public schools. We don't tell kids, even in our State, in elementary school of the possibilities that lie ahead of them in a way that changes their expectations. That is what this bill will hopefully do. It encourages partnerships between schools and colleges, nonprofits and businesses. It allows them to develop individualized student accounts, such as their Facebook account, married to a college savings account; individual accounts that are secure, Web-based, personal, and portable; accounts that contain information about each student's academic preparedness and financial literacy. It is something that combines a portfolio of their entire education experience with the very real savings for the future of higher education we want to pull them toward from their earliest years.

Instead of forcing motivated parents or concerned teachers or interested mentors or empowered students—instead of forcing all of these folks to track down these different resources separately, this legislation, this idea would connect them across existing silos and across existing education programs at the State and Federal level.

So tomorrow Senator RUBIO and I will reintroduce this legislation as the bipartisan American Dream Accounts Act of 2013. We are working hard to earn the support of our colleagues in the Senate and in the House, and I will keep at this for as long as it takes.

The American Dream Accounts Act addresses the longstanding challenges and barriers to college access: connectivity, financial resources, early intervention, and portability. Let me briefly speak to each of those.

First, connectivity. The journey from elementary school, to high school, to higher education is a long one, and for a student to be successful it takes lots of engaged and attentive adults—motivated parents, concerned teachers, supportive family. So many students in our schools all over this country disengage or drop out along the way because they are not connected, they are not supported by those concerned and engaged adults. The American Dream Accounts Act takes advantage of modern technology to create Facebook-inspired individualized accounts—an opportunity to deliver personalized hubs of information that would connect these kids and sustain and support them throughout the entire journey of education by continuing to remind them of the promise of higher education and its affordability.

Second, these dream accounts would connect kids with college savings opportunities. Studies show that students who know there is a dedicated college savings account in their name are seven times more likely to go to college than peers without one. Think about that for a moment. States such as Delaware and our Nation invest billions of dollars in programs to make higher education affordable. Yet so few of the kids I have worked with all over this country in the ''I Have a Dream'' program have any idea. They have never heard of Senator Pell. They don't know Pell grants exist. They don't live in States that have the HOPE scholars, the Aspire scholars, or the Dream scholarships that a number of States have, and they don't know they will be there for them when they are of age to go to college. Why don't we tell them early? Why don't we change their expectations? That is one of the things this program would do. And it is not a new idea; it is a demonstrated one that we know works.

The third piece of this American Dream Accounts Act is early intervention. As I said, States and Federal programs that provide billions of dollars

in support to make college affordable don't connect with kids early enough. By letting them know early, we can change their ultimate orientation and outcomes.

The last important piece is portability. One of the things I saw in my own experience with my Dreamers, the students in the ''I Have a Dream'' program I helped to run in Delaware, was just how often they moved. Children growing up in poverty, in families facing unexpected challenges, relocate over and over and bounce from school to school, district to district, often facing overstretched teachers with full classrooms who, when they move midyear into a new school, don't get any background information or insight on the student who has moved into their classroom. So instead of being welcomed and engaged in a positive way, sometimes they feel and are disconnected and develop into discipline problems or students who are difficult to teach. The mobility that comes with poverty sometimes also leads to disconnection from education.

This robust, online, secure, individualized account would empower teachers to connect with parents, to connect with mentors, and to know the entire education history of the student newly before them. So no matter what disruptions or challenges a student might face as they travel through the long journey of education, their own individual American dream act—their own portfolio of their dreams and their activities and their progress—would be there with them.

Our Nation's long-term economic competitiveness requires a highly trained and highly educated workforce, and our Nation's commitment to a democracy and to a country of equal opportunity demands that we do everything we can to make real the hope of higher education for kids no matter the ZIP Code into which they are born, no matter their background. While we spend billions on making higher education affordable, we aren't delivering it effectively enough to change that future. What I saw in my years with the ''I Have a Dream'' program was bright faces, raised arms, hope, and opportunity that sadly was not as often as it could be realized. This program, this connectivity, this new type of account is a way to make real on that promise.

We can meet this challenge by connecting students with a broad array of higher education options, informing them about them early, whether it is vocational school or job training, community college or 4-year universities. Not everyone is made for a 4-year higher education degree. This would connect kids with all of the different opportunities for skill training and higher education that are out there. It also would support students as they identify the type of education best for them, the career they most want, and give them the tools to get there.

As I visit schools across my own State of Delaware, one thing is clear: All of these different resources currently exist in different ways and at different stages of education, but they are not connected in a way that weaves together students, parents, mentors, and the resources of our highly motivated, highly engaged State.

So this vision—one that has stayed with me from my time at ''I Have a Dream'' to my service here as a Senator—is that when we ask a roomful of elementary school kids in the future, ''What do you dream of, what is your hope,'' when their hands shoot up in the air and they list all of the different dreams they have, regardless of background or income or community, we can make that possible. We can make our investments real, and we can make the dream of equal opportunity a reality.

This year, with the support of lots of groups, including the Corporation for Enterprise Development, a wonderful group called Opportunity Nation, the First Focus Campaign for Children, we are hopeful that bipartisan support for this American dream accounts idea will simply continue to grow. Let's work together to empower students and parents of all backgrounds to achieve their dreams from the earliest age.

THE BUDGET

Madam President, I rise today to speak about our current impasse over the progress of the Federal budget. I have been a Senator for just a little over 2 years. I have presided over this Chamber a great deal, as has the Senator now presiding. I have listened to dozens of speeches from colleagues—in particular, Republican colleagues—upset that this Chamber and the Budget Committee on which I serve hadn't passed a budget in several years. But this year we passed a budget, finally. We went through the long and grinding process known here in Washington as vote-arama where we considered, debated, and disposed of over 100 amendments over hours and hours of deliberation and debate and voting on this floor, and we passed a budget.

It has been 46 days since the Senate passed our budget, but we still need to reconcile it with the House of Representatives' budget for it to become a forceful resolution, a budget resolution that drives the decisions of the Congress. It is important we do that because it has been 66 days since the sequester kicked in.

I know ''sequester'' is Washington-speak, but all of us as Senators are hearing from our home States the very real, very human impact of these across-the-board spending cuts that have begun to really bite. We hear about potential furloughs of men and women who serve at Dover Air Force Base. We hear about the tens of thousands of children being kicked out of needed Head Start Programs. We hear about the thousands of women not getting the breast cancer screenings they need, and we hear about the hundreds of thousands of children not getting the vaccines they are supposed to get. The impacts of the sequester are becoming stronger and broader and more negative all across our country.

The sequester exists because of a lack of political will to come together and resolve a fundamentally different vision between the Senate and the House enacted in our respective budgets. This sequester exists because we haven't come together across the House and the Senate in the way that for 200 years and more this Congress has done. When we pass a bill and when the House passes a bill, it is supposed to go to conference or reconciliation, resolution, and ultimately passage. Here is our chance.

Why would Republicans actively keep us from going to conference to finalize a budget, especially after years of coming to this floor and giving speeches, claiming over and over how terrible it was that we would not pass a budget in the Senate? Americans are tired of this dysfunction. In my view, today Republicans are manufacturing a crisis by preventing the Senate and House from coming together to reconcile our budgets in conference.

As I said, I am a member of the Budget Committee, and I can say with some detailed knowledge, as can the Presiding Officer, that there are real differences between the budget adopted here in the Senate and the budget adopted in the House. I believe the Democratic budget promotes growth and the Republican budget focuses on cuts. I believe ours prioritizes the middle class while the other prioritizes more tax cuts for the wealthiest. In my view, ours prioritizes balance; the other, politics. I think our budget puts us on the path toward job creation while the other takes a path to austerity. But we will never reconcile these two budgets, achieve a shared path forward, and set aside this terrible sequester if we don't go to conference.

Reconciling these two budgets is the definition of what I have heard Member after Member come to the floor and call for, what we have heard here in the Senate called regular order—the process set out by the Founders of this Nation and to which we should return.

These political games, in my view, are destroying this institution. I think it is no wonder the opinion of the average American across this country of this institution simply sinks lower and lower.

What is standing in the way of our progress on this budget at this point is repeated Republican objections. It is my hope that they will step aside and allow us to walk the corridor to the House, get to the conference table, and resolve our budget differences.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 805

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have up to 5 minutes to speak before the vote. Am I correct in assuming the vote is at 2 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Madam President.

I wish to again let Senators know where we are. At 2 o'clock, we will be voting on a gun amendment. I would hope this gun amendment would not get the 60 votes required because I believe it is dangerous. Even though Senator COBURN says it would not allow guns to be carried on critical infrastructure such as dams and locks and reservoirs, we now have two studies that say, in fact, it would allow that.

According to the Bush administration, this critical water infrastructure is a target for terrorists. We are now entering into a stage when our leaders are talking about homegrown terror, and we do not have to look too much further than Boston to understand this is a problem.

Why would we want to have on a water infrastructure bill an amendment that allows people to come in with guns and go right to the heart of those critical water infrastructure projects—those dams, those reservoirs, those locks, et cetera—particularly since the corps already allows, for recreational use, the use of guns for hunting, target practice or fishing. That is already allowed.

There are rules. This is not comparable to the National Park Service. We could get into another debate on that. That one—I know some people here voted for that, to allow extensive guns being carried on parkland. That change was made. The corps is a different situation. The Park Service act like police. They can come in. They can quell a disturbance. They are armed. They are trained. The corps is not a law enforcement entity. That means what they would have to do, if there was a violent outburst, is call the local governments, the State governments, and we do not know how long it would take to have those law enforcement people arrive at such a situation.

So I am pleading with my colleagues, this is a water infrastructure bill. This is not a gun bill. This is not the place to add these types of amendments. We have a very bipartisan bill. It is supported by the chamber of commerce, it is supported by the unions, it is supported by local governments, by the Governors Association. I could go on and on. There is a list of literally 150 organizations. It came out of the committee with a bipartisan vote.

I hope when the clock strikes 2 we can have a vote that keeps us on track, that does not turn the WRDA bill into a gun bill. It is not necessary. It is not appropriate. The fact is, there is nothing in the amendment that would stop people from carrying guns onto critical water infrastructure. It sets up a national security threat. It endangers people.

I just want to be clear: I am not going to allow a bill to move forward that endangers the lives of the people I represent. I owe them a lot more than that, let alone the entire country. We all serve this Nation.

So I hope we will not pass this amendment. I ask for a ''no'' vote on the Coburn amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). All time is expired. The question is on agreeing to the Coburn Amendment No. 805.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 115 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Fischer	McConnell
Ayotte	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Baucus	Grassley	Paul
Begich	Hagan	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Pryor
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shaheen
Collins	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Tester
Cornyn	King	Thune
Crapo	Landrieu	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Donnelly	Manchin	Wicker
Enzi	McCain	

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Harkin	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Reid
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kirk	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Levin	Udall (CO)
Casey	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Cowan	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	
Gillibrand	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. One of the three scheduled votes has been withdrawn, an amendment, so we only have one more vote. Senator BOXER and Senator VITTER have a number of other people wanting to offer amendments today, so if you have amendments, talk to the managers of the bill.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CARDIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Whitehouse amendment and urge its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 803 offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President and colleagues, if I could have my colleagues' attention for a moment, I would appreciate it. This is a measure that this body has voted on before in a strong bipartisan vote. This was part of the RESTORE Act, which was a part of the highway bill.

For reasons that don't merit further discussion now, this piece of it fell out of the bargain that had been reached at the last minute in conference.

I hope this will be a bipartisan vote with support on both sides. If you supported the RESTORE Act, you have already supported this bill. If you believe that deals should be deals in the Senate, then you should support this bill. For all of us in coastal States who are facing very unique pressures, it is very important that we as a body support this bill.

It does not create a single extra bureaucracy or person. It works within the existing government, and it adds no funding. I am going to have to work with all of you to find funding for it later and within our existing budget constraints.

This is just the authorization. Please give me a strong bipartisan vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time in opposition?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I understand there are some asking for a voice vote. Would that be all right with Senator WHITEHOUSE?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would require unanimous consent.

Mrs. BOXER. All right. I think we should go on with the vote then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 803 offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 116 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Ayotte	Hagan	Murray
Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Baucus	Heinrich	Pryor
Begich	Heitkamp	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Reid
Blumenthal	Isakson	Rockefeller
Boxer	Johanns	Sanders
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	King	Sessions
Carper	Kirk	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Shelby
Chambliss	Landrieu	Stabenow
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cowan	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murkowski	
Graham	Murphy	

NAYS—32

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Flake	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Coats	Heller	Rubio
Coburn	Hoeven	Scott
Corker	Inhofe	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the amendment is agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on rollcall vote 116, I voted ''yea.'' It was my intention to vote ''nay.'' Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request. I will make it in a minute.

We are making good progress. We have three amendments in order now: the Blunt amendment No. 800, Pryor amendment 806, and Inhofe amendment No. 835. I ask they be the following amendments in that order to be considered; further, that no second-degree amendments be in order to these amendments prior to votes in relation to the amendments. That is my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we are well on our way to getting this bill done, I hope. The Whitehouse amendment was one that was overwhelmingly supported. I hope that will set the tone for this particular bill; that we will come forward together; that we will not have contentious issues that divide us and divide the American people on a bill that is so motherhood and apple pie as this one is, which is to make sure our ports are dredged, that our flood control projects are done, that our environmental restoration of wetlands is done. It is a very simple, straightforward bill.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I further ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks here Senator WHITEHOUSE be recognized for up to 5 minutes to thank the Senate for this vote—I know he has worked exceedingly hard on this—and then there be a period of morning business for up to 30 minutes, with each Senator allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, amendment No. 799, as amended, is agreed to and is considered original text for the purposes of further amendment.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the chairman's leadership and her offer of 5 minutes of time. I will not need anything near that. I want to take this moment to extend to all of my colleagues a very heartfelt thank you for that last vote.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate is in a period of morning business.

The Senator from Virginia.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 25

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise to make a few remarks and to make a motion. Everyone in this body knows one of the issues, the issue I believe is most holding back our economic recovery and most holding back our ability to sort through so many issues our country faces, is the issue of our debt and deficit. We are like $17 trillion in debt. The debt goes up over $4 billion every night when we go to sleep. This problem is structural in nature. Time alone will not solve this issue.

In the last 4 years, my time in the Senate, there has been no issue on which I have spent more time, spent more effort trying to reach out. I understand many of my colleagues actually try to avoid me in the hallways now because they fear they are going to get a Mark Warner harangue on the debt and deficit.

I also know the only way we are going to get this issue resolved is if both sides are willing to meet each other in the middle. This is a problem that cannot be solved by continuing to cut back on discretionary spending. It will require, yes, more revenues, and it will require entitlement reform. Those are issues where, unfortunately, in many ways our parties have not found agreement.

We have all agreed as well at least that, while we do not have to solve this problem overnight, we need at least $4 trillion in debt reduction over the next 10 years. The good thing is, while we have been lurching from budget crisis to budget crisis, we have gotten halfway to our goal. The good news as well is that this year both the Senate and the House adopted budget resolutions. As I said on the floor in March, I believe the Senate budget was a solid first chapter toward producing a balanced fiscal plan for our country. My vote for the Senate budget—and it was not a budget on which I would agree with every component part—was a vote for progress, a vote for regular order, regular order that so many of my distinguished colleagues who served here much longer than I say is the glue that holds this institution together.

It has now been 46 days since the Senate passed its budget. Unfortunately, there are certain colleagues on the other side of the aisle who seem to block our ability to go to conference. In a few minutes—just 2 minutes—I will ask my colleagues to agree to authorize the Chair to name a conference to the Budget Committee. Unfortunately, I expect that request to be objected to. I find that extremely disappointing. I can only speak at this point for folks from Virginia, but no single other issue is as overriding, as I travel across Virginia and I imagine for most of my colleagues as they travel across their States. At the end of the day, Americans, Virginians, want us to work together and get this issue solved.

We have seen, over the last 2½ years, as we have lurched from manufactured budget crisis to budget crisis, the effects on the stock market, on job creation, and our overall recovery. We have a chance to put this behind us. We need to find the kind of common ground between the House budget proposal and the Senate budget proposal on which so many have called upon us to work.

Again, I am going to make this motion in a moment. I want to add one last point. I appreciate some of the calls we have had from colleagues on the Republican side over the last couple of years for the Senate to pass a budget. I believed we needed to pass that budget. Mr. President, 46 days ago, after 100 amendments and a session that went until 5 o'clock in the morning, we passed such a document. I think it is time now that we allow the Senate to announce its conferees to meet with the House, to get a budget

resolved for the United States of America so we have a framework to make sure we get this issue of debt and deficit behind us; that we allow the economy to recover in a way that it needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment which is at the desk, the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof, and H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, all with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator to modify his request so it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes tax increases or reconciliation instructions to increase taxes or raise the debt limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I point out what the Senator requests is for us to redo the budget debate where those amendments were considered and defeated in the Senate, and it is now up to us to go to conference to work out our differences with the House. There is no need to go back through another 50 hours of debate and 100-plus amendments to be considered. This body needs to go to work. We have been told time and time again we need a budget, we need a solution. We do not need to manage by crisis. There is no need to relitigate the budget on this side. We need to go to conference and litigate our differences with the House Republicans.

I object to the Senator's request and urge we move to conference and allow the request of the Senator from Virginia, Senator WARNER, to go forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, while it is not unexpected, I am disappointed. The nub of this issue, as commentators from left to right, Democrat and Republican, pointed out, is if we are going to avoid the path we are on, the path of sequestration, which was set up to be literally the worst possible option—which right now is seeing cuts made in the most unsophisticated, unplanned, and inefficient way possible, plans that, if we continue on the path we are on, would so dramatically cut back this country's investments in education, infrastructure, research and development, that I don't believe, as a former business person, that America will be able to compete with the kind of economic growth we need to maintain our economy.

If we are going to avoid those kinds of Draconian cuts, if we are going to have a rational business plan for our country, I think most of us, or at least an overwhelming majority of the Senate, would recognize we have to generate both some additional revenues and—while there may be some on my side who disagree—we have to find ways to reform entitlement programs to make sure Medicare and Social Security are going to be there 30 years from now.

The only way to get that done is to take the House product, which focuses particularly on entitlement reform, combine it with the Senate product that makes reasonable increases in revenues and starts us on a path on changes in some of our entitlement programs but also puts in place a more reasonable and balanced approach on cuts. The only way we are going to get to that finish line, particularly for those who have advocated for regular order, is to have a conference.

It is with great distress that we heard opposition raised to regular order, an appeal for regular order, an appeal that was made consistently for the past 2½ years. I don't understand why my colleagues on the other side will not take yes for an answer. They asked for us to pass a budget. We passed that budget. I think it is a good first step in the process and I hope in the coming days there will be a change of heart, that the regular order will be allowed to proceed, conferees will be named for both the House and Senate, and that we can reach agreement on this issue that I think is important, not only to the future of our economy but quite honestly now has taken on the metaphor for whether institutions can actually function in the 21st century.

I see my good friend, the Senator from Virginia, who may want to add some comments to this discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the motion of Senator WARNER and his argument for budget compromise and a budget conference that would enable us to find that compromise for the Nation. During my campaign for the Senate I heard this over and over. Every time I would turn on the TV it seemed there would be someone, even a colleague from this body, arguing that the Senate had not passed a budget in 2 years or 3 years or 4 years. That was a point that was repeated over and over. Then, coming into this body, often sitting there in the presider's chair, I have heard that speech delivered from the floor of this body in January and February, often with charts demonstrating the number of days it had been since the Senate passed a budget.

We know as part of the debt ceiling deal a bill was passed, signed by the President so, arguably, even the claim of no Senate budget was inaccurate. But taking that claim at its word, that the Senate had not passed a budget in 4 years, you would think that, having passed a budget, everyone would be excited and would be willing now to move forward to try to find a compromise for the good of the Nation.

Instead, what we have is an abuse of a Senate rule, an individual Senator standing up—even though they had a chance to vote against a budget and to vote on 100 amendments about a budget—they are utilizing and abusing a prerogative to block a budget conference.

For those listening to this who do not understand what a conference is, it is exactly what it sounds like. We passed a budget. The House passed a budget. The next step in normal business would be for the two budgets to be put in a conference and House and Senate Members to sit down and, God forbid, listen to one another and dialog and hopefully find compromise.

That is all we are asking to do, to have a process of listening and compromise. Yet individual Senators are objecting, blocking even the opportunity to have this discussion. In the 4 months I have been in this body we have had two major budgetary issues and I think it is important to point them both out. The first was the issue surrounding the sequester, a designed regimen of nonstrategic, stupid, across-the-board budget cuts that were never supposed to go into place. In late February this body developed a plan that was able to attain more than 50 votes, to turn off the sequester, to avoid the harm to the economy and other key aspects of the military, and to do it and find first year savings. That proposal was able to get more than 50 votes in this body. It had sufficient votes to pass. But the minority chose to invoke the paper filibuster process to block it from passing. They were not required to. Fifty votes is normally enough for something to pass. We could have avoided the filibuster altogether. We could have avoided the sequester altogether and the harmful cuts. Yet the other side decided: We are going to invoke the filibuster to block it from happening. That was the first instance of an abuse of the Senate rules to proceed with normal budgetary order.

Now we are in the second such instance. On March 23, this body passed a budget in accord with normal Senate order, and as we have seen over the past few days, the very group of people who criticize the Senate for not wanting to pass a budget have done everything they can and pulled out every procedural mechanism they can come up with to block the us from coming up with a budget. This is an abuse of rules, and it is directly contrary to the Members' claims—now for years—that they wanted to pass a budget. This is not just a matter of budget nor is it a

matter of numbers on a page. This is hurting our economy.

Everyone in this Chamber will remember that when the American credit rating was downgraded in the summer of 2011—in the aftermath of the discussion about the debt ceiling limitation—the reason cited for the downgrade was not that the mechanics of the deal were bad; instead, our credit was downgraded because of the perception that legislators were engaging in foolish behavior and threatening to repudiate American debt instead of focusing upon their jobs and trying to do the right thing for the economy.

It was legislative gimmickry, not the details of the deal, that caused us to have a bond rating downgrade for the first time in the history of the United States. It hurts the economy when we elevate legislative gimmickry above doing the Nation's business, especially on matters such as the budget.

There are some signs of economic progress these days. The unemployment rate is moving down, the stock market is moving up, the deficit projections going forward are moving down, but we know we have a long way to go. There is more work to be done, and finding a budget deal that addresses the components which Senator WARNER mentioned is one of the factors that can create confidence to additionally accelerate the economy.

A budget deal will provide an additional acceleration to the economy. I have to ask the question: Is that what people are truly worried about? Are they worried about doing the budget deal that will accelerate the economy because it might not work to their particular political advantage? That is the concern I have; otherwise, why wouldn't they be true to the cause they have had for the past few years to actually have a conference and find a deal?

This is not only hurting the economy, this is hurting defense. The hearing I had earlier with Senator KING was the hearing of the Seapower Subcommittee of Armed Services. In that hearing we talked about the effect on the Nation's security and on our defense that is being visited upon us as we are going through budgetary challenges, including the sequester.

We talked about the effect of the sequester on what the witnesses called the platform, the shipbuilding, and the assets we need to keep us safe in a challenging world. We talked about these budget crises and how they hurt our planning. Because instead of planning in a forward-looking way, we are tying up all of our planning time to meet one self-imposed crisis after the next. We talked about the effect on readiness. Because of the sequester, one-third of the air combat command units in this country are standing down at a time when we may well need them today or tomorrow.

Finally, and most important, we talked about the effect of this budgetary uncertainty on our people, whether it is civilians being furloughed, whether it is private sector ship repairers getting warning notices because the ship repairing accounts cannot be done consistent with the sequester. This also affects people who are trying to make a decision about whether they want to make the military a career, and they look at Congress's unwillingness to provide budgetary certainty so they may decide maybe it is not the best thing to do right now.

Whether it is our platform, whether it is our readiness, whether it is our planning or whether it is our people, this sequester and these budgetary challenges and crises are hurting our ability to defend our Nation at the very time when the world is not getting simpler or safer but it is getting more challenging.

Many of my colleagues came from a joint session this morning with the President of South Korea, who is visiting at a time of incredible concern because of Northern Korea's nuclear ambitions that will call upon us, the United States—just as with so many other challenges around the world—to have a well-planned and well-financed defense of the Nation.

I join Senator WARNER in expressing disappointment. We passed this budget. We passed it 46 days ago. We were here until 5 in the morning. We voted on 100 amendments. Everyone had a chance to have their say and have their vote. Guess what. After our conference, they will have a chance to have their say and vote again. They will have a chance to express their opinions.

I urge my colleagues to rethink their position and allow this budget to move into conference so we can do the business of the United States of America.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to thank my budget colleagues who are here with me today. They have spent many hours putting together a budget and coming to the floor with all of the Senate to work on over 100 amendments way into the middle of the night in order to get a budget passed. We are all here ready because we came to the Senate—to this Congress—to solve problems. We decided, as a committee and as a Democratic caucus, it is very important we move forward on a budget.

We want to solve this problem so we can get back to regular order so our country—businesses, communities, and everyone—knows where our priorities are and what path we are on so we can bring some certainty to this country again.

It is so disappointing to me that four times now the Republicans have objected to us now taking the necessary next step, which is to work together with our House colleagues, find a compromise, and move forward. We are working for certainty. It is disappointing to me that those on the other side of the aisle—and we all remember they spent month after month and had chart after chart on the floor telling us we had not passed a budget, we need to go to regular order—are now saying: No. No regular order, no budget, no process, no certainty, no conclusion to this very important problem on which we have all come together to work. This is disturbing for a number of reasons, and my colleagues have talked about it.

We have constituents at home—whether it is a business, a school, delivering Meals On Wheels, planning their military operations for the next year, as well as the agricultural industry—wondering what their plan is for the future. What they are being told—now for the fourth time in a row—by the Republicans in the Senate is: We are not going to give you any certainty. We like to live with uncertainty.

There is no doubt that moving to conference is not going to be easy; solving this problem is not going to be easy. I want our colleagues to know what I have consistently heard from the Democratic side is that we understand the word ''compromise.'' We know that in order to solve this huge problem, we have to come to the table and compromise and listen to the other side.

We cannot do this in the dead of night. We cannot do it with a couple of people sitting in a room. That has been done before, and it doesn't work. We need to have regular order, and we need to have this process out in the open. We need to have the American people hear what the different sides say, and then we are all going to have to take some tough votes.

I can assure the American people that on this side we understand what it means to take tough votes and we understand the word ''compromise'' and the need to get our country back on track.

As the Senator from Virginia said, we need to show the country that democracy can work. We are willing to take that step to make it work, and I urge our Republican colleagues to step forward and allow us to make that move. Do not object to us trying to solve problems because that is what is happening.

I urge our Republican colleagues—and the House as well—to move to conference so we can have a debate and discussion on this deeply urgent matter for our country.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank the chair of our Budget Committee for doing such a terrific job in bringing us all together. I wish to thank my colleagues on the committee. We worked very hard together in order to be able to put together a balanced budget that reflects the values of the American people. It is fair

and balanced in values as well as in numbers, and we did that 46 days ago.

So we passed that 46 days ago after hearing for over 3 years about how the Senate had not passed a budget. By the way, we did pass a law—this is a caveat—called the Budget Control Act which actually had done the same thing as a budget. Those of us who were on the ballot this last time heard that over and over from our opponents.

So I am stunned that we would now be 46 days—and counting—into a situation where we have been trying to take the budget we passed by a majority vote—by the way, this passed on a majority vote. Each one of us ran for election, and we can win by one vote, and that is the majority. Decisions are made by a majority vote.

We went through 110 amendments. We were here all hours of the night. There were a lot of tired faces by the time we got done, but we got it done, and we made the commitment we were going to get a budget done.

The House did a budget—a very different budget, no question about it. There is no question we have a very different vision of the country. The budget in the House eliminates Medicare as an insurance plan. That is certainly not something I or the majority here would support. We rejected that approach, but that was in their budget. They have a right to put forward their vision for how things should be done.

There were many differences in values and perspectives, and that is what the Democratic process is all about. So we passed a budget by a majority and they passed a budget by a majority. The next step is to negotiate and come up with a final budget. That is the next step, and that is how the process works. We have different views, different perspectives, and then we sit down in something called a conference committee.

We cannot get to that next step. We have had 46 days of trying to get to a point to get it done by working with the House, and all we get is objection after objection after objection. I appreciate that colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have voted for similar budgets to the Ryan Republican budget would have preferred if we would have eliminated Medicare. We didn't do that, and we are not going to do that.

The majority here said we are putting forward a budget that is going to move the country forward and address the deficit and reflect the values around education and innovation and outbuilding the competition in a global economy. We are putting forward our vision. The House has their vision, which cuts innovation and cuts education and does not allow us to build.

We have very different visions. The Democracy we have says: We take both of those visions and then we sit down and try to figure something out. That is the next step.

We are not interested in just being on the floor and counting the days, although we will be on the floor and counting the days. That is not how we want to spend our time. We would rather spend our time listening to our colleagues in a respectful way about very different visions and very different values so we can find a way—if we can—to come together. We need to come together so we can tackle the last part of deficit reduction.

We have gone about $2.5 trillion toward the $4 trillion that everyone says we need to do to begin to turn the corner as it relates to the economy and the deficit. In order to get the rest of it, we need to sit down in a room together and figure it out.

We are going to continue to come to the floor and ask for an agreement. Unfortunately, if there is an objection, we have to go through the whole process of trying to get it done. We are going to keep pushing and pushing until we can get a budget done.

Why is this so important? It is very important because in our bill we stop what everyone feels is a very crazy approach to the final step in deficit reduction, which is to have across-the-board—regardless of value, importance or impact—cuts in the investments and in the discretionary budget of our country.

We know there needs to be spending reductions. We have voted for them. We have already put in place about $2.5 trillion in deficit reduction, and right now about 70 percent of that has been in spending reductions.

The concern that I have and that others in the majority have is that most of those have fallen right in the laps of the middle class, our children, the future through innovation, and seniors. We have said in our budget: No more. No more. We have to look at an approach that is balanced and that says to those who are the wealthiest in our country, who are the most blessed economically: You have to be a part of the solution in a significant way.

We want to look at spending under the Tax Code. How many times do we talk about special deals in the Tax Code, things that don't make sense in terms of spending, special deals that support jobs going overseas rather than keeping them here at home. There is spending in the Tax Code that needs to be addressed so it is more fair for American businesses, for small businesses, for families, for the future of the country. Our budget does that by saying we are going to tackle spending in the Tax Code, we are going to tackle the question of fairness in the code and asking those who are the wealthiest among us to contribute a little bit more to be able to help pay down this deficit, not just cutting Meals On Wheels or Head Start or cancer research, which is what is happening right now.

So the intensity we feel about getting this budget done is to be able to stop the things happening now that are very harmful. We saw the lines at the airports. We don't as readily see the lines of people who can no longer participate, such as people I know, in cancer research efforts that may save lives. We know there is incredibly important research going on in science, in medicine, in agriculture, including food safety and pest and disease control and every area of research where our country, the United States of America, has led the world. And that doesn't show up in lines at the airport, but it does show up in the future of our country. It does show up in the lives of someone who has Alzheimer's or Parkinson's disease or breast cancer or other diseases where we are this close to cures, where there is treatment going on that can save lives—is saving lives—and it is stopping.

We don't see the seniors who get Meals On Wheels lining up. They are getting one meal a day right now—one meal a day that allows them a little bit of a visit from a volunteer and one meal a day to eat through Meals On Wheels. Now, because of these irrational cuts, we are told there are waiting lists for one meal a day. How do we have a waiting list for one meal a day? I don't get that.

So we are saying we want to fix the airports; we appreciate that. We want to fix the one meal a day going to somebody's grandma who can't figure out what is going on in terms of the priorities of this country. The children who are getting a head start to be successful in school—how many times do we all say: Education, the most important thing; children, the most important thing. But because they don't directly have a voice here, as do a lot of other special interest groups, who gets cut first? Our budget values children and families, opportunity, innovation, fairness, and the ability to grow this economy, to create jobs so everyone has the dignity of work.

We want to get to conference committee. We want to get about the business of negotiating a final budget because we do not accept what is happening right now without a budget. Tackle the deficit, yes. Do it in a way that works for growth in America and jobs, do it in a way that supports families, that lifts our children, that respects our elders, yes. That is the budget we voted for in the Senate and the budget we want to see come to completion in this process. We can't get there unless we can negotiate, and that is what this whole discussion is about.

It has been 46 days since we passed a budget. We are ready to go. We are more than ready to go. Let's sit down in a room and work it out. We know it is a negotiation. We know we have to have give-and-take. But we are blocked right now from even getting in the room, and that is wrong. We are going to keep coming every day, and we are going to keep counting the days until our colleagues on the other side of the aisle decide they are willing to get in the room and get a budget done that works for the growth and the families of our country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this discussion, this debate isn't about budgets. It is not about deficits. It is about governing. That is the fundamental question that is before this body. It is about governing.

I rise surprised and disappointed. I expected to come here and debate issues. Instead, we are debating debating. We are having to argue and debate about the very act of getting to talk about these issues. And the problem with the economy of this country right now, to my mind, is very largely attributable to the uncertainty about whether the government in Washington is competent. It is the uncertainty that is killing us.

A reporter asked me this last week in Maine: What do you think you can do in Washington to help us create jobs?

My immediate answer was that the most important thing we can do is pass a budget in a kind of rational process, in the normal way it has been done for 200 years, and show the country we can govern. What is in the budget is less important than whether we can do it at all. That is why I am so surprised and disappointed to have come to this impasse where we can't even get to the point of negotiating with the majority about the budget in the other body. It makes me wonder if the Members on the opposite side of the aisle in the Senate lack so much confidence in their colleagues in the House that they don't think they can hold the line on whatever issues they believe are important.

These two budgets are very different, but I think there are items of value in both, and I can see the outlines of a compromise. We need deficit reduction. We need to clean up the Tax Code. We need a tax rate reduction as part of cleaning up the Tax Code. We need to make investments in the future of this country. But the idea that we can't even get to talk—I, frankly, am perplexed. I don't understand what the strategy is because when I was running last year and when I was in Maine just last week, the single question I got more than anything else was, why in the heck can't you people do something down there—only they stated it a little less elegantly than I just did. Why can't you get anything done?

The question that was raised in the hearing this morning was from people in the street: We are having a hard time understanding what is happening and why.

Well, I am a U.S. Senator, and I am having a hard time understanding what is happening and why.

Budgeting is one of the most fundamental obligations of government. I was a Governor. I know about putting budgets together. I know about making choices. It is not easy. It is not going to be easy to make the choices required for this budget. It is going to be very difficult, but that is what we were sent here to do. That is our job. That is our obligation to the American people. I believe there are areas of consensus and there are some areas in the House budget that I think are ideas worth considering.

The American people simply want us to act. Sure, everybody in this body has different views, and they are partisan views, but as somebody who was sent down here explicitly to try to make the place work—I think that was why I was elected as an Independent, because people are so frustrated with this warfare that they don't understand and that doesn't contribute to the welfare of the country.

So I hope, from the point of view of someone who sees values on both sides and believes that the only way we are going to solve these problems is by discussion and, yes, by compromise, that is what we move forward toward. That is what we have to do in order to regain the confidence of the American people.

We have a long way to go, but I believe that if we can move in a regular, orderly way to go to conference, which is what my civics book always told me we are supposed to do next—the House passes a bill, the Senate passes a bill, they have differences, they go to conference, they resolve the differences, both Houses then vote, and it goes to the President. That is the way the system was designed. If we could do that, almost regardless of what the content of the budget is, that in itself would electrify the country. It would be so remarkable, and people would say: Oh, now they are finally doing something.

So I hope my colleagues on the other side will decide to engage, to allow the conference to go forward with Members of both parties who go over to the House and sit down and try to work something out. We all know what the issues are. We all know what the amounts are. We all know what the dollars are.

I believe that people who enter a room in good faith could solve this in about an afternoon if they left their ideological blinders at the door. I believe there are solutions to be had, and we have a responsibility to find them. But today we can't even begin to talk about it, and that is what is so puzzling to the American people. That is what is puzzling to me. I don't understand what is wrong with debating, what is wrong with working on the problem. And to just say: Oh, well, we can't do it; the sequester is going to be with us, and it is going to be with us for another couple of years—I think that doesn't meet our fundamental responsibility as people who came here to govern.

We all know there was something passed last year about no budget, no pay. Well, unfortunately, it only said that if you pass a budget in the House, they get it, and if you pass a budget—well, we have done that. It should have been no budget that finally gets done, no pay, because now we are just stuck at an impasse.

I don't know what the outcome of the negotiations would be. I am not sure I would like them. But I believe the real task before us today is not budgets and deficits. The question before us is, Is this experiment in democracy that is an aberration in world history, is it still working? Are we able to make this idea work in the 21st century and meet the challenges of this country? It seems to me the only way to begin that process is to talk and debate and argue and work through the process the Framers gave us in order to solve the problems of the country.

I hope that before long we will reach a point where all of us can agree in this body that it is time to go to work on trying to bring a budget back to both Houses that we can all support and move this country forward. The act of at least coming up with a solution—not a perfect solution but a solution—would be the most important gift we could provide today to the people of this country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS of Montana, warned that the President's premier domestic legislative accomplishment—ObamaCare—was turning into a huge train wreck. Now, that is pretty remarkable for a number of reasons, one of which is that Senator BAUCUS was one of the principal authors of ObamaCare. So his comments cannot be dismissed as simply partisan rhetoric or politics as usual.

A few days after he made those comments, another important contributor to ObamaCare, Dr. Zeke Emanuel, brother of Rahm Emanuel, the President's former Chief of Staff, acknowledged that the massive uncertainty generated by the health care law is already causing insurance premiums to go up. Here is the scary part: ObamaCare hasn't actually been fully implemented and won't be until next year, 2014. So when it does take effect in 2014, we can expect insurance premiums to continue to rise, particularly for young people who are being asked once again to subsidize their elders, this time in the context of health care premiums.

So much for the President's promise that the average family of four would see a reduction in their insurance premiums under his premier health care law by $2,500. That is right. If people remember, the President said: If you like what you have, you can keep it, which is proving not to be true as employers are going to be shedding the employer-provided coverage and dropping their employees into the exchange. He also said the average family of four would see a reduction in their health care costs of $2,500. Neither one of these is proving to be true.

It gets worse from there. According to a new study, there is a new tax that

was created by ObamaCare on insurance premiums. So we have to pay a tax on our insurance premiums too, which will reduce private sector employment anywhere from 146,000 jobs to 262,000 jobs by the year 2022. And, of course, the majority of those jobs will be in small businesses. It is not surprising, since small businesses are actually the engine of job creation in America, that they will be disproportionately hit.

To make matters worse, ObamaCare's looming employer regulations are already prompting businesses to lay off workers, to reduce their working hours, and transform many full-time jobs into part-time jobs just so they can avoid the penalties and the sanctions in ObamaCare for employers.

Last month alone the number of Americans doing part-time work ''because their hours had been cut back or because they were unable to find a full-time job'' increased by 278,000—more than a quarter million Americans. Indeed, the total number of involuntary part-time workers was higher in April 2013 than it was in April 2012, just a year before.

So the message for President Obama could not be any more obvious: His signature domestic legislative initiative is driving up health care costs, destroying jobs, and damaging our economic recovery. That is why it is so important we repeal this law, which I will grant the President his best intentions but in practice has shown to be the opposite of what he promised in so many different instances.

But the consequences on long-term unemployment are what most people will feel; and that is the story of a very human tragedy for many people, some of whom have just simply given up looking for work. In fact, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has something called the labor participation rate. You can search it on the Internet. Look under ''labor participation rate.'' It will reveal that the percentage of Americans actually in the workforce and looking for work is at a 30-year low.

What that means is some people have simply given up. We all know the longer you are out of work, the harder it is to find a job because your skills have gotten rusty. Others may, in fact, be more qualified to get a job opening if one presents itself.

I cannot imagine the pain and frustration felt by millions of Americans who have been jobless for more than half a year. That is a long time. Unfortunately, the President does not seem to have an answer to this unemployment crisis—and that is exactly what it is—other than more taxes, after he got $620 billion in January as a result of the fiscal cliff negotiations, the expiration of temporary tax provisions. The President seems to believe more spending—even after his failed stimulus of a $1 trillion, which ratcheted up the debt even more—and more regulations is the answer to the unemployment crisis: more taxes, more spending, more regulations.

Since the President has taken office, he has raised taxes by $1.7 trillion already. That includes the $620 billion I just mentioned—but $1.7 trillion. His policies have increased our national debt by $6.2 trillion. He has added another $518 billion worth of costly new regulations on the very people we are depending on to create the jobs and provide employment opportunities. The consequence is the longest period of high unemployment since the Great Depression.

Now for some good news: Tomorrow the President is traveling to Texas, to the city of Austin where my family and I live. According to Forbes magazine, Austin is one of America's 10 Best Cities for Good Jobs. In fact, half of the top 10 Best Cities for Good Jobs in America include Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, and San Antonio. So, yes, I am bragging. But we must be doing something right, and I hope the President goes with an open mind to try to learn what is the cause of the Texas miracle when it comes to job creation and economic growth.

Let me just point out that for 8 consecutive years Texas has been ranked as the best State for business by Chief Executive magazine. That explains why between 2002 and 2011 Texas accounted for almost one-third of all private sector job growth in America—one-third—many of these in high-paying industries. I know we like the claim about being big, but we are only 8 percent of the population, and we accounted for one-third of all of the U.S. private sector job growth between 2002 and 2011.

Now, there is not a secret sauce or a secret formula. It is pretty clear why we have enjoyed that sort of job growth in America, and it is something I think the rest of the country could learn. It is low taxes on the very people we are depending upon to create jobs; it is limited government; it is the belief in the free enterprise system as the best pathway to achieve the American dream; and it is sensible regulations.

We also believe in taking advantage of the abundant natural resources we have in our State and using those resources to expand the domestic energy supply, to bring down costs for consumers, and to create jobs in the process.

I was recently in the Permian Basin—that is the Midland-Odessa region, as the Presiding Officer knows. This is an area that since 1920 has been one of the most prolific energy-producing regions of our State and the country. But because of new drilling technology—horizontal drilling and fracking—it is anticipated that from this point forward that region will produce as much as it has since 1920. That is amazing. That is something we ought to be very excited about, and it has created a lot of jobs.

The nominal unemployment rate in the Permian Basin is about 3.2 percent. But employers will tell you they are hiring everybody they can get their hands on. Some of these folks have had problems in the past that might otherwise disqualify them for work, but as one employer told me: There is nothing like a job to provide an opportunity for people to rehabilitate themselves and get themselves on the right track.

Well, President Obama's policies, in contrast to what we are seeing in Texas, seem to send the message that only Washington knows how to revive our economy, and by raising taxes and spending more money we do not have to boot. In other words, with all due respect to my colleagues from the west coast, he favors the California model. Unfortunately, that model has not worked too well for even our friends in California, and it will not work well for the rest of America either.

By comparison, in that laboratory of democracy known as the State of Texas, our State has become a powerhouse for job creation, and it would go a long way to restoring the fiscal and economic health of the United States. Yes it would help those people who have been unemployed for 6 months or more, or even a shorter period of time, find work that will help them regain their sense of dignity and productivity and allow them to provide for their families, which is a goal I know we all share.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS PEREZ

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on another matter—but it is an important matter—I want to share a few words and a few observations about the President's nominee to be the Secretary of the Department of Labor, who is currently serving in the Justice Department. I am talking about Assistant Attorney General Thomas Perez.

Of course, we know the Department of Labor plays a very significant role in our economic policy and even U.S. immigration policy, which is a very controversial topic that we are just getting to take up tomorrow in the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member.

During his tenure at the Justice Department, Mr. Perez has been in charge of the Civil Rights Division, which includes the Voting Section—obviously, a very important responsibility, but one that ought to eschew politics. Unfortunately, under his watch as head of the Civil Rights Division and Voting Section, that section has compiled a disturbing record of political discrimination and selective enforcement of our laws—something antithetical to what we consider to be one of the best things we have going for us in America, which is the rule of law: that all of us, no matter who we are, are subject to the same rules and play by those rules.

You do not have to take my word for it—how the Voting Section and the Civil Rights Division have gotten dangerously off track under Mr. Perez's leadership. The Department of Justice inspector general published a 258-page report that said the Voting Section

under Mr. Perez's leadership had become so politicized and so unprofessional that at times it became simply dysfunctional, it could not function properly.

This 258-page report by the Department of Justice inspector general cited ''deep ideological polarization,'' which began under his predecessors and which has continued under Mr. Perez's leadership. The inspector general said this polarization ''has at times been a significant impediment to the operation of the Section and has exacerbated the potential appearance of politicized decision-making.''

This is at the Department of Justice. So instead of upholding and enforcing all laws equally, the Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division—the Voting Section—under Mr. Perez, has launched politically motivated campaigns against commonsense constitutional laws, such as the voter ID laws adopted by the States of Texas and South Carolina.

In addition, he delivered misleading testimony to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights back in 2010. The inspector general said Mr. Perez's testimony about a prominent voting rights case ''did not reflect the entire story regarding the involvement of political appointees.'' So when you are not telling the whole truth, you are not telling the truth.

Before joining the Department of Justice—and this is part of his unfortunate track record—he served as a local official in Montgomery County, MD. During those years, he consistently opposed the proper enforcement of our immigration laws. In fact, Mr. Perez testified against enforcement measures that were being considered by the Maryland State Legislature.

I would ask my colleagues, because we have an important function to play under our constitutional system, one of advice and consent—that is the confirmation process for Presidential nominees—is this really the type of person we want running the Department of Labor, especially at a time when Congress is contemplating passage of important immigration reform laws?

Given his record, I am concerned Mr. Perez does not have the temperament or the competence we need in our Secretary of the Department of Labor. I fear that, just like he has at the Department of Justice, he would invariably politicize the Department of Labor and impose ideological litmus tests. For all these reasons, and more, I will oppose his nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS PEREZ

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to express my deep disappointment that once again Republican obstructionism and procedural tricks are preventing this body from carrying out its constitutional duty and responsibility, its obligation to consider important Presidential nominations.

This time the target is Mr. Tom Perez, the President's extremely qualified nominee to be Secretary of Labor.

The HELP Committee, which I chair, was scheduled to vote on his nomination at 4 o'clock this afternoon. Obviously, we are not doing that. An anonymous Republican has invoked an obscure procedural rule to prevent our committee from meeting at that scheduled time. This pointless obstructionism is extremely disturbing.

I would like to point out that we had previously been scheduled to vote on his nomination in my committee 2 weeks ago. In an effort to bend over backwards and to be accommodating to our colleagues who requested more time to consider documents related to the nomination, I deferred it for 2 weeks as sort of senatorial courtesy.

This time there is no allegation that they have had insufficient time for consideration, just delay for delay's sake on the nomination. Tom Perez has been before our committee since March. We have had our hearing, during which Mr. Perez fully answered all questions posed to him. I cut off no one. I allowed anyone to ask whatever questions they wanted.

Mr. Perez has met with any interested Senator personally and answered over 200 written questions for the record. It is an understatement to say his nomination has been thoroughly vetted. This continuing delay is unconscionable and only hurts the American workers and businesses that rely on the Department of Labor each and every day.

As our country continues to move down the road to economic recovery, the work of the Department of Labor is becoming even more vital to the lives of our working families. Whether it is making sure workers get paid the wages they deserve, helping returning veterans reenter the workforce, protecting our seniors' retirement nest eggs, ensuring that a new mother can care for her baby without losing her job, the Department of Labor helps families build the cornerstones of a middle-class life.

Now more than ever we need strong leadership at the Department to help strengthen our fragile recovery and build a stronger and revitalized American middle class. That is why this nomination is so important.

There has been a lot of public discussion about Mr. Perez but remarkably little of it has focused on what should be the central question before our committee today: Will Tom Perez be a good Secretary of Labor. The answer is unequivocally yes. Without question, he has the knowledge and experience needed to guide this critically important agency.

Through his professional experiences, and especially his work as Secretary of the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, he has developed strong policy expertise about the many important issues for American workers and businesses that come before the Department of Labor every day. He spearheaded major initiatives on potentially controversial issues, such as unemployment insurance reform and worker misclassification, while finding common ground between workers and businesses to build sensible, commonsense solutions.

He also clearly has the management skills to run a large Federal agency effectively. He was also an effective manager and a responsible steward of public resources, undertaking significant administrative and organizational reforms that made the Maryland DLLR more efficient and more effective.

His outstanding work in Maryland has won him the support of the business community and worker advocates alike. To quote from the endorsement letter of the Maryland Chamber of Commerce:

> Mr. Perez proved himself to be a pragmatic public official who was willing to bring differing voices together. The Maryland Chamber had the opportunity to work with Mr. Perez on an array of issues of importance to employers in Maryland, from unemployment and workforce development to the housing and foreclosure crisis. Despite differences of opinion, Mr. Perez was always willing to allow all parties to be heard, and we found him to be fair and collaborative. I believe that our experiences with him here in Maryland bode well for the nation. That is a pretty strong endorsement by a chamber of commerce for a nominee whom the minority leader today on the floor characterized as a ''crusading ideologue . . . willing to do or say anything to achieve his ideological ends.'' That is how he was characterized by the Republican leader today, but the Maryland Chamber of Commerce didn't seem to think so. So that grossly unfair characterization by the Republican leader is manifestly inconsistent with the experiences of the Republican leaders and businesses that have actually worked with Tom Perez.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters from businesses and Republican leaders demonstrating the strong bipartisan support for Mr. Perez's nomination. These people clearly disagree with the Republican leader's assessment of Mr. Perez's qualifications and character.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 19, 2013.

JOINT STATEMENT FROM STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL IN SUPPORT OF NOMINATION OF TOM PEREZ AS SECRETARY OF U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

''Tom Perez is a brilliant lawyer and leader, who listens thoughtfully to all sides and

works collaboratively to solve problems. He has dedicated his career to serving the public, and his experience as Secretary of the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation and in the U.S. Department of Justice make him ideally suited to serve as the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor.

''As state Attorneys General, we have found Perez to be open, responsive and fundamentally fair. He is committed to justice and the rule of law and able to work across party and philosophical lines to achieve just results.

''The U.S. Department of Labor and the country will be well served by a leader who understands the need to forge partnerships with state and local officials and who values cooperation to bring about successful results for both employers and employees.''

''The following Attorneys General issued this joint statement in support of Perez's nomination:

''California Attorney General Kamala Harris, Delaware Attorney General Beau Biden, Illinois Attorney General Lisa Madigan, Iowa Attorney General Tom Miller, Mississippi Attorney General Jim Hood, North Carolina Roy Cooper, Oregon Attorney General Ellen Rosenblum, Tennessee Attorney General Robert Cooper, Jr., Former Utah Attorney General Mark Shurtleff and Former Washington Attorney General Rob McKenna.

MARCH 15, 2013.

Hon. BARACK OBAMA,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: The Maryland Chamber of Commerce supports the nomination of Thomas E. Perez to serve as the United States Secretary of Labor.

During his tenure as Secretary of Maryland's Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, Mr. Perez oversaw a wide range of regulatory programs of critical importance to the state's business community, including unemployment insurance, the regulation of financial institutions, worker safety and professional licensing.

Mr. Perez proved himself to be a pragmatic public official who was willing to bring differing voices together. The Maryland Chamber had the opportunity to work with Mr. Perez on an array of issues of importance to employers in Maryland, from unemployment and workforce development to the housing and foreclosure crisis.

Despite differences of opinion, Mr. Perez was always willing to allow all parties to be heard and we found him to be fair and collaborative. I believe that our experiences with him here in Maryland bode well for the nation.

The Maryland Chamber of Commerce is Maryland's leading statewide business advocacy organization. Our 800 member companies employ more than 442,000 people in the state. The Chamber works to support its members and advance the State of Maryland as a national and global competitive leader in economic growth and private sector job creation through its effective advocacy, high level networking and timely communications.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN T. SNYDER,
CCE, President/CEO,
Maryland Chamber of Commerce.

GREATER PRINCE GEORGE'S
BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE,
Bowie, MD, March 18, 2013.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: Tom Perez is one of the most honest and dedicated public officials that we in the Prince George's County business community have ever worked with. His understanding that government must work in partnership with business to find solutions that succeed in today's marketplace highlights his continual accessibility and his empathic approach to working with job creators nationwide.

We applaud the President's nomination of Tom Perez as Secretary of Labor because we have experienced, first hand, the fruits of Tom's open door policy and his steady approach to finding solutions that work for the benefit of all.

Sincerely,

M.H. JIM ESTEPP,
President/CEO.

THE MARYLAND MINORITY
CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Baltimore, MD, March 21, 2013.

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House, Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA, The Maryland Minority Contractors Association applauds the nomination of Tom Perez as the United States Secretary of Labor, and encourages a quick confirmation. While serving as Maryland's labor secretary, Tom proved to be fair-minded, and always had an open door.

The Maryland Minority Contractors Association is composed primarily of merit shops, so our member companies have employees that are not under union collective bargaining agreements. We found ourselves at the table with Tom on a range of issues, from workplace safety to apprenticeships to the proper classification of employees. Although our perspectives often differed, we always had a seat at the table, and I can confidently say that our perspective was always taken into consideration. Tom pursues his role of protecting workers with vigor, but he always took the concerns of our members seriously, and, when presented with sound arguments, was willing to compromise.

We strongly support the nomination of Tom Perez, and we believe that he will make an excellent Secretary of Labor. He is a smart, honest person who will serve our county well.

PLESS JONES,
President, Maryland Minority Contractors.

WHITEMAN OSTERMAN
& HANNA LLP,
Albany, NY, April 15, 2013.

Re Thomas Perez, Nominee for
Secretary of Labor.

Sen. THOMAS HARKIN (D–IA),
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Sen. LAMAR ALEXANDER (R–TN),
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS HARKIN AND ALEXANDER: I write as an appointee by former President George H.W. Bush to the United States Department of Justice in support of Thomas Perez who has been nominated by President Obama to serve as Secretary of Labor and urge your favorable consideration of his candidacy.

As the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights (1990–1993), I worked directly with Tom (in fact, I hired him in 1990) on a variety of sensitive matters, including criminal and voting rights issues. During a number of face-to-face meetings, I had the opportunity both to review his legal-based memoranda and to engage in a number of intense debates as to what should be the Division's final course of action. As a result of those experiences, I found Tom to be an excellent lawyer, a dedicated public servant with a deep commitment to the common good, and a person of legal and moral integrity; qualities that enable him to recognize the value of contending parties' positions in order to achieve workable solutions.

I believe that he will bring those skills and strong personal qualities to the duties of the Secretary of Labor and enable him to perform in a manner worthy of your trust.

Thank you for listening to my support for this very special and patriotic man.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN R. DUNNE.

Mr. HARKIN. Indeed, I think Mr. Perez's character—his character—is exactly what qualifies him for this job—his character.

Tom Perez has dedicated his life to making sure every American has a fair opportunity to pursue the American dream. At the Maryland Department of Labor, he revamped the State's adult education system so more people could successfully train for better jobs and brighter futures. As the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights at the U.S. Department of Justice, where he is right now, he has been a voice for the most vulnerable, and he has reinvigorated the enforcement of some of our most critical civil rights laws. He has helped more Americans achieve the dream of home ownership through his unprecedented efforts to prevent residential lending discrimination. He has helped to ensure that people with disabilities have the choice to live in their own homes and communities rather than only in institutional settings and to make sure people with disabilities receive the support and services they need to make independent living possible. He has stepped up the Department's efforts to protect the employment rights of servicemembers so our men and women in uniform can return to their jobs and support their families after serving their country.

I can tell you that Tom Perez is passionate about these issues. He is passionate about justice and about fairness, and I believe these are qualities that Tom Perez learned at the hand of his former employer here in the Senate, our former committee chairman of the HELP Committee, Senator Ted Kennedy. But, as he explained in his confirmation hearing, he also learned from Senator Kennedy ''that idealism and pragmatism are not mutually exclusive.'' Mr. Perez knows how to bring people together to make progress on even controversial issues without burning bridges or making enemies. He knows how to hit the ground running and quickly and effectively become an agent of real change. That is exactly the kind of leadership we need at the Department of Labor. We need his vision, we need his passion, and we need, yes, his character at the helm of this important agency.

Allow me to state very clearly that while I know there has been generated controversy—not real controversy but generated controversy—surrounding Mr. Perez's nomination, there is absolutely nothing that calls into question his ability to fairly enforce the law as it is written. There is absolutely nothing that calls into question his professional integrity or his moral character or his ability to lead the Department of Labor.

As I mentioned, Mr. Perez has been as open and aboveboard as he could possibly be throughout this entire confirmation process. He has met with any Member personally who requested a meeting. As I said, he appeared before our committee in a public hearing. He has answered more than 200 written questions. He has bent over backward to respond to any and all concerns raised about his work at the Department of Justice.

This administration—President Obama—has also been extraordinarily accommodating to any Republican colleague, especially to their concerns about Mr. Perez's involvement in the global resolution of two cases involving the city of St. Paul, MN—Magner v. St. Paul and Newell v. St. Paul. The administration has produced thousands of documents concerning these two cases. They have arranged for the interview of government employees. They have facilitated almost unprecedented levels of disclosure to alleviate any concern about his involvement in these cases.

As chairman of the committee, I have also tried to be as accommodating as possible, joining in requests for documents that I, quite frankly, thought were unnecessary but willing to acquire and postponing the executive session for 2 weeks to provide Members additional time for consideration.

All this extensive process has revealed is that Mr. Perez acted at all times ethically and appropriately to advance the interests of the U.S. Government. For example, with respect to the Magner and Newell matters, Mr. Perez consulted with both outside ethics and professional responsibility experts at the Department of Justice, and Mr. Perez acted within their guidelines at all times. It is no surprise that outside ethics experts have confirmed that Mr. Perez acted appropriately in these matters.

I would like to submit again for the RECORD letters and statements from several legal ethics experts and experts in the False Claims Act confirming that Mr. Perez's handling of the Magner and Newell cases was both ethical and appropriate. And I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these letters.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN GILLERS, ELIHU ROOT PROFESSOR OF LAW, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, MAY 6, 2013

The Joint Staff Report makes many assertions and contains many factual allegations, which may or may not be contested. However, only one issue is described as ethical. It is this issue that the Democratic Staff memo mainly addresses. Stated most favorably from the Joint Staff perspective, the issue is:

''Assuming that Assistant Attorney General Tomas E. Perez (Civil Rights Division) was mainly responsible for reaching the agreement with the City of St. Paul described below—even assuming that the agreement would not have happened without his intervention—but assuming, too, that Assistant Attorney General Tony West (Civil Division), who had ultimate authority to decide whether or not to intervene in Newell and Ellis, chose not to do so after considering their merits, the United States interest in preserving the disparate impact test under the Fair Housing Act, and the U.S. interest in ensuring (so far as possible) that a Supreme Court ruling on the proper test be based on favorable facts, did Perez violate any rule of professional conduct (ethics rule) governing him as a lawyer by encouraging others at DOJ or HUD (or elsewhere) to refrain from intervention in Newell and Ellis in exchange for St. Paul's agreement to withdraw the Magner appeal?''

The Joint Staff Report argues that linking the two cases—withdrawal of the Magner appeal and U.S. non-intervention in the two Qui Tam actions, Newell and Ellis (hereafter Newell)—was unethical. However, it cites no professional conduct rule, no court decision, no bar ethics opinion, and no secondary authority that supports this argument. In fact, no authority supports it.

The duty of lawyers for the United States is no different from the duty of lawyers generally, namely to pursue the goals of their client within the bounds of law and ethics. Clients generally identify those goals, but when the client is the government, its lawyers often do so, sometimes in conjunction with agencies, elected officials, or other representatives of the government who are authorized to speak for the client.

The United States had interests in Magner and also in Newell. Qui Tam actions are brought to vindicate interests of the sovereign, here the U.S. The U.S. interest was to recover money assuming, of course, that Newell had merit. The U.S. interest in Magner was to avoid Supreme Court review of a legal issue in Magner, whose facts were seen as unfavorable to a decision that would sustain a disparate impact test for violations of the Fair Housing Act. Perez believed that preserving the disparate impact test was important to his client and more important than intervention in Newell.

I assume that Perez persuaded others with decision-making authority, and in particular West, that withdrawing the Magner appeal was more important to U.S. interests than intervention in Newell. I also assume, though it is contested, that Newell was meritorious and that but for the agreement with St. Paul, the United States would have intervened in Newell and perhaps prevailed.

Of course, it is legitimate to argue that Perez, West, and others made the wrong choice and that pursuing Newell was more important to U.S. interests than how the Supreme Court would ultimately resolve the issue in Magner. I have no view on that question. It is not an ethical question. The question I can answer is whether Perez could ethically make the decision he did and which he encouraged others to accept. Could he ethically decide, when faced with a situation where only one of two possible choices could be made, and where each choice offered a benefit to his client, to choose option A over option B?

The answer is unequivocally yes. Perez was not choosing to advantage one client over another client. There was no conflict here between the interests of two clients because there was only one client. That client, we are assuming, had two interests—withdrawal of Magner or intervention in Newell—but under the circumstances, it could pursue only one. Perez made a choice between these options and encouraged others to agree. His conduct violates no ethical rule that governs lawyers. He was acting in what he believed to be the best interests of his client, which is what lawyers are required to do.

THE VERNIA LAW FIRM,
Washington DC, May 6, 2013.

Re Declination by the United States Department of Justice in *United States* ex rel. *Newell* v. *City of St. Paul*, Civil No. 09–SC–001177 (D.Minn.).

Hon. Representative JIM JORDAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Job Creation & Regulatory Affairs Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. Representative MATT CARTWRIGHT
Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Job Creation & Regulatory Affairs, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. Representative TRENT FRANKS
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. Representative JERROLD NADLER
Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MESSRS. JORDAN, CARTWRIGHT, FRANKS, AND NADLER:

I am writing in advance of the Committee's May 7, 2013 hearing regarding the Department of Justice's declination of the False Claims Act *qui tam* cases, *United States* ex rel. *Newell* v. *City of St. Paul, Minnesota*, Civil No. 09–SC–001177 (D.Minn.), and *United States* ex rel. *Ellis* v. *City of St. Paul*, Civil No. 11CV–0416 (D.Minn.), to provide my comments on certain of the conclusions reached in the Joint Staff Report, *DOJ's Quid Pro Quo with St. Paul: How Assistant Attorney General Thomas Perez Manipulated Justice and Ignored the Rule of Law* (April 15, 2013). I appreciate the opportunity to address the Committee.

For most of my twenty years practicing law, I have handled investigations and cases brought under the False Claims Act, 31 §U.S.C. §§3729, *et seq*. Early in my career, I served for eight years as a Trial Attorney in the Fraud Section of the Commercial Litigation Branch of the Department of Justice's Civil Division. In that capacity, I handled dozens of False Claims Act cases involving numerous federal agencies, including the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). I left the Fraud Section to be a prosecutor in the Criminal Division where, in 2005 I received a John Marshall Award from the Department of Justice, and the National Exploited Children's Award from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

That same year, I joined Covington & Burling LLP, initially focusing on the defense of False Claims Act investigations and suits. I started my own firm in 2009, in part to have the flexibility of representing whistleblower clients as well as defendants. I have filed numerous *qui tam* suits, and I am now litigating some of those, including a major case against a long-term care pharmacy for prescriptions reimbursed by Medicare Part D. In addition to my work on these cases, I have made presentations on the False Claims Act and related statutes, and I write the best-read legal blog on the topic, www.falseclaimscounsei.com.

I have had no professional involvement in the *Newell* or *Ellis* cases, and have not spoken about them with any of the persons described in the Joint Staff Report. I have, however, reviewed that Report, its attached documents, the Democratic Staff's Report on the same topic (April 14, 2013), and certain of the documents publicly available on the District Court for the District of Minnesota's PACER website.

As one of the few attorneys in private practice with significant Department of Justice experience who represents both defendants and whistleblowers, I read these documents with great interest. With all due respect to the Joint Staff, however, I feel compelled to write to take issue with certain of their factual conclusions. I will limit my comments to those that I feel are critical to assessing the conduct of Department of Justice officials involved in these cases.

MERITS OF THE NEWELL CASE

Because the documents do not treat the *Ellis* case as a significant factor in the Department's decision-making, I have not undertaken to analyze the merits of that matter. Let me also preface my remarks by stating that I do not intend this letter to disparage Mr. Newell or his counsel. The Department of Justice appears to have largely corroborated his allegations and his *qui tam* complaint is well-drafted.

I disagree, however, with the Joint Staff's conclusion that ''The Department of Justice Sacrificed a Strong Case Alleging a Particularly Egregious Example of Fraud.'' *See* Joint Staff Report at 37. Instead, I believe that the documents evidence significant bases for skepticism by Department of Justice officials.

The Joint Staff's conclusion rests in large part on its rejection of statements by Department of Justice supervisors that whether or not to intervene in *Newell* was a ''close call,'' and its reliance instead on earlier positions in support of intervention taken by the trial attorney and others assigned to the case. But the draft memorandum urging intervention acknowledges several significant potential problems with the case—problems that clearly rebut the conclusion that the case was a ''strong'' one, as the Joint Staff asserts.

Newell's most prominent weakness was the potential difficulty in proving that St. Paul's noncompliance with Section 3 was material to the decision of HUD to make grant payments. The trial attorney handling the case candidly admitted that there was litigation risk regarding materiality:

''The City will argue that even if HUD did not say it explicitly, HUD's silence over many years is tacit approval. We will have to admit that the City was failing to comply with Section 3 in ways that should have been apparent to HUD. The City did not send its HUD 60002 forms each year. HUD never objected to this failure. The City will argue that HUD was so unconcerned with Section 3 compliance that the City's failure to comply did not affect, or could not have affected HUD's decision to pay.

''The City will argue that HUD's failure to monitor its Section 3 compliance was consistent with HUD's general lack of oversight of Section 3 during the relevant period. The city has already noted that previous federal administrations were not concerned with Section 3 (a position with support in recent HUD comments), and that it is unfair to require a City to make boilerplate certification each year, ignore the City's non-compliance year-after-year, and then seek FCA relief when a new administration comes in that is more concerned with compliance with Section 3.

Draft Intervention Memo at 7. Although the trial attorney was optimistic that these arguments could be overcome, there can be no doubt that significant concerns about proving materiality of the City's noncompliance were evident long before the alleged *quid pro quo*.

RELIABILITY OF THE DRAFT INTERVENTION MEMORANDUM'S DAMAGES CALCULATION

I also respectfully disagree with the Joint Staff's assertion that the Department of Justice's decision to intervene in the case cost taxpayers a significant opportunity to recover over $200 million. *See* Joint Staff Report at 61. This, too, significantly overstates the strength of *Newell*.

The draft intervention memo very briefly describes only one damages theory, which the trial attorney characterizes as ''aggressive'': that the damages under the False Claims Act were the entire amount of the Section 3 construction project grants (which was some unknown fraction of the overall $86 million in HUD grants). That ''aggressive'' theory is an unsettled area of law, however, and the Joint Staff's reliance on it in calculating the cost to taxpayers of declining to intervene in the suit is dubious.

For much of the False Claims Act's 150–year history, computing damages was relatively straightforward: the fact-finder calculated the difference between what the Government actually paid and the value of the goods or services it received. *See United States* v. *Bornstein*, 423 U.S. 303, 316 n. 13 (1976). When a third-party, and not the Government is the intended recipient of the tangible benefit from the outlay of federal funds, this approach arguably breaks down. The traditional ''benefit-of-the-bargain'' approach is strained further when the false claim relates not to quality of the goods or services received by the third-party, but to the fund recipient's satisfaction of some other condition intended to benefit society more generally. The *Newell* case falls into this category: the city receives Section 3 funds to improve housing, and allegedly false claims relate to its compliance with a condition unrelated to the quality of that work.

The Courts have struggled with these issues, and four Courts of Appeals—for the Second, Fifth, Seventh, and Ninth Circuits—have chosen to follow the ''aggressive'' approach the trial attorney described. The District of Columbia and Third Circuits instead continue to employ the ''benefit-of-the-bargain'' approach, which might result in a very low damages calculation in a case such as *Newell*. I am not aware of any controlling precedent on this issue in the Eighth Circuit, in whose jurisdiction *Newell* was filed.

Given the unsettled nature of this area and the imprecision in the Draft Intervention Memorandum's damages figure, $86 million represented only a *theoretical* upper limit on the Government's damages for St. Paul's alleged violations. The Department of Justice trial attorney acknowledged the limitations of this approach, writing in the Draft Intervention Memorandum: ''We acknowledge this is an aggressive position, and that some less aggressive approach may be needed for trial. To date, however, we have not yet determined an alternative approach.'' *Id.* at 5.

Even if the Department of Justice had intervened and secured a judgment against the City on False Claims Act liability, moreover, there is a significant risk that the District Court or the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit would, under the facts of this case (including HUD's apparent disregard of Section 3 enforcement, and the defendant's status as a taxpayer-funded entity) reject the ''aggressive'' approach of seeking to recoup all Section 3 grants. Such a decision would hinder the Government and relators in future False Claims Act cases in the Eighth Circuit's jurisdiction.

THE RISK OF NEWELL'S DISMISSAL ON PUBLIC DISCLOSURE GROUNDS

The Joint Staff Report also criticizes the Department's declination on the grounds that it exposed Mr. Newell to dismissal of his *qui tam* suit on grounds that the Court lacked jurisdiction under the False Claims Act's public disclosure bar. *See* Joint Staff Report at 58; 31 U.S.C. § 3730(e)(4)(A) (2010). I respectfully disagree with the premise of this criticism, which is that the Department of Justice does, or should, evaluate the potential success of a motion to dismiss on public disclosure grounds.

In my experience, both at the Department and in private practice, the Government does not typically investigate the common grounds on which declined qui tam suits founder: public disclosure and particularity under Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b). Although I, as a whistleblower attorney, would prefer that the Department investigate these possible grounds for dismissal prior to deciding whether to decline or intervene a case, there are sound reasons for not doing so: the Department of Justice has inadequate resources to investigate the merits of the fraud allegations; routinely investigating the public disclosures that might lead to the dismissal of a declined *qui tam* would ultimately detract from the Department's ability to carry out the False Claims Act's core mission of detecting and remedying fraud.

Certainly no one has done more than Senator Grassley to encourage whistleblowers to assist the Government in uprooting fraud. The recent amendment to the public disclosure bar demonstrates well his interest in improving enforcement of the Act. I nevertheless believe that Congress could best improve whistleblowers' involvement in fraud enforcement by addressing more significant problems besetting them (such as the application of Fed. R. Civ, P. 9(b) to False Claims Act complaints, which is by far the most common grounds for dismissal of declined *qui tam* cases).

In conclusion, after reviewing the publicly available materials on the Department of Justice's decision to decline to intervene in *United States* ex rel. *Newell* v. *City of St. Paul*, I believe that Department officials acted well within the scope of their discretion in declining to intervene in that case. I must respectfully disagree with the contrary conclusions the Joint Staff reached in its Report. I appreciate your consideration.

Truly yours,

BENJAMIN J. VERNIA.

COHEN MILSTEIN
SELLERS & TOLL PLLC,
Philadelphia, PA, May 6, 2013.

The Hon. JIM JORDAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Job Creation & Regulatory Affairs Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

The Hon. MATT CARTWRIGHT,
Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Job Creation & Regulatory Affairs, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

The Hon. TRENT FRANKS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

The Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN JORDAN AND FRANKS AND RANKING MEMBERS CARTWRIGHT AND NADLER: The undersigned are partners and co-chairs of the Whistleblower/False Claims Act Practice Group at Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll, PLLC. For over ten years, we have assiduously represented whistleblowers in legal actions brought pursuant the federal False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§3729, *et seq.*, and its state counterparts in federal and state courts throughout the country. We regularly engage in the evaluation of the viability of

potential claims under those statutes and work with relators to combat fraud against the government. We have been asked by committee staff to offer our opinion regarding the effect of the Department of Justice's decision to decline to intervene in the *qui tam* cases of *United States* ex rel. *Newell* v. *City of St. Paul* and *United States* ex rel. *Ellis* v. *City of Minneapolis, et al.* What follows is that opinion.

On May 19, 2009, Relator Frederick Newell filed his *qui tam* action under the federal False Claims Act against the City of St. Paul in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota. On February 9, 2012, the Department of Justice advised the court that it declined to intervene in the case. On March 12, 2012, Mr. Newell filed an amended complaint in response to which the City of St. Paul filed a motion to dismiss based, in part, on the Public Disclosure Bar.

At the time that Mr. Newell filed his initial complaint in his action, the False Claims Act provided a jurisdictional bar to a relator's *qui tam* action commonly referred to as the Public Disclosure Bar. Subsequently amended and rendered a non-jurisdictional basis for dismissal in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010, this section, 31 U.S.C. §3730(e)(4), provided as follows:

''(A) No court shall have jurisdiction over an action under this section based upon the public disclosure of allegations or transactions in a criminal, civil, or administrative hearing, in a congressional, administrative, or Government Accounting Office report, hearing, audit, or investigation, or from the news media, unless the Attorney General or the person bringing the action is an original source of the information.

'''(B) For purposes of this paragraph, 'original source' means an individual who has direct and independent knowledge of the information on which the allegations are based and has voluntarily provided the information to the Government before filing an action under this section which is based on the information.''

On July 20, 2012, the court granted St. Paul's motion to dismiss, finding that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over Mr. Newell's action because of manifold public disclosures of his allegations predating the filing of his complaint and because he was not an original source of the information on which the allegations were based. Mr. Newell has appealed the dismissal of his case and his appeal is currently pending before the United States Court of Appeals for the 8th Circuit.

On February 18, 2011, Relators Andrew Ellis, Harriet Ellis and Michael Blodgett filed their *qui tam* action under the federal False Claims Act against, among others, the Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota. On June 18, 2012, the Department of Justice filed a Notice of Election to Decline Intervention. The defendants in that case subsequently filed motions to dismiss the Relators' complaints, which the court denied without prejudice. That case remains pending as of the date of this letter.

The effect of the government's decision not to intervene in these two *qui tam* cases is central to the issues presently being considered by your subcommittees. Indeed, it is important to understand that, contrary to conclusory statements set forth in the Congressional Committees' Joint Staff Report of April 15, 2013, the decision by the Department of Justice not to intervene in Mr. Newell's case did not allow the City of St. Paul to move for dismissal of the case ''on grounds that would have otherwise been unavailable if the Department had intervened.'' (Joint Staff Report, p. 58). In fact, the same motion would have been available to the City whether or not the government had intervened in the case. In *Rockwell Intl. Corp.* v. *United States ex rel. Stone*, 549 U.S. 457 (2007), the United States Supreme Court rejected the argument that government intervention provides jurisdiction to a Relator who is not an original source. Even had the government intervened, Mr. Newell would have been vulnerable to the exact same public disclosure jurisdictional bar.

Likewise, in declining to intervene in Mr. Newell's *qui tam* action, the Department of Justice did not ''give up the opportunity to recover as much as $200 million.'' (Joint Staff Report, p. 4). A declination of intervention has never been recognized by any court as tantamount to the termination of the government's right to pursue the claim asserted in the action. In fact, the federal False Claims Act specifically provides that if the government initially elects not to proceed with the action, it may intervene at a later date upon a showing of good cause. 31 U.S.C. §3730(c)(3). The government can decline to intervene in one action and, after that complaint is dismissed, decide to intervene in a subsequently filed action. Or the government can institute and pursue its own action under the False Claims Act. Moreover, the dismissal of Mr. Newell's complaint does not affect the government's ability to pursue the same claims itself. Thus, in declining to intervene in the Newell and Ellis actions, the government is not foreclosed from pursuing the claims that Mr. Newell could no longer himself pursue or to intervene at a later date in the Ellis action, nor is it foreclosed from pursuing remedies that might be available under any other statutory or regulatory provisions. In fact, in declining to intervene in these actions, it ''gave up'' no rights or opportunities whatsoever.

We trust that the foregoing sheds light on the effect of the government's decision not to intervene in the Newell and Ellis *qui tam* actions and that this letter is helpful to the work of your committees.

Respectfully submitted,

GARY L. AZORSKY.
JEANNE A. MARKEY.

Mr. HARKIN. As Professor Stephen Gillers, who has taught legal ethics for more than 30 years at New York University School of Law, wrote in one of these letters, Mr. Perez's actions in these cases ''violate[d] no ethical rule that governs lawyers. He was acting in what he believed to be the best interests of his client, which is what lawyers are required to do.''

In short, Mr. Perez did his job at DOJ, and he did it well. When it comes down to it, I think the fact that he did his job well is probably the source of much of the generated controversy surrounding his nomination. Maybe some people just don't like Tom Perez precisely because he is passionate about enforcing our civil rights laws and has vigorously pursued such enforcement in his current position.

I take great issue with the minority leader's suggestion today that Mr. Perez doesn't follow the law or believe that it applies to him. I would respectfully suggest that the Republican leader needs to check his facts. To the contrary, Tom Perez has had a remarkable career as a result of a determination to make the promise of our civil rights statutes a reality for everyday Americans. Maybe these are some of the same laws that some colleagues sometimes would like to forget are on the books, but these laws matter. Voting rights matter. Fair housing rights matter. The rights of people with disabilities matter. These laws are part of what makes our country great. I am incredibly proud of the work Mr. Perez has done at the Department of Justice to make those rights a reality after years of neglect. He should be applauded, not vilified, for the service he has provided to this country.

Mr. President, it almost seems that when Mr. Perez's name came up, there was a controversy generated about these cases in St. Paul involving whistleblower types and that somehow he acted inappropriately and denied the government the ability to get back a couple hundred million dollars or so. That seemed to be a belief some of my colleagues on the other side had. So we looked into it. We went through all the documents, all the e-mails, and thousands of pages, with ethics lawyers both in the government and out. What we came up with was that Mr. Perez acted ethically and appropriately at all times. There is no ''there'' there. So the facts belie the belief, but it seems that the belief carries on and that somehow the belief trumps the facts.

Well, if some of my colleagues want to believe the worst about Tom Perez, they can believe that, but they have no facts to back it up. It is an unfounded belief. Is that what is going to guide this body in approving nominations for this President or any President—that if I believe something and I can get maybe some of my colleagues to join in and believe it, that is enough? That is sufficient to vilify a nominee, to try to tear him down?

What about the facts? Don't facts matter? Doesn't the record matter? Of course it does. And the facts, as proven time and time again, are that Mr. Perez acted ethically and appropriately at the Department of Justice at all times and especially in the two cases—Magner v. St. Paul and Newell v. St. Paul. That has been clearly brought forth, that he acted appropriately and ethically.

So I say to my colleagues on the other side, believe what you want, but that belief, mistaken as it is, should not be used to tear down a good person, to vilify a good person, to cast this person in a light which is totally false.

So, yes, Mr. President, there was an objection to our meeting today under this obscure rule of the Senate, but we have rescheduled the meeting for 1 week hence. So in 1 week we will meet again, and we will vote to report out the nomination of Tom Perez, and then we will come to the floor. Again, I hope that it won't be filibustered by my Republican colleagues but that we will be able to vote up or down on Mr. Perez based not upon what someone believes but what the facts are, what his record is, what his record has been both in local government, State government, and at the Department of Justice.

When you look at that record, it is an exemplary record of unstinting public service in the best interests of the civil rights and equal rights of our country. That is why, with his background, his experience, and his dedication to fairness and justice, the fact that he has actually worked in the Senate on the HELP Committee—the committee that has jurisdiction over the Department of Labor—gives tremendous weight to his background and insight into how to be a truly great Secretary of Labor.

So we will vote next week. I hope there are not other kinds of roadblocks—unfounded roadblocks—thrown into the path of his confirmation. We will do everything we can to make sure this good person takes his rightful place as our next Secretary of Labor.

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 Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 133 submitted earlier today. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Reserving the right to object, I will have a request with another resolution momentarily, but I understand the resolution of my friend from Utah. I believe this problem is broader than the one cited in his resolution. In fact, looking to the conduct of the Philadelphia instance, I would prosecute that case to the fullest extent of the law. I think the conduct—or, more correctly, misconduct—in that instance was absolutely despicable and abhorrent.

I am concerned about patient safety in a variety of areas. They may be a small fraction of the total number of health care cases in this country, but anytime, anywhere patients are endangered or threatened by criminal conduct or malpractice, people should be prosecuted and disciplined to the full extent of the law. These cases shock and horrify our sense of decency and we understand the responsibility of health care practitioners anywhere, anytime.

My resolution, which I intend to offer after the Senator from Utah concludes his, will call upon our colleagues to condemn these actions in all health care settings, whether clinics, hospitals, nursing homes, or dental offices across the country.

So with that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, this week in Philadelphia, a jury is deliberating the case of Kermit Gosnell. That doctor has been charged and tried for some of the most gruesome atrocities ever encountered by the American justice system.

As the grand jury opened its harrowing report:

> This case is about a doctor who killed babies and endangered women. What we mean is that he regularly and illegally delivered live, viable babies in the third trimester of pregnancy—and then murdered these newborns by severing their spinal cords with scissors.

Yet according to defense attorneys, Dr. Gosnell is not a monster, not a serial killer, not a predator of vulnerable mothers and their helpless children. He is just an abortionist.

Mr. President, let me suspend my speech momentarily. I understand my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, wishes to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to offer the resolution that I and Senator BOXER, who is a long-time champion of better health care for the citizens of our country, and Senator SHAHEEN, expressing the sense of the Senate that these practices will not be tolerated in any setting, regardless of personal beliefs about the type of health care being offered.

This resolution is broader than the resolution of the Senator from Utah. I understand and sympathize with the basic objectives which, as I understand it, are to improve health care generally and to make sure the kinds of abuses being prosecuted in Philadelphia will not occur anywhere in this country.

I offer my resolution calling on the Senate to condemn such practices in all health care settings, be they clinics or hospitals, dental offices, anywhere in this country. They may be a small fraction and, hopefully, are a very small fraction, of the kinds of cases we would want to condemn. But we should condemn them wherever they occur, not just in one instance, not just singling out one case, but everywhere, anytime.

I might add as a former U.S. attorney that while this case is before the jury, I think we need to be very careful about what we say in a public forum as respected as this one about the facts of that case and about potentially prejudging the result. My understanding is the jury has not yet come back. If the allegations are true—if the jury concludes they have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt—then the punishment should certainly be sufficiently severe and serious to fit those circumstances and well deserving of our condemnation. But equally deserving of our condemnation are any circumstances where health care patients are put in danger, where safety is in peril, where the consequences do damage, or threaten damage, to the recipients of health care. Whatever the kind of health care, whatever we may think of it personally in terms of the merits and the type of care provided, we ought to condemn it, and that is the purpose and sense of the resolution I am offering.

So if I may, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a Senate resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding all incidents of abusive, unsanitary, or illegal health care practices be condemned—the text is at the desk; and I ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Reserving the right to object, as my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, is aware, we have only just received the language of this resolution in the last few minutes. Without having to read it closely, I am reluctant to grant consent at this time. But I will say I am heartened, and I think all Americans should be heartened, and the entire pro-life movement should be heartened by the clear implication that health regulations should be equitably applied and enforced on abortion clinics as they are on other health care facilities.

Part of the reason we fear that Dr. Gosnell's clinic, if, in fact, the allegations are proven true, was not a rare outlier is that abortion clinics are generally held to the same safety standards as hospitals, ambulatory, surgical facilities, et cetera. So on that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, if I may continue my remarks which I started a few moments ago.

According to his defense attorneys, then, Dr. Gosnell is not a monster, not a serial killer, not a predator of helpless mothers and their children. He is just an abortionist. In this context, Dr. Gosnell's alleged crimes were just abortions, and his facility, the so-called Women's Medical Society—reportedly strewn about with animal waste, infectious instruments, and fetal remains—was not, as the grand jury alleged, ''a baby charnel house.'' No, it was just a clinic.

His staff of allegedly unqualified, untrained frauds were not coconspirators in the contract killing of newborns. No, they were just health care providers. And the failure of local health inspectors and political officials to investigate repeated claims of Dr. Gosnell's barbarism was just a bureaucratic oversight—perhaps—or perhaps, as the

panicked abortion industry would have us believe, Dr. Gosnell is an outlier, an outcast, nothing like the professional, competent, law-abiding late-term abortion providers around the country. But then again perhaps not.

Just a few weeks ago, a Planned Parenthood representative testified before the Florida State legislature and suggested that infants born alive during botched abortions might not be entitled to medical attention—in clear violation of Federal law, to say nothing of fundamental human rights and dignity. Even since then, undercover videos have caught late-term abortion providers telling pregnant mothers that even if their babies are accidentally born alive during the procedure, even if the law requires them to treat the newborn as a patient and citizen of the United States, and also telling them that even if the baby is born somewhere other than their clinic, they will see to it that the child does not survive.

So is the case of Dr. Gosnell an outlier or is the legitimacy of the late-term abortion industry merely a lie? The American people deserve to know.

Yesterday I introduced legislation to end the practice of late-term abortion in Washington, DC, after 20 weeks, the point at which science tells us unborn children can feel pain, in light of the chilling details coming in from Pennsylvania, Maryland, the District of Columbia, and various abortion clinics around the country that late-term abortions on pain-capable, unborn children are an important issue we need to debate.

Opinions will obviously be divided, as they always are on abortion-related issues. But we owe it to the American people to see if we can find common ground to protect innocent women and innocent children.

But there should be no division or controversy surrounding the sense-of-the-Senate resolution I called up a few minutes ago. The resolution has the support of every Republican Senator, pro-life and pro-choice Members alike.

The resolution expresses the sense of the Senate, affirming: The duty of the State and Federal Government agencies to protect women and children from violent criminals posing as health care providers; the equal human and constitutional rights of fully born infant children; the need to prevent and punish abusive, unsanitary, and illegal abortion practices.

One of the newborns Dr. Gosnell is accused of murdering, ''Baby Boy A,'' was born alive—breathing and moving—to an underage girl almost 30 weeks pregnant. Witnesses describe Gosnell severing the baby's spine, discarding the child in a shoebox, and joking that he was big enough ''to walk me to the bus stop.''

Joking. Joking.

A clinic employee estimated Baby Boy A's birth weight at about 6 pounds, larger and heavier than two of my own children when they were born.

If there are other Kermit Gosnells out there waging their own personal war on women, we need to know about it, and we need to stop them.

I don't think I can make a stronger argument for this resolution than the one the grand jury in the Gosnell case made itself:

> Let us say right up front we realize this case will be used by both sides of the abortion debate. We ourselves cover a spectrum of personal beliefs about the morality of abortion. For us as a criminal grand jury, however, the case is not about that controversy; it is about disregard of the law and disdain for the lives and health of mothers and infants. We find common ground in exposing what happened here and in recommending measures to prevent anything like this from ever happening again.

I hope the Senate too, whose Members cover a similar spectrum of views on abortion, can follow the grand jury's lead to find common ground in the pursuit of truth and justice for American women and children.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Again, Mr. President, I accept and sympathize with the goals of the resolution offered by my friend from Utah. What I am suggesting is a resolution that includes those criminals who may be posing as health care practitioners in one field of practice but extends the condemnation to all areas of practice.

I hope Senator LEE, my friend from Utah, will share my outrage at reprehensible and illegal actions that occur, unfortunately and tragically, in other areas of practice. Let me mention a few.

We ought to speak about the tragedy at the Pennsylvania clinic, where these incidents occurred, but we also should talk about the Oklahoma dentist who exposed as many as 7,000 patients to HIV and hepatitis B and C through unsanitary practices. Thousands of his patients are being tested to see if they have been infected. So far 60 of his patients have tested positive for these viruses. That is 60 people who trusted their dentist, a health care provider in a position of trust and responsibility, relying on him to respect and care for them safely and responsibly, and, instead they are now facing potentially life-threatening diseases that are as abhorrent and despicable in the lack of responsibility and care as what happened in Pennsylvania. We ought to talk about that incident with the same outrage that we talk about what happened, allegedly, in Pennsylvania.

We ought to speak about the health care practitioners at the Endoscopy Center of Southern Nevada who exposed 40,000 patients to hepatitis C through unsanitary practices. These unsanitary practices went on for years, and that is why this clinic may have hurt as many as 40,000 people. We are talking about 40,000 people, again, exposed to unnecessary danger because of the lack of trust and responsibility on the part of their health care provider.

We also ought to talk about the nursing director at Kern Valley nursing home in California who inappropriately medicated patients using antipsychotic drugs for her own convenience, resulting in the death of at least one patient.

We should be talking about the compounding pharmacies in Massachusetts and elsewhere in this country that provided products that killed and harmed thousands of people.

These incidents, as alleged, are willful violations of law, violations of human dignity and decency, that ought to shock the conscience of the Nation every bit to its core as much as the alleged misconduct and potential criminal activity in Pennsylvania.

These standards of care—or more appropriately and correctly, the violation of them—are simply unacceptable and intolerable, which is why my resolution would take as common ground the alleged Pennsylvania misconduct and include many other instances where standards of care—basic standards of decency and trust—are violated. I ask my friend from Utah to join me in espousing a resolution that establishes this kind of common ground.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appreciate the insight and the concern shared by my friend and colleague from Connecticut. These are all things we all ought to be thinking about, be concerned about, and be debating from time to time. To reiterate one of the points we need to make here: As with all health-care-providing institutions, all clinics, all hospitals need to be subjected to the scrutiny of some outside regulator. They need to have some accountability to those who will ensure that conditions there are safe, that the treatments being provided are effective, and that they are not going to result in more injury, in more disease, in life-threatening conditions, in emergency responders who show up not being able to access the patient in time because the hallways are too narrow, the exits are blocked or the hallways are crowded.

I appreciate the insight from my colleague from Connecticut and thank him for his remarks.

Thank you, Mr. President.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013—Continued

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, can I ask what the order is at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering S. 601.

Mrs. BOXER. OK. So this is my understanding: I ask Senator BLUMENTHAL, do you have more to say on this matter with the resolution?

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I do not.

Mrs. BOXER. OK. I know Senator COATS has some very important remarks to make about the death of a figure whom he cares about very much.

What I wish to propose, if I can, is to talk a little bit about this little back

and forth we had going between my two friends here, and then immediately following what will only take about 2 or 3 minutes is to yield the floor to Senator COATS for 10 minutes.

Mr. COATS. Less than that.

Mrs. BOXER. Less than that. For the benefit of all Senators, we think we are going to have a vote tonight on the Brown amendment. So everyone stay around. We are hoping to have that in the next half hour or so. That is our plan. We hope it will happen.

But I wanted to say in this back and forth we heard between two Senators why I was very strongly for the resolution that was put forward by Senator BLUMENTHAL.

Clearly, what we have in our society today are callous, abusive, unsanitary, or illegal health care practices. These horrible, callous practices turn into tragedies. They produce tragedies. As Senator BLUMENTHAL said, it goes across a wide array of various health care settings.

We do not come down here every day to call out one horrific problem after another. Certainly what has happened in Pennsylvania—and, again, I would take the admonition of Senator BLUMENTHAL, who was a prosecutor, we have to be careful when a jury is deliberating—but certainly if these allegations are true, the individuals involved should be punished to the full extent of the law—and the toughest kind of punishment—and I believe in other cases too.

I know my colleague has talked about a horrible situation in southern Nevada, where 40,000 patients were exposed to hepatitis C. Hepatitis C is a serious and life-threatening condition. Mr. President, 40,000 people were exposed to it. They did nothing. That is deserving of condemnation as well.

He talked about a nursing home in California, where we had the death of a patient because the nurse in that particular case—and nurses are some of the most extraordinarily wonderful people, but in this particular case she had her own convenience ahead of the situation. She improperly medicated patients using antipsychotic drugs, and we know one patient died.

Whatever the setting is—if it is a reproductive health care clinic, if it is a dentist, if it is any type of doctor, any kind of clinic—where there are willful violations of the law and violations of human dignity and violations of standard of care, we should call them out.

What I thought was so important about Senator BLUMENTHAL's resolution is that he took the spirit of Senator LEE's resolution. He did. He actually included in that what occurred in Pennsylvania. And we did get it to the Republicans 2 hours ago, so it was not a few minutes. I think that is a case in point where we could come together, where we say: Absolutely what happened in Pennsylvania is an outrage, it is a violation of everything we hold dear; and here are some other cases.

As long as I have the floor, I will conclude with this: I have been getting involved in issues that deal with medical errors. I was stunned to find out, as I think are my colleagues—as a matter of fact, I met with a doctor from a Texas hospital where they have improved very much where they were losing patients, dozens of patients every month, because of medical errors, terrible errors that are preventable errors: the wrong prescriptions, the lack of monitoring, infections, terrible infections in hospitals. These are all horrible deaths that are preventable.

I think my colleague's resolution was very statesmanlike. I think what he did was he said to our colleagues who wanted to pass their resolution: Of course we will work with you. Let's broaden it. Let's include condemnation of other horrible tragedies that are occurring throughout the Nation, not just this one case, which is tragic and despicable and every word I could think of, but all these other cases, so we do not every day come here with another example. This is a broad problem in our country. We do the best out of most developed countries, but we still have a long way to go.

I wanted to explain why I supported my friend when he opposed the narrower resolution and support his broad resolution. I would urge my colleagues to work with us.

With that, I yield the floor to my friend from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for allowing me to speak as in morning business, and I ask unanimous consent to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING OTIS RAY BOWEN

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, this past Saturday my State of Indiana lost a humble giant whose soft-spoken yet very firm convictions influenced many Hoosiers for many years, including me.

Former Indiana Governor Otis Ray Bowen, known affectionately to Hoosiers as ''Doc,'' passed away at the age of 95, the culmination of a life spent in service to others.

Born in 1918, near Rochester, IN, Doc Bowen earned both a bachelor's degree and a medical degree from Indiana University, joining the Army Medical Corps, after completing his internship, in 1943.

He served in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Army during World War II and went ashore with the first wave of Allied troops during the invasion of Okinawa in 1945.

After the end of the war, Doc Bowen started a family medical practice in Bremen, IN, which he continued for the next 25 years. He estimated that during his career this family doctor delivered more than 3,000 babies.

He was first elected to political office in 1952 as Marshall County's coroner and then to the Indiana House of Representatives in 1956.

Doc lost the reelection following that 2-year stint by only 4 votes in 1958 but then subsequently was elected to seven consecutive house terms, beginning in 1960. He became minority leader in 1965 and speaker in 1967. He served as speaker of the Indiana House through four legislative sessions.

As the 44th Governor of Indiana, from 1973 to 1981, Dr. Bowen served Hoosiers with dignity and respect. His tenure included numerous accomplishments, including landmark tax restructuring, improvements to State park facilities, and the development of a Statewide emergency medical services system.

One of the most significant accomplishments of Governor Bowen was a medical malpractice bill he signed into law. Aimed to reduce the cost of health insurance and the burden on doctors, Governor Bowen's medical malpractice law became a national model.

Hoosiers will also remember the Governor's passionate love of Indiana basketball. When the TV cameras would scan the players' bench, there was Doc, encouraging the team and, at times, casting a critical eye on the referee who just missed an important call.

Following his service as Governor, Dr. Bowen returned to medicine as a professor at the Indiana University Medical Center.

But his time in public service did not end there. President Ronald Reagan called Dr. Bowen out of private life and back into public service in 1985 by naming him Secretary of Health and Human Services—the first physician to serve in this position.

In 1989, Dr. Bowen returned to his Bremen home and continued to serve others through various charities and commissions.

I was privileged to be able to meet with him on some occasions—quietly, nonpublicly, just sharing stories, talking about his career, and, more importantly, his love for Indiana, his love for his wife, his love for his country.

This good doctor and good Governor will long be remembered as an example of political leadership and human decency. The imprint of his leadership and, most of all, the imprint of his character will live on in the minds and hearts of Hoosiers for generations to come.

My wife Marsha and I join millions of Hoosiers as we extend our deepest condolences to his family and also our gratitude for his shining example of a life well lived.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his very warm remarks.

I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order, the Brown amendment No. 813, as modified with the changes that are at the desk, also be in order; that there be no amendments in order to the Brown amendment prior to a vote in relation to the amendment; that at 5:45 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Brown amendment No.

813, as modified; further, that all other provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I just asked unanimous consent to vote on the Brown amendment. I am going to be supporting that amendment. I think it is an important amendment. I just want to say to colleagues, we are making progress. It is not as fast as Senator VITTER and I would like, but considering the Senate it is not bad. We have moved through a number of amendments already, one particularly contentious amendment.

We are moving toward the finish line. I urge everyone to get their amendments in. I urge them, as best I can, to stay away from nongermane amendments that are controversial, that cause us to pause in our work. This is an important bill. This bill was last done in 2007. You would ask, why does it take so long? We used to do these bills every 2 or 3 years. But the reason it has taken this long, in the interim we decided we would no longer have earmarks.

That made this bill particularly difficult because normally we would mention the projects by name. We could not do that. So we had to figure a way to move forward by making sure we never listed any particular project. We did it in a good way. We said if there is a completed Army Corps report, the project runs forward. If there is a modification that has to be made that did not add to the cost of the project, it goes forward. In the future the local governments can come forward and pitch to the Corps directly. We need flood control in this country. We know that. We knew that before Superstorm Sandy. We certainly know it now. We need port dredging in this country to move our goods. Our goods must be moved, and goods to our country have to come into our ports.

We need environmental restoration. We need to take care of the Everglades. We need to take care of the Chesapeake. I have a place called the Salton Sea that is drying up. We need to take care of these kinds of challenges. We are going to turn to the Brown amendment. I am going to give up the floor now and hope he will explain it. I will be strongly supporting it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 813, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator from California, the chair of the committee who has done an extraordinary job with Senator VITTER on this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 813.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR and Mr. DURBIN, proposes an amendment numbered 813, as modified.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a multiagency effort to slow the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries)

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 50_____. MULTIAGENCY EFFORT TO SLOW THE SPREAD OF ASIAN CARP IN THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND OHIO RIVER BASINS AND TRIBUTARIES.

(a) MULTIAGENCY EFFORT TO SLOW THE SPREAD OF ASIAN CARP IN THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND OHIO RIVER BASINS AND TRIBUTARIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in coordination with the Chief of Engineers, the Director of the National Park Service, and the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall lead a multiagency effort to slow the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries by providing high-level technical assistance, coordination, best practices, and support to State and local governments in carrying out activities designed to slow, and eventually eliminate, the threat posed by Asian carp.

(2) BEST PRACTICES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the multiagency effort shall apply lessons learned and best practices such as those described in the document prepared by the Asian Carp Working Group entitled ''Management and Control Plan for Bighead, Black, Grass, and Silver Carps in the United States'', and dated November 2007, and the document prepared by the Asian Carp Regional Coordinating Committee entitled ''FY 2012 Asian Carp Control Strategy Framework'' and dated February 2012.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31 of each year, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in coordination with the Chief of Engineers, shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Environmental and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the coordinated strategies established and progress made toward goals to control and eliminate Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) any observed changes in the range of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries during the 2-year period preceding submission of the report;

(B) a summary of Federal agency efforts, including cooperative efforts with non-Federal partners, to control the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries;

(C) any research that the Director determines could improve the ability to control the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries;

(D) any quantitative measures that Director intends to use to document progress in controlling the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries; and

(E) a cross-cut accounting of Federal and non-Federal expenditures to control the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer today, with my colleagues from Pennsylvania, Senator TOOMEY and Senator CASEY, this amendment. As many of you know, the spread of Asian carp poses a threat to the Great Lakes' ecosystem. Because of the work of my Great Lakes State colleagues from Minnesota to Michigan, Pennsylvania, we are working to address this problem.

But it is not, contrary to what many believe, limited just to the Great Lakes. The Ohio and Upper Mississippi River Basins also face the threat of these invasive species. This no-cost amendment that Senator TOOMEY and I are offering would support multiagency efforts to hold the spread of Asian carp in the Ohio and Upper Mississippi Basin.

I ask my colleagues for their support.

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. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I would like to begin by thanking my colleague Senator BROWN for his leadership on this issue, and Senator CASEY, my colleague from Pennsylvania, who is supportive of this effort as well.

This is not a complicated amendment. I do not think it is a controversial amendment either. The fact is in southwestern Pennsylvania, we have three iconic rivers. In northwestern Pennsylvania we have access to and a coastline along a beautiful and important national treasure, Lake Erie.

On all of these, the rivers and Lake Erie, the commerce and the recreation that occurs on these waterways are potentially at risk to an invasion of the Asian carp. This, as we all know, is a very aggressive, large, nonindigenous species that could be very disruptive to the ecosystem of the rivers, to the ecosystem of Lake Erie.

What we discovered is that there is no single entity in the entire Federal Government that is responsible for coordinating our response, a response that will help to minimize the risk that the Asian carp would be able to invade the waterways and ultimately make their way into the Great Lakes.

It would be potentially devastating if the Asian carp were to do so. We have introduced this amendment to this bill which would simply do two things. It would place the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in charge of coordinating the Federal multiagency effort. That would include the National Park Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the Army Corps of Engineers. It would require an annual report on what is being done at

the Federal and State level to minimize the risk of an invasion of the Asian carp.

As I say, I believe this is a very constructive, modest amendment. I trust it is not controversial. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Brown amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, Mr. BROWN.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 117 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Flake	Murphy
Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Baucus	Grassley	Portman
Begich	Hagan	Pryor
Bennet	Harkin	Reed
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reid
Blunt	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Heitkamp	Roberts
Boxer	Hirono	Rockefeller
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Chambliss	Kaine	Sessions
Coats	King	Shaheen
Coburn	Kirk	Shelby
Cochran	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Landrieu	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cowan	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	McConnell	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Enzi	Mikulski	Wicker
Feinstein	Moran	Wyden
Fischer	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—5

Cardin	Johanns	McCaskill
Heller	Lautenberg	

The amendment (No. 813), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have made progress on this bill in the last couple of days. We have had a difficult time on some of the amendments that were nongermane, but we worked our way through those. The two managers on this bill are waiting for amendments to be offered.

I hope we could get this bill done as quickly as possible. It is an important bill for every State in the Union. I hope it is not bogged down with a lot of nonrelevant, nongermane amendments. If people want to offer them, have at it. I just don't think it is the right thing to do on this bill. We have already been through that. I have talked to Senator BOXER and Senator VITTER and they want to move through this bill.

There is a lot of good stuff in this legislation, and they have worked so hard. They have listened to all of their colleagues who have situations, and some of that can be resolved with a managers' amendment. So if Senators have to offer an amendment, go ahead and offer it, but let's try to get this legislation complete.

Monday is a no-vote day. We should do everything tomorrow to at least come up with a finite list of amendments because we are not going to spend all week on this bill next week, that is for sure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 or 11 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INSIDER TRADING LAWS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, with the passage of the STOCK Act last year, Congress made an important statement: When it comes to insider trading laws, there is no special exemption for Congress. If anyone in government provides confidential information to someone for the purpose of trading on it, that is insider trading.

It is illegal if the information is both material and nonpublic. The word ''material'' means a reasonable investor would want to know it before investing. ''Nonpublic'' means the information has not been released to the general public. To violate the law, the person making the disclosure must have a duty to keep the information secret.

Frankly, there is very little information in Congress that must be kept secret. Of course, that is a good thing. Unlike the executive branch, most of what Congress does is public immediately. But disclosing material nonpublic information can be a crime. Even if it is done intentionally, people might be investigated before getting a chance to clear their name. And there is a big difference between material nonpublic information and an expert's educated guess about what a government agency might do.

We now know that Wall Street has been harvesting expertise and tidbits of information from Washington, DC, for years while keeping us largely in the dark. In fact, the political intelligence industry is so big and so opaque that the Government Accountability Office was unable to quantify it or judge its size despite 1 whole year of investigating.

Political intelligence firms extract pieces of information from the government and use that intelligence to make money on Wall Street. Each detail a political intelligence firm gathers may not be material or nonpublic on its own, but the purpose of collecting and analyzing those details is to get an edge in the markets over other investors.

That is not illegal, and I have never suggested that it should be. People should not be discouraged from sharing information and opinions about how our government operates. We should be more transparent, not less. The less open and transparent government is, the more opportunities there are to exploit government information for profit in the markets.

I have been investigating the role of political intelligence firms in the early release of information about Medicare Advantage rates prior to the public announcement on April 1st. There has been some confusion over the scope of my inquiry, so I want to be clear.

There are reports that the Securities and Exchange Commission is investigating whether material non-public information was released about the Medicare Advantage rates. My interest is much broader than that. Political intelligence is not the same thing as material non-public information. Gathering political intelligence includes a lot of activity that falls short of material non-public information. So, just because I am asking questions about how certain information or expert opinions flowed to these political intelligence firms, does not mean I am accusing anyone of any wrongdoing.

I am not seeking to ban the gathering of political intelligence. I am not suggesting that if someone was the source for some piece of political intelligence, that the source did anything illegal. But, the goal of these firms is to get an edge on other investors, and that should be understood by everyone who communicates with them.

This investigation has shed a great deal of light on the political intelligence industry. I hope to use this information to improve the legislation on political intelligence disclosure that I plan to re-introduce with Representative SLAUGHTER. I am trying to learn how these political intelligence firms function by using this real-world example, so that I can write better legislation on disclosure.

To be clear, I am not focused on examining whether particular Congressional staff acted properly with regard to their professional duties. Any reports to the contrary are simply inaccurate. What I think we need is more transparency. Government officials need to know what happens with the information they provide to outside parties. I want to arm government officials with knowledge about who they are talking to.

My inquiry started with Height Securities, the firm that put out an alert 18 minutes before the markets closed on April 1st. That alert caused a huge spike in the health insurance stocks

that stood to gain from the rate announcement.

I initially learned that an email on April 1st from a healthcare lobbyist to the analyst at Height Securities looked like the basis for the flash alert that moved the markets. In the interest of full disclosure, it has been reported in the press that the lobbyist was formerly on my staff. But, I continued to press for more information.

I learned that Height paid for his expertise on healthcare, although his entire billing amounted to only 1.75 hours of work before sending the email on April 1st. I learned that the Height analyst had also communicated with two other healthcare policy experts before putting out his alert to the market.

Then, I learned that the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—CMS—had already made its decision to reverse the rate cuts much earlier, two weeks before the Height Securities alert.

The press has reported that there were major spikes in options trading on March 18th and March 22nd. Options trading is one way folks on Wall Street make big bets on a stock when they think they have a sure thing. March 18th happens to be the first trading day after CMS made its decision internally. March 22nd happens to be the day that CMS transmitted its draft decision to the White House more than a week before the public announcement. On that date, the circle of people in the administration who would have known about the CMS decision expanded significantly.

This suggests that political intelligence firms may have obtained key information for their clients in mid-March, not just the day of the announcement on April 1st.

The press also reported on the possible involvement of another political intelligence firm, Capitol Street. Capitol Street arranges conference calls between investors and governments experts.

In addition, I have asked two major hedge funds mentioned in the press whether they profited from trades in advance of the rate announcement. So the scope of my inquiry is broad. It is not focused on particular people. It is focused on the facts.

The Securities and Exchange Commission is also investigating. It is their job to determine whether any material non-public information was passed to Height or to anyone else in this case. That is not my job.

I am working on legislation to make the political intelligence industry more transparent. I am gathering facts to inform that legislation.

Remember, political intelligence does not necessarily involve material non-public information. But, people in government need to know who they are talking to and what they will do with your information. That is why it is so important to ensure that political intelligence relationships are transparent. Even if the information you provide is merely an educated guess, it can still move markets. It can still create an impression that a fortunate few are making money from special access to insiders.

If political intelligence transparency is passed, government officials would be more fully informed when they provide expertise to these firms about how the information might be used. But as things stand, without transparency, you do not necessarily know what firms like Height Securities or Capitol Street do with the information you provide to them. You don't know if they have a contract with a lobbyist who is bringing in some other client for a meeting. You don't know that your discussion with that lobbyist's client might be repeated to people who are looking for an edge in the stock market. What you think may be an innocent detail or an educated guess may move markets.

At the end of the day, that is what these firms want to exploit. That is what they are after. That is what they sell. They should be honest and upfront with people about how they make money. Lobbying disclosure isn't perfect, but it has brought more transparency to the process.

Now, we need political intelligence disclosure too, for the same reasons.

Transparency increases the public's ability to trust that we are working for them, not for just for special interests. That principle should apply just as much to special interests on Wall Street as it does to special interests on K Street.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask consent to follow Senator MORAN at the conclusion of his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHARITABLE GIVING

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, April 15 has now come and gone, known as tax day to most Americans. Millions of Americans filed their returns last month and many took into account in filing that return the dollars they contributed to charitable and worthwhile causes. According to an organization called Giving USA, Americans gave nearly $300 billion in 2011 to support important programs and services, from food pantries and medical research to youth programs and seed grants to start new businesses. Because of those generous donations of millions of Americans each year, not-for-profits have impacted the lives of countless individuals for decades.

An example back home in my State, an example of where a charitable contribution made a tremendous difference in the life of an individual is William Wilkerson, a 16-year-old from Overland Park, KS. At age 3, William was diagnosed with moderate to severe bilateral hearing loss.

After visiting several doctors, William was taken to Children's Mercy Hospital, where he was fitted with his first set of hearing aids. He later put into words what he experienced that day: With so many different things that I had never heard before, it was as if somebody had turned on the world!

Denise Miller, the manager of the Children's Mercy Hearing and Speech Clinic, said this about the importance of donations: Because of the donor support we receive, we are able to fit the most appropriate hearing aids on each and every child, based on their own unique needs.

In 2011, the clinic fit nearly 500 patients with hearing aids bringing the world of sound to their ears and changing their lives forever.

Nonprofits like Children's Mercy Hospital depend on the generosity of Kansans and other Americans to help support their ongoing care for children.

But President Obama has proposed changes to the 100-year-old tradition of providing tax incentives for charitable giving that could significantly diminish this support for nonprofits.

In the President's 2014 budget is a proposal to cap the total value of tax deductions at 28 percent for higher income Americans—including the charitable tax deduction.

According to the Charitable Giving Coalition, this proposal could reduce donations to the nonprofit sector by more than $5.6 billion every year. This reduction amounts to more than the annual operating budgets of the American Red Cross, Goodwill, the YMCA, Habitat for Humanity, the Boys and Girls Clubs, Catholic Charities, and the American Cancer Society combined. A reduction in giving of this magnitude would have a devastating impact on the future of charitable organizations in our country.

Given our country's current economic situation, more Americans have turned to nonprofits for help in recent years. According to the Nonprofit Finance Fund, 85 percent of nonprofits experienced higher demand for their services in 2011 and at least 70 percent have seen increased demand since 2008. Our country depends upon a strong philanthropic sector to provide a safety net for services, especially given the tighter local and State budgets.

Americans understand the value and impact of the charitable deduction, which is why a recent United Way Worldwide survey found that two out of every three Americans are opposed to reducing the charitable tax deduction.

Nonprofits are best equipped to provide assistance on the local level and can often do so in a far more effective manner than many government programs. Studies have shown that for every $1 subject to the charitable deduction, communities will receive $3 in benefits.

The Federal Government will be hard-pressed to find a more effective way to generate that kind of public impact. Congress has previously acknowledged the benefits of private investments and regularly passes charitable giving incentives in the wake of a natural disaster to encourage more giving.

Last October, when Hurricane Sandy tore across the east coast, the storm left thousands of residents without the basic necessities of life: food, water, and shelter. Within 6 weeks, the American Red Cross served more than 8 million meals, provided more than 81,000 shelter stays, and distributed more than 6 million relief items to thousands of residents impacted by the storm.

In times of crisis, Americans depend on relief service organizations such as the American Red Cross, Catholic Charities, and the Salvation Army—all not-for-profit organizations whose main purpose is to help their fellow citizens when they need it the most.

Nonprofits such as Habitat for Humanity also help families make a fresh start in life after a disaster. In May of 2007, an EF5 tornado swept through my home State of Kansas devastating 95 percent of the town of Greensburg.

Diana Torres, a single mom, had lived in Greensburg for nearly 7 years when the tornado destroyed the home they were renting. Diana faced the likelihood of having to move out of State when the Wichita Habitat for Humanity stepped in with 1,400 volunteers to build a new home. Thanks to special financing and donated supplies, Diana could afford to purchase the home for her family.

Executive director of the Wichita Habitat for Humanity Linda Stewart said those who support Habitat ''know they are making a difference in someone's life that lasts for years.'' That is what not-for-profits do every day across Kansas and around our country. They make a difference one life at a time.

Since the founding of our Nation, neighbors have been helping other neighbors. They lend that helping hand that is so often needed. The charitable deduction is one way to encourage that tradition to continue.

Any change in the Tax Code related to charitable giving would have a long-lasting and negative consequence, not necessarily to the generous donor but, more importantly, to the millions of Americans who rely upon the services provided by a charitable organization. With our economy still recovering and the tremendous need for charitable causes, the President should be encouraging Americans to give more, not less, and Congress should reject this administration's proposal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I would like to ask consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. As I am sure the Presiding Officer suspects, I am back on the floor again to urge that we awaken to what carbon pollution is doing to our planet, to our oceans, to our seasons, and to our storms. I wonder why is it that we are so comfortably asleep when the warnings are so many and so real. What could beguile us away from wakefulness and duty?

I was recently at a Senate meeting when I heard a Member of our Senate community say: ''God won't allow us to ruin our planet.'' Maybe that is why we do nothing. We are comfortable that God somehow will not allow us to ruin our planet. That seems like such an extraordinary notion, I thought I would reflect on it in my remarks this week.

First of all, the statement refers to God and is couched in religious terms, but is it truly an expression of religious inquiry? I think not. It is less an expression of religious thinking than it is of magical thinking. The statement that God will not allow us to ruin our planet sweeps aside ethics, responsibilities, consequences, duties, even awareness. It comforts us with the anodyne assumption that no matter what we do, some undefined presence will—through some undefined measure—make things right and clean up our mess. That is seeking magical deliverance from our troubles, not divine guidance through our troubles.

Is God truly here just to tidy up after our sins and follies, to immunize us from their consequence? If that is true, why does the Bible say in Galatians 6:7, ''Do not be deceived . . . whatever one sows, that will he also reap.'' If God is just a tidy-up-after-us God, why does the book of Job 4:8 warn that ''those who plow iniquity and sow trouble reap the same.'' If God is not a God of consequences, why does Luke 6:38 tell us, ''For with the measure you use, it will be measured back to you.'' Proverbs 22:8 tells us, ''Whoever sows injustice will reap calamity.''

Jeremiah 17:10 says, ''I the Lord search the heart and test the mind to give every man according to his ways, according to the fruit of his deeds.''

So it seems we should not walk in the counsel of the wicked or sit in the seat of the scoffers and then expect there will be no bitter fruit of our deeds, no consequence.

We are warned in the Bible not to plow iniquity, not to eat the fruit of lies. Where in the Bible are we assured of safety if we do? I see no assurances of that. The Bible says in 1 Samuel 2:3 that ''the Lord is a God of knowledge, and by him actions are weighed.'' At Thessalonians 1:6, ''God considers it just to repay with affliction those who afflict.'' Those who ''sow the wind,'' the Bible says, ''they shall reap the whirlwind.''

Look at our own American history. If God is just here to tidy up after our sins and follies, how could Abraham Lincoln say this about our bloody Civil War to free and redeem us from the sin of slavery? Here is what Lincoln said about that war:

> Yet, if God wills that it continue, until all the wealth piled by the bond-man's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said: ''The judgments of the Lord, are true and righteous judgment altogether.''

That was Abraham Lincoln. Blood drawn by the sword in equal measure to that drawn by the lash as the true and righteous judgment of the Lord—that doesn't sound like a God of amnesty.

Go to the very beginning. If we live in a state of God-given general amnesty from consequences, why were Adam and Eve expelled from Eden for their sin? Why was Cain sent into the wilderness, condemned to wander for the crime against his brother? If it is your assertion that God's love has no measure of tough love, wander a bit through the Old Testament before getting too married to that idea.

If the Old Testament is too bloodthirsty for you, look at Revelations 11:18:

> And thy wrath is come, and the time . . . that thou . . . shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth.

If we believe in an all-powerful God, we must then believe that God gave us this Earth, and we must in turn believe God gave us its laws of gravity, chemistry, and physics. We must also believe that God gave us our human powers of intellect and reason. He gives us these powers so we, his children, can learn and understand Earth's natural laws, which he also gave us, so that as his children we can use that understanding of Earth's natural laws to build and create and prosper on his Earth.

Hasn't that, in fact, been the path of human progress? We learn these natural laws, and we apply them to build and create and we prosper.

Why then when we ignore his plain, natural laws, when we ignore the obvious conclusions to be drawn by our God-given intellect and reason would God—the tidy-up God—drop in and spare us? Why would he allow an innocent child to burn its hand when it touches the hot stove but protect us from this lesson? Why would he allow a badly engineered bridge or building to fall, killing innocent people, but protect us from this mistake? Why would he allow cholera to kill in epidemics until we figure out that the well water is contaminated?

The Earth's natural laws and our capacity to divine them are God's great gift to us, allowing us to learn and build great things and cure disease. But God's gift to us of a planet with natural laws and natural order has as an integral part of that gift consequences—consequences when we get

that law and order wrong. The child's hand burns, the bridge falls, the disease spreads. If it didn't matter whether we got it right or wrong, there would be no value to God's creation of that natural law and order in the first place.

So is that then to be our answer to polluting our atmosphere with carbon by the megaton and changing our climate and changing our seas? Is it to be our answer to that, that God would not allow us to ruin our planet? We are to continue to pollute our Earth with literally megatons each year of carbon, heating up our atmosphere, acidifying our seas, knowing full well by His natural laws what the consequences are? Instead of correcting our own behavior, we are going to bet on a miracle? That is the plan? Excuse me, but that is not the American way. President Kennedy described the American way as he ended his inaugural address connecting our work to God's:

> . . . let us go forth, to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

That is the order of things. We are here to do God's work. He is not here to do ours. How arrogant. How very far from humility would be the self-satisfied smug assurance that God—a tidy-up-after-us God—will come and clean up our mess; that on this Earth, God's work need not be our own.

Remember the story of the man trapped in his house during a huge flood. A faithful man, he trusted God to save him. As the waters began to rise in his house, his neighbor came by and offered him a ride to safety, and he said: I am waiting for God to save me. So the neighbor got in his pickup truck and drove away.

As the water rose, the man climbed to the second floor of his house, and a boat came by his window with people who were headed for safe ground. They threw a rope and they yelled at the man to climb out and come with them, but he told them: No, I trust in God to save me. They shook their heads, and they moved on.

The flood waters kept rising, and the man clambered up onto his roof. A helicopter flew by, and a voice came over the loud speaker offering to lower a ladder to the man, let him climb up and fly to safety. The man waved the helicopter away, shouting back that he counted on God to save him, so the helicopter left.

Well, eventually the floodwaters swept over the roof, and the man was drowned. When the man reached Heaven, he had some questions for God:

God, he asked, didn't I trust in You to save me?

Why did You let me drown?

God answered: I sent you a pickup truck, I sent you a boat, I sent you a helicopter. You refused my help.

Just as God sent the pickup truck, the boat, and the helicopter to the drowning man, he has sent us everything we need to solve this carbon pollution problem. We just refuse. We just refuse. Some of us even deny that the floodwaters are rising.

As I have indicated in previous speeches, climate denial is bad science. Indeed, it is such bad science it falls into the category of falsehood. Climate denial is bad economics, ignoring that in a proper marketplace the costs of carbon pollution should be factored into the price of carbon. Climate denial is bad policy in any number of areas—bad national security policy, bad environmental policy, bad foreign policy, bad economic policy.

Although I am a Senator, not a preacher, from everything I have learned and believe, it seems to me that climate denial is also bad religion and bad morals. Hopes for a nanny God who will, with a miracle, grant us amnesty from our folly is not aligned with history or text of the Bible.

We need to face the fact that there is only one leg on which climate denial stands: money. The polluters give and spend money to create false doubt. The polluters give and spend money to buy political influence. The polluters give and spend money to keep polluting. That is it—not truth, not science, not economics, not safety, not policy, and certainly not religion, nor morality. Nothing supports climate denial—nothing except money.

But in Congress, in this temple, money rules. So here I stand in one of the last places on Earth that is still a haven to climate denial. In our arrogance, we here in Congress think we can somehow ignore or trump Earth's natural laws—laws of chemistry, laws of physics, laws of science—with our own political lawmaking, with our own political influence. But we are fools to think that. The laws of chemistry and the laws of physics neither know nor care what we say or do here.

So we need to wake up. We need to walk not in the counsel of the wicked, nor sit in the seat of scoffers, but with due humility awaken to our duty and get to work because here on Earth God's work must truly be our own.

Thank you very much. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I just want to say to Senator WHITEHOUSE before he leaves the floor how much I appreciated his remarks tonight and how much I learned from his remarks. I wish to say to the Senator that I think he put forward the most cogent argument from a religious perspective as to why we have to take action to make sure we don't lose this planet. We are in a planetary emergency. As he said, this is the last place in the world, almost, that doesn't get it.

I wish to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that the reason so many religious leaders are in our coalition to call attention to climate change, to call attention to global warming, to call attention to the rising waters, to call attention to the terrible droughts, to the terrible fires, to the terrible storms, to the extreme weather and all the things we are seeing around us—the Senator from Rhode Island has laid it out chapter and verse, we can truly say, chapter and verse, and I so appreciate what he is doing here. I so appreciate his consistent voice, his passionate voice.

I so appreciate that he is on the committee I am so proud to chair, the Environment and Public Works Committee. We are on a bill that deals with the public works side of the committee. We have good camaraderie there. But when it comes to protecting the environment, it is as if there are just two totally different species of humanity—the deniers and the believers. I am proud to be on the side of the believers. I believe America is built on facts. It is built on, yes, religious beliefs and scientific proof.

I think the Senator from Rhode Island laid it out tonight in such a magnificent way that I intend to send the Senator's remarks, with his permission, to all of our colleagues, to put them up on my Web site because I am so proud to stand with the Senator from Rhode Island in this fight. This is a fight, and as my friend from Rhode Island said it is a fight that puts on one side the special interests, the polluters, the money, versus those who just say we have to save this planet. It is our responsibility. It is our God-given responsibility.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island so much, and I yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I just want to say how honored I am to serve on Senator BOXER's committee with her as our chairman and leader and how eager I am to fight beside her in the struggles ahead.

With that, with my appreciation, I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend, today was a great day for the Senator from Rhode Island, not only because of the speech that I think is quite memorable but also because of the amendment he passed with the help of our Republican friends, to set up an oceans trust fund. I think this is a good, positive day, and I am very pleased about that.

I would ask the staff if we are ready to make the unanimous consent request.

We will be in 2 minutes. So I would say to my colleague that we are going to dispose of about six amendments very quickly on the floor, with the indulgence of the Senator, and we should be free and done with this business in a few minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the Senator. No objection.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator.

So we will put in a quorum call. I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks after the remarks of Senator HOEVEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 801, 806, 835, 833, AND 832, EN BLOC

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order, the following amendments which have been cleared on both sides be considered and agreed to en bloc: Pryor amendment No. 801, as modified, with the changes at the desk; Pryor amendment No. 806; Inhofe amendment No. 835, with a modification to the instruction lines; McCain amendment No. 833; and Murray amendment No. 832; further, that all of the provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 801, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms)

At the end, add the following:

TITLE XII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 12001. APPLICABILITY OF SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) FARM.—The term ''farm'' has the meaning given the term in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(3) GALLON.—The term ''gallon'' means a United States liquid gallon.

(4) OIL.—The term ''oil'' has the meaning given the term in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(5) OIL DISCHARGE.—The term ''oil discharge'' has the meaning given the term ''discharge'' in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(6) REPORTABLE OIL DISCHARGE HISTORY.—The term ''reportable oil discharge history'' has the meaning used to describe the legal requirement to report a discharge of oil under applicable law.

(7) SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.—The term ''Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule'' means the regulation, including amendments, promulgated by the Administrator under part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(b) CERTIFICATION.—In implementing the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to any farm, the Administrator shall—

(1) require certification of compliance with the rule by—

(A) a professional engineer for a farm with—

(i) an individual tank with an aboveground storage capacity greater than 10,000 gallons;

(ii) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity greater than or equal to 20,000 gallons; or

(iii) a reportable oil discharge history; or

(B) the owner or operator of the farm (via self-certification) for a farm with—

(i) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity not more than 20,000 gallons and not less than the lesser of—

(I) 6,000 gallons; or

(II) the adjustment described in subsection (d)(2); and

(ii) no reportable oil discharge history of oil; and

(2) not require a certification of a statement of compliance with the rule—

(A) subject to subsection (d), with an aggregate aboveground storage capacity of not less than 2,500 gallons and not more than 6,000 gallons; and

(B) no reportable oil discharge history; and

(3) not require a certification of a statement of compliance with the rule for an aggregate aboveground storage capacity of not more than 2,500 gallons.

(c) CALCULATION OF AGGREGATE ABOVEGROUND STORAGE CAPACITY.—For purposes of subsection (b), the aggregate aboveground storage capacity of a farm excludes—

(1) all containers on separate parcels that have a capacity that is 1,000 gallons or less; and

(2) all containers holding animal feed ingredients approved for use in livestock feed by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

(d) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months of the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall conduct a study to determine the appropriate exemption under subsection (b)(2)(A) and (b)(1)(B) to not more than 6,000 gallons and not less than 2,500 gallons, based on a significant rise of discharge to water.

(2) ADJUSTMENT.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the study described in paragraph (1) is complete, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall promulgate a rule to adjust the exemption levels described in subsection (b)(2)(A) and (b)(1)(B) in accordance with the study.

AMENDMENT NO. 806

(Purpose: To provide a work-in-kind credit)

In section 2012, strike subsection (b) and insert the following:

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 2003(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b) is amended—

(1) by inserting '', or construction of design deficiency corrections on the project,'' after ''construction on the project''; and

(2) by inserting '', or under which construction of the project has not been completed and the work to be performed by the non-Federal interests has not been carried out and is creditable only toward any remaining non-Federal cost share,'' after ''has not been initiated''.

AMENDMENT NO. 835, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide for rural water infrastructure projects)

On page 319, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(10) RURAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT.—The term ''rural water infrastructure project'' means a project that—

(A) is described in section 10007; and

(B) is located in a water system that serves not more than 25,000 individuals. On page 527, strike lines 1 through 3, and insert the following:

(2) ELIGIBLE PROJECT COSTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the eligible project costs of a project shall be reasonably anticipated to be not less than $20,000,000.

(B) RURAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.—For rural water infrastructure projects, the eligible project costs of a project shall be reasonably anticipated to be not less than $5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 833

(Purpose: To protect the American taxpayer by establishing metrics to measure the effectiveness of grants administered by the national levee safety program)

In section 6004(i)(2), add at the end the following:

(C) MEASURES TO ASSESS EFFECTIVENESS.—Not later than 1 year after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement quantifiable performance measures and metrics to assess the effectiveness of the grant program established in accordance with subparagraph (A).

AMENDMENT NO. 832

(Purpose: To modify the definition of the term ''cargo container'')

On page 305, strike lines 11 through 14 and insert the following:

''(i) CARGO CONTAINER.—The term 'cargo container' means a cargo container that is 1 Twenty-foot Equivalent Unit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise in support of amendment No. 802, which I understand will be offered to the WRDA bill by my colleague from Louisiana Senator LANDRIEU which would stop flood insurance premiums from skyrocketing until FEMA completes its study on the affordability of premiums of the National Flood Insurance Program.

As everyone here knows, my home State of New Jersey was at the epicenter of Superstorm Sandy which destroyed thousands of homes, left millions without power, and caused billions of dollars in damage. But despite the devastation, the people of New Jersey didn't give up. They began rebuilding, and we showed the country that ''Jersey Tough'' isn't just a slogan.

But even as we slowly recover from the worst natural disaster in our State's history, a manmade disaster is looming in the distance, jeopardizing our recovery. The combination of updated flood maps and the phaseout of premium subsidies for the National Flood Insurance Program threaten to force victims out of their homes and destroy entire communities.

It is like a triple whammy. We have the consequences of Superstorm Sandy, which devastated homes, so they have to rebuild. Many times, that insurance didn't rise to the level of the cost of rebuilding. Secondly, and as a result of flood maps that came in after the storm, there are now requirements for new elevations. Thirdly, the premiums are going to skyrocket because the subsidies go down. So we have a triple whammy.

Now, many homeowners are going to be forced to pay premiums that are several times higher than their current policy. Those who cannot afford the higher premiums will either be forced to sell or abandon their homes. This, in turn, will drive down property values and local revenues at the worst possible time—when we are doing everything we can to bring communities back to life after the storm.

I have heard from countless New Jerseyans. Many who are facing this

predicament have come to me in tears. These are hard-working middle-class families who have played by the rules, purchased flood insurance responsibly, and now are being priced out of the only home in which they have ever lived. This amendment would delay these potentially devastating changes until FEMA completes its study on premium affordability.

This study is the result of a requirement I authored in the flood insurance bill last year because I was concerned that premiums could become unaffordable for too many families. Of course, at that time the challenge was made by many of our colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle, who said: Well, we will let the flood insurance program die unless it can be self-sufficient.

Given the choice between having no flood insurance program—that, therefore, would mean no homeowner would have any insurance available to them, and, of course, it dramatically reduces the value of the home if you cannot get flood insurance and you are in a flood plain—or having a flood insurance program under the conditions our colleagues insisted on, there was a need to have a flood insurance program. But because I knew that had some potential rate shock to individuals, the study I required and sought and achieved in the flood insurance bill last year was because of this concern of unaffordability for too many families. That was even before Superstorm Sandy struck.

While my friends on the other side of the aisle protested my efforts to provide assistance to help low- and middle-income families afford insurance, I was able to include a requirement that FEMA conduct this study on affordability. Well, it has been 10 months since we passed the reauthorization, and there is still no study.

Unfortunately, my concerns about premiums becoming unaffordable have already come true for many New Jersey homeowners. Until FEMA does its job and provides options, according to the law, to improve affordability, the people of New Jersey should not have to face these skyrocketing premiums at a time they are, in essence, getting a triple whammy: They lost their homes or their homes are dramatically uninhabitable, they have to rebuild—in many cases, because of new flood maps, they will have to elevate—and they will have to pay incredibly higher premiums. That is simply a devastation that should not take place.

We all remember the devastation that happened in New Jersey in late October and the way the country came together to help the victims. Last week we marked the 6-month anniversary of Sandy, and the work is far from over. We still have too many people out of their homes and too many people who are afraid of losing their homes.

New Jersey families already suffered from a natural disaster. The next disaster should not be a manmade one. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Connecticut.

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.

TRIBUTE TO JOEL NAJMAN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, to many Vermonters, Joel Najman is part of rock-and-roll radio history. Taking the reins of the Vermont Public Radio show ''My Place'' 30 years ago this spring, he captivated rock-and-roll enthusiasts from around the region and staked his claim in Vermont radio history.

Marcelle and I have known Joel for many years and have followed his career with great interest. Starting in radio at Vermont's own Middlebury College, Joel went on to WJOY in South Burlington and continues to work WDEV in Waterbury, in addition to hosting ''My Place'' on Vermont Public Radio.

Joel first joined ''My Place'' as a substitute host in 1982. After taking over full time in 1983, he took the show far beyond an ''oldies rock radio hour'' and made it his mission to apply cultural and historical context to rock music for his listeners. In each hour-long episode, he examines rock-and-roll history, providing his listeners with details that often take years to accumulate. He has even been known to spend his entire radio hour picking apart a single song.

In 2004, he was inducted into the Vermont Broadcaster's Hall of Fame, and the Vermont State Legislature recently passed a resolution honoring him as a ''rock and roll impresario.'' Today, I would like to congratulate Joel for his 30 years as host of ''My Place.'' I ask unanimous consent an article from the Vermont publication, Seven Days, entitled, ''Vermont Legislature Honors 'My Place' Host Joel Najman'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Seven Days, Apr. 26, 2013]

VERMONT LEGISLATURE HONORS ''MY PLACE'' HOST JOEL NAJMAN

(By Dan Bolles)

On Wednesday, April 24, the Vermont Legislature surprised Joel Najman with a resolution congratulating the local DJ on his 30th anniversary as the host of the Vermont Public Radio show, and rock-and-roll time machine, ''My Place.''

''My Place'' was originally hosted by David Field and began life as a wide-ranging, interactive retrospective of rock and roll from the 1950s and '60s. But Najman dramatically revamped the show's format when he took over in 1983, after serving as a substitute host the year prior.

Najman is as passionate a musicologist as he is a fan, which is really saying something. In each hourlong episode, he hones in on a specific theme or topic, sometimes sharpening his focus to a single song, and examines its historical context and cultural importance in painstaking detail.

He's said those details can take years—yes, years—of sleuthing to fully unearth. Recent episodes of ''My Place'' have explored the first and second waves of the British Invasion, Berry Gordy's pre-Motown canon and ''Popular Songs About Women.''

''There are a lot of oldies stations, and you can buy oldies CDs, or go online and MP3 them or however you want to get the music,'' said Najman in a 2007 interview with Seven Days celebrating his 25th anniversary. ''But it's relating it to the evolving culture of that time and the stories behind the songs—how they came about, how they were made—which has always been my hobby.''

Some hobby.

If you're into stiff, overly formal verbiage with lots of ''Whereas''-es, you can read the full resolution here. Whereas, if you'd like to hear from the man himself, Najman will appear as a guest on VPR's ''Vermont Edition'' on Monday, April 29.

Whereas, you could also listen to ''My Place'' on VPR Saturdays at 8 p.m.

Congrats, Joel.

TRIBUTE TO BRIAN JOSEPH DAVID

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Brian Joseph David, who retired from the Department of Defense on December 31, 2012, after 30 years of dedicated service to the Federal Government. Mr. David's expertise in continuity issues greatly enhanced the safety and security of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government.

While serving as the Detection Project Officer for the Joint Program Office of Biological Defense, JPO-BD, Mr. David supervised and operated DOD's first integrated biological and chemical detection system, which was deployed overseas for force protection during Operation Desert Thunder in Kuwait. He also created the Concept of Operations for the Portal Shield biological detection Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration, ACTD, Program, which was implemented during actual deployment conditions. He was awarded the Superior Civilian Service Award for successfully leading this deployment overseas.

Mr. David played an integral role providing advice and counsel to assist national emergency managers as they worked to mitigate and recover evidence from biological warfare attacks on the Senate. Mr. David's knowledge and expertise significantly reduced the recovery time and expenses related to the anthrax and ricin attacks on the Senate. He oversaw a major chemical, biological, radiological, and explosives defense effort to protect our country's national assets. By combining surveillance and identification technologies, defensive measures and mitigation capabilities, Mr. David formed a standard

by which other large-scale protective efforts are now measured.

I commend Mr. David's contributions and longstanding career in public service. I, along with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, congratulate him on his well-earned retirement and wish him well in his future endeavors.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on May 7, 2013, the Joint Committee on the Library organized, elected a Chairman, a Vice Chairman, and adopted its rules for the 113th Congress. Members of the Joint Committee on the Library elected Senator CHARLES E. SCHUMER as Vice-Chairman and Congressman GREGG HARPER as Chairman. Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Committee rules.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY 113TH CONGRESS

TITLE I—MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. Regular meetings may be called by the chairman, with the concurrence of the vice-chairman, as may be deemed necessary or pursuant to the provision of paragraph 3 of rule XXVI of the Standings Rules of the Senate.

2. Meetings of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the committee on the same subject for a period of no more that 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (A) through (F) would require the meeting to be closed followed immediately by a recorded vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(A) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(B) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personal or internal staff management or procedures;

(C) will tend to charge an individual with a crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy of an individual;

(D) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interest of effective law enforcement;

(E) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(F) may divulge matters required to kept confidential under the provisions of law or Government regulation. (Paragraph 5(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.)

3. Written notices of committee meetings will normally be sent by the committee's staff director to all members at least 3 days in advance. In addition, the committee staff will email or telephone reminders of committee meetings to all members of the committee or to the appropriate staff assistants in their offices.

4. A copy of the committee's intended agenda enumerating separate items of committee business will normally be sent to all members of the committee by the staff director at least 1 day in advance of all meetings. This does not preclude any member of the committee from raising appropriate non-agenda topics.

5. Any witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing shall file with the clerk of the committee at least 3 business days before the date of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and an executive summary thereof, in such form as the chairman may direct, unless the chairman waived such a requirement for good cause.

TITLE II—QUORUMS

1. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 4 members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

2. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(2) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 2 members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony; provided, however, once a quorum is established, any one member can continue to take such testimony.

3. Under no circumstance may proxies be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

TITLE III—VOTING

1. Voting in the committee on any issue will normally be by voice vote.

2. If a third of the members present so demand, a recorded vote will be taken on any question by rollcall.

3. The results of the rollcall votes taken in any meeting upon a measure, or any amendment thereto, shall be stated in the committee report on that measure unless previously announced by the committee, and such report or announcement shall be include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and the votes cast in opposition to each measure and amendment by each member of the committee. (Paragraph 7(b) and (c) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

4. Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the committee. However, the vote of the committee to report a measure or matters shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the committee who are physically present at the time of the vote. Proxies will be allowed in such cases solely for the purpose of recording a member's position on the question and then only in those instances when the absentee committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded. (Paragraph 7(a)(3) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

TITLE IV—DELEGATION AND AUTHORITY TO THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN

1. The chairman and vice chairman are authorized to sign all necessary vouchers and routine papers for which the committee's approval is required and to decide in the committee's behalf on all routine business.

2. The chairman is authorized to engage commercial reporters for the preparation of transcripts of committee meetings and hearings.

3. The chairman is authorized to issue, on behalf of the committee, regulations normally promulgated by the committee at the beginning of each session.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on May 7, 2013, the Joint Committee on Printing organized, elected a Chairman, a Vice Chairman, and adopted its rules for the 113th Congress. Members of the Joint Committee on Printing elected Senator CHARLES E. SCHUMER as Chairman and Congressman GREGG HARPER as Vice Chairman. Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Committee rules.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING, 113TH CONGRESS

RULE 1.—COMMITTEE RULES

(a) The rules of the Senate and House insofar as they are applicable, shall govern the Committee.

(b) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record as soon as possible following the Committee's organizational meeting in each odd-numbered year.

(c) Where these rules require a vote of the members of the Committee, polling of members either in writing or by telephone shall not be permitted to substitute for a vote taken at a Committee meeting, unless the ranking minority member assents to waiver of this requirement.

(d) Proposals for amending Committee rules shall be sent to all members at least one week before final action is taken thereon, unless the amendment is made by unanimous consent.

RULE 2.—REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House and Senate are in session. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered and after appropriate notification is made to the ranking minority member. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman, as he may deem necessary or at the request of the majority of the members of the Committee.

(b) If the Chairman of the Committee is not present at any meeting of the Committee, the vice-Chairman or ranking member of the majority party on the Committee who is present shall preside at the meeting.

RULE 3.—QUORUM

(a) Five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum, which is required for the purpose of closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders or changing the rules of the Committee.

(b) Three members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE 4.—PROXIES

(a) Written or telegraphic proxies of Committee members will be received and recorded on any vote taken by the Committee, except for the purpose of creating a quorum.

(b) Proxies will be allowed on any such votes for the purpose of recording a member's position on a question only when the absentee Committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded.

RULE 5.—OPEN AND CLOSED MEETINGS

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of business of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No such vote shall be required to close a meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(b) No person other than members of the Committee, and such congressional staff and other representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business session that has been closed to the public.

RULE 6.—ALTERNATING CHAIRMANSHIP AND VICE-CHAIRMANSHIP BY CONGRESSES

(a) The Chairmanship and vice Chairmanship of the Committee shall alternate between the House and the Senate by Congresses: The senior member of the minority party in the House of Congress opposite of that of the Chairman shall be the ranking minority member of the Committee.

(b) In the event the House and Senate are under different party control, the Chairman and vice Chairman shall represent the majority party in their respective Houses. When the Chairman and vice-Chairman represent different parties, the vice-Chairman shall also fulfill the responsibilities of the ranking minority member as prescribed by these rules.

RULE 7.—PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Questions as to the order of business and the procedures of Committee shall in the first instance be decided by the Chairman; subject always to an appeal to the Committee.

RULE 8.—HEARINGS: PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS AND WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the Committee, shall make public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the Chairman shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The staff director of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, all witnesses appearing before the Committee shall file advance written statements of their proposed testimony at least 48 hours in advance of their appearance and their oral testimony shall be limited to brief summaries. Limited insertions or additional germane material will be received for the record, subject to the approval of the Chairman.

RULE 9.—OFFICIAL HEARING RECORD

(a) An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all Committee proceedings and actions. Brief supplemental materials when required to clarify the transcript may be inserted in the record subject to the approval of the Chairman.

(b) Each member of the Committee shall be provided with a copy of the hearing transcript for the purpose of correcting errors of transcription and grammar, and clarifying questions or remarks. If any other person is authorized by a Committee Member to make his corrections, the staff director shall be so notified.

(c) Members who have received unanimous consent to submit written questions to witnesses shall be allowed two days within which to submit these to the staff director for transmission to the witnesses. The record may be held open for a period not to exceed two weeks awaiting the responses by witnesses.

(d) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee. Testimony received in closed hearings shall not be released or included in any report without the approval of the Committee.

RULE 10.—WITNESSES FOR COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(a) Selection of witnesses for Committee hearings shall be made by the Committee staff under the direction of the Chairman. A list of proposed witnesses shall be submitted to the members of the Committee for review sufficiently in advance of the hearings to permit suggestions by the Committee members to receive appropriate consideration.

(b) The Chairman shall provide adequate time for questioning of witnesses by all members, including minority Members and the rule of germaneness shall be enforced in all hearings notified.

(c) Whenever a hearing is conducted by the Committee upon any measure or matter, the minority on the Committee shall be entitled, upon unanimous request to the Chairman before the completion of such hearings, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

RULE 11.—CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION FURNISHED TO THE COMMITTEE

The information contained in any books, papers or documents furnished to the Committee by any individual, partnership, corporation or other legal entity shall, upon the request of the individual, partnership, corporation or entity furnishing the same, be maintained in strict confidence by the members and staff of the Committee, except that any such information may be released outside of executive session of the Committee if the release thereof is effected in a manner which will not reveal the identity of such individual, partnership, corporation or entity in connection with any pending hearing or as a part of a duly authorized report of the Committee if such release is deemed essential to the performance of the functions of the Committee and is in the public interest.

RULE 12.—BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The rule for broadcasting of Committee hearings shall be the same as Rule XI, clause 4, of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 13.—COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) No Committee report shall be made public or transmitted to the Congress without the approval of a majority of the Committee except when Congress has adjourned: provided that any member of the Committee may make a report supplementary to or dissenting from the majority report. Such supplementary or dissenting reports should be as brief as possible.

(b) Factual reports by the Committee staff may be printed for distribution to Committee members and the public only upon authorization of the Chairman either with the approval of a majority of the Committee or with the consent of the ranking minority member.

RULE 14.—CONFIDENTIALITY OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

No summary of a Committee report, prediction of the contents of a report, or statement of conclusions concerning any investigation shall be made by a member of the Committee or by any staff member of the Committee prior to the issuance of a report of the Committee.

RULE 15.—COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The Committee shall have a staff director, selected by the Chairman. The staff director shall be an employee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate.

(b) The Ranking Minority Member may designate an employee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate as the minority staff director.

(c) The staff director, under the general supervision of the Chairman, is authorized to deal directly with agencies of the Government and with non-Government groups and individuals on behalf of the Committee.

(d) The Chairman or staff director shall timely notify the Ranking Minority Member or the minority staff director of decisions made on behalf of the Committee.

RULE 16.—COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman of the Committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. Specifically, the Chairman is authorized, during the interim periods between meetings of the Committee, to act on all requests submitted by any executive department, independent agency, temporary or permanent commissions and committees of the Federal Government, the Government Printing Office and any other Federal entity, pursuant to the requirements of applicable Federal law and regulations.

BATTLE OF ATTU 70TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 70th Anniversary of the Battle of Attu.

The Battle of Attu is often times forgotten or dismissed, but this battle is an important part of our history as a Nation. After all, it was the last battle between warring nations to be fought in North America.

During WWII Alaska was still a territory to the United States, and in 1942, Japan seized three islands off the end of the Aleutian chain in the most southwest part of Alaska. Japan prepared the island for the inevitable counterattack.

On May 11 1943, the Americans launched towards Attu Island, and a battle raged until May 29 when 800 Japanese soldiers employed a full fledged Banzai attack, fighting hand to hand. While the Japanese attack crumbled,

Japanese soldiers pulled grenades, dying by their own hand as a sign of honor. By the afternoon, the battle was over. American forces had prevailed.

This battle was remarkable in many ways. More men were killed in action on Attu than at Pearl Harbor. It also remains the only time American soldiers have fought an invading army on American soil since the war of 1812. Last summer I had the honor of travelling to Attu with Admiral Ostebo, the Coast Guard District 17 Commander, where we dedicated a permanent memorial to the sacrifice of the Attu villagers. Now all who walk the hills of Attu will be reminded of the sacrifice Attu village residents and other Alaskans made during World War II.

An article in the Anchorage Daily News by Mike Dunham did a great job in relaying the story of the battle, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anchorage Daily News, May 4, 2013]

70 YEARS AGO THIS MONTH, THE BATTLE OF ATTU RAGED

(By Mike Dunham)

Cpl. Joe Sasser was asleep in his pup tent on a cold, soggy morning 70 years ago when the alarm sounded. ''Somebody was shouting, 'The Japs have come through!' '' he recalled.

Sasser's outfit, the 50th Engineers, were builders, not fighters. Most of the men—and there weren't a lot of them—were what the Army calls noncombatants. Their job was to make roads and move supplies to the soldiers on the front lines. The strung-out line of supply tents was not fortified. The soldiers had rifles, not machine guns.

He struggled into his perpetually damp leather boots—''Not the right attire'' for the snow and mud of Alaska, he said—grabbed his helmet and M–1 rifle, went to an embankment created when the road was pushed through a few days earlier and peered over the side.

''The Japanese were moving up the hill,'' he said. ''The ravines were full of them'' in numbers that far exceeded the Americans at the outpost.

He watched the mass of determined, desperate men swarm toward him in an action no U.S. soldier had faced since the War of 1812—a bayonet charge by an enemy invader on American soil.

Thus began the Battle of Engineer Hill, the last battle between warring nations to be fought in North America.

THEATER OF FRUSTRATION

In 1942 Japan seized three islands at the end of Alaska's Aleutian chain. Only one, Attu, had a village. The citizens, mostly Aleut Natives, were sent to internment camps in Japan. The invaders prepared the island for the counterattack they knew would come.

Historians debate whether Japan's Alaska incursion was a feint to draw attention away from their real target, Midway Island, or part of an ambitious plan to create a virtual ''fence'' across the Pacific.

Either way, the propaganda value was undeniable. The Territory of Alaska was part of the North American continent, sharing the mainland with the 48 states. The occupation by a hostile force, even of an island 1,000 miles from the coast, constituted an embarrassment that could not be tolerated.

On May 11, 1943, the Americans launched the Battle of Attu with amphibious landings from two directions.

The day began in fog, Sasser recalled in a phone call from his home in Carthage, Miss., last month. ''But it cleared up somewhat later in the day. We got on our boats and went ashore at Massacre Bay,'' the southern landing site.

''There was no resistance.''

It was a misleading start.

American intelligence originally estimated Japanese strength at 500 men. There were more like 2,500. U.S. maps were incomplete or inaccurate. Planners failed to understand the swampy tundra that rose from the beach, a skim of grass over bottomless muck. Soldiers went ashore in summer uniforms and slick-bottom leather boots suitable for desert combat.

The defenders waited in the steep mountains, cloaked in clouds, set in positions to cover the approaches in crossfire. When the Americans were well into Massacre Valley, the Japanese opened up with machine guns and mortars. The valley offered little cover and no quick retreat. The advance ground to a halt and the scene turned into what one historian has called ''the theater of military frustration.''

Planes supposed to provide air cover crashed in the Aleutian winds. Some attacked American soldiers by mistake. The offshore armada couldn't see or reach inland targets where U.S. forces were getting ripped up. Heavy guns and supplies barely moved off the beach as heavy equipment bogged down in the mire.

''The invasion of Attu was scheduled for a three-day deal,'' Sasser said. ''Three days, they told us, and we'd be out of there.''

On the fifth day the commanding general was replaced. Reinforcements poured in as the Americans suffered heavy losses—not just from the bullets but from exposure. Some froze or died from hypothermia. ''Trench foot'' and frostbite crippled their numbers. So did the psychological battering of constant incoming fire.

''We went on one detail all the way across the valley to pick up a guy who'd lost his marbles,'' Sasser said. ''He was really a zombie at that point. He followed us back, almost like a child, not saying anything.''

GALLONS OF BLOOD

Historian John Cloe observes that ''two under-strength Japanese infantry battalions on half-rations'' repeatedly threw back six battalions of amply supplied U.S. infantry. But bit by bit the Americans pushed ahead—particularly on days when air support could reach them.

On the seventh day, the Japanese retreated toward Chichagof Harbor. The Americans' northern and southern landing forces finally met. The Americans slowly took possession of strategic ground, one yard at a time, each little victory measured in gallons of blood. By May 28, the Japanese were cornered at Chichagof Harbor.

Commander Col. Yasuyo Yamazaki had less than half his forces still able to fight. They were almost out of ammunition and near starvation.

But the valley above the harbor was lightly defended with the Americans' main fighting units dispersed along the high ground—and there were caches of U.S. supplies at the top.

Yamazaki devised a last-ditch plan. A surprise attack could throw the Americans in Chichigof Valley back in panic. In the rout, his men might reach the heavy artillery in Massacre Valley and turn the Americans' own guns against them. He could replenish his stock of weapons, hold strategic ground, cut supply lines, divide the dispirited American forces and perhaps maintain a stalemate until help arrived.

But he knew the odds of success were slim. He ordered all documents burned. Men too sick or injured to fight died either by their own hand or from an overdose of morphine.

BANZAI

Just before dawn on May 29, Americans in the valley were told to leave their positions and get a hot breakfast at the regimental mess tent. Cloe suspects the order may have been spread by an English-speaking Japanese infiltrator.

The groggy men were thinking of coffee when upwards of 800 screaming Japanese came charging out of the mist and dark. The Americans were caught off guard and overrun. Fighting was hand-to-hand. It was impossible to see what was going on. There were no prisoners.

The Japanese reached the medical tents and slaughtered the wounded in their cots. Their death shrieks added to the chaos. U.S. troops, their top officers dead, uncertain of the number or positions of the invisible enemy, scattered or retreated.

It was one of those soldiers, fleeing over Engineer Hill, who gave the warning that woke Sasser.

Among those escaping the carnage was an unarmed doctor. ''He asked for a gun, but nobody had two,'' Sasser said. ''He disappeared for a while and came back with a rifle and took up position with us. He wanted to be in the fight.''

Dr. John Bassett was killed about 15 feet from Sasser.

Sasser had a slight advantage over many of the other men. He had trained as a scout before being transferred to the engineers. As he looked down on the approaching Japanese, he felt lucky that he'd moved his tent the night before.

''Three of us initially pitched at the crest of a ravine. Then, I can't remember why, we moved 40 to 50 yards farther up the hill to the road bed,'' he said. ''Two other guys thought it was a good spot and pitched there. They were bayonetted in their sleeping bags.''

Sasser credited a small embankment along the road for saving him from a similar fate. ''It saved our lives.''

Outnumbered and rattled, a thin line of bulldozer drivers, mechanics, medics and cooks formed a hasty defense. Some of the men didn't have time to put on their boots. The only automatic weapons they had were those dropped by the men in retreat.

But the Japanese had even less, little more than bayonets, swords, knives and sticks along with a few precious bullets. Nonetheless, they engaged the Americans with a ferocity that Sasser recalls to this day.

''They were a tenacious group,'' he said. ''I was surprised. It was dishonor for them to be captured and an honor to be killed.''

Yamazaki died with his sword in hand. The Japanese fell back and reassembled for a second charge. The Americans had their rifles ready.

''We picked 'em off one by one,'' Sasser said.

As their assault crumbled, the remaining Japanese each took the grenade he kept for himself, gripped it to his chest or his head—and pulled the pin.

The battle was over. The valley, in the words of one historian, looked like an excavated cemetery. Hundreds of corpses from both sides lay atop the rock and tundra.

''Then we had to go down there and pick 'em up,'' Sasser said.

Morning's heroes became the afternoon's grave diggers.

AFTERMATH

The Battle of Attu, often dismissed or forgotten, was remarkable in many ways.

More men were killed in action on Attu than at Pearl Harbor: at least 2,350 Japanese—plus those never accounted for—and 549 Americans; 1,148 Americans were wounded and 2,100 listed as casualties due to cold and shell shock. How many Americans died as a result of injuries in the weeks after the battle is uncertain, but some say it was equal to or greater than the battlefield deaths.

Fewer than 30 Japanese were captured alive.

It was the only land battle in the war fought in the Americas, the first amphibious landing by the U.S. Army and, aside from Iwo Jima, the most costly in terms of the percentage of American casualties. ''For every hundred of the enemy, about 71 Americans were killed or wounded,'' according to the official Army history.

It was the first time in the war that the U.S. military retook occupied American territory, and the first time the Army encountered the fanatical fight-to-the-death ethos of the Japanese.

It remains the only time American soldiers have fought an invading army on American soil since the War of 1812.

It was the deadliest battle on the continent since the Civil War.

But history wasn't on Sasser's mind as he braced for the screaming, charging enemy 70 years ago. ''At that particular point I was not aware of the significance,'' he said. ''I just knew we were there because it was American territory. And we were going to get it back.''

REMEMBERING AUDREY THIBODEAU

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on May 25, loving family members and countless friends will gather in Presque Isle, ME, to celebrate the remarkable life of Audrey Bishop Thibodeau, who passed away January 2, at the age of 97. I rise today in tribute to a caring citizen and dear friend.

It has been said that we all have a birth date and a death date, with a dash in between. It's what we do with our dash that counts.

Audrey Thibodeau's dash was long, and she made it count. She was a devoted wife, a wonderful mother, an educator, a farmer, and an entrepreneur. Wherever there was a need, she was a committed volunteer and a generous philanthropist.

She was born Audrey Elaine Bishop on December 13, 1915, in Caribou, ME, my hometown. She attended Caribou public schools and, in 1937, graduated from the University of Maine with a degree in nutrition. It was while teaching high school home economics that she developed one of the great passions of her life—raising awareness and fostering education for students with reading disabilities. Her commitment to youth was also seen years later when she founded a Pony Club to help young people learn the skills and responsibilities of horsemanship.

In 1939, she married Lawrence Thibodeau, a high school classmate. After a brief adventure with farming in New York State, they returned to Maine and settled in Fort Kent, on the Canadian border. It was there that Audrey immersed herself in French to better appreciate the culture of the region.

The couple, with their growing family, relocated to Presque Isle in 1946 and soon became valued members of that community. Audrey's love of local culture led her to become instrumental in the incorporation of the Vera Estes House into the Presque Isle Historical Society and the creation of the Cultural and Museum Center at the Old Presque Isle Fire House, which celebrates the heritage of the local area. Audrey witnessed much history during her long life. Just as important, she was devoted to preserving the rich history of Aroostook County for future generations.

Her husband, Lawrence Thibodeau, better known as ''Tib,'' passed away in 2008, but he will long be remembered for his contributions to Maine agriculture and support of the University of Maine Cooperative Extension Service. Together, the couple will always be remembered for the Larry and Audrey Thibodeau Scholarship that helps Aroostook County students pursue careers in medicine. After Audrey's passing, her family carried on her commitment to others by asking that memorial contributions be made to the Audrey B. Thibodeau Charitable and Educational Fund.

Audrey's philanthropy and volunteerism earned her accolades from the Maine Legislature and the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Presque Isle Area Chamber of Commerce. Her service and compassion will always be cherished by the people of Aroostook County. A strong leader, Audrey Thibodeau filled her dash with an infectious smile, enthusiasm for life, assistance to others, community participation, a dedication to Aroostook County, and a great deal of love for her remarkable family. May her memory inspire us all to follow her example.

RECOGNIZING AROOSTOOK MEDICAL CENTER

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to commend The Aroostook Medical Center, TAMC, in Presque Isle, ME, for its efforts to improve its energy efficiency with compressed natural gas, CNG.

Dedicated to environmental stewardship and improving the community, TAMC is at the cutting edge with its conversion to CNG to meet the hospital's heating, cooling, and other energy needs. CNG represents a sensible effort to use a viable and affordable domestic energy alternative. This event demonstrates TAMC's efforts to create, sustain, and grow a modern health care organization to continue making a positive difference in Aroostook County. The countless and continuing efforts this northern Maine hospital is making to energy efficiency are to be commended for their lasting impact.

Converting to CNG is just one of the ways TAMC has reduced its carbon footprint. This efficient source of energy is safer to work with, will lower costs, and will burn more cleanly. The conversion to CNG will not only benefit the hospital and its patients and employees directly, but also will benefit the entire community by reducing emissions.

TAMC is quickly becoming a leader in environmentally friendly practices in northern Maine. The hospital has made changes to its nutritional program by eliminating disposable kitchenware, which has reduced the amount of waste it sends to the area's landfill. In addition, TAMC partners with the University of Maine at Presque Isle to improve composting. TAMC also purchases produce from MSAD No. 1 school farm, local farmers, and other small local growers to support the community and reduce transportation emissions.

Whether it is taking actions as small as reducing waste or as large as converting to CNG, TAMC is making a positive impact on the area, improving both public health and the environment. I commend TAMC for its commitment to conservation and improving efficiency. TAMC is truly standing up to its motto, TAMC: More Than a Hospital.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING THE BOSTON CHILDREN'S MUSEUM

• Mr. COWAN. Mr. President, today I am delighted to recognize the Boston Children's Museum for receiving the National Medal for Museum and Library Service. I had the pleasure of congratulating the staff of the Boston Children's Museum earlier today before they headed to the White House to have the medal presented in a ceremony by the First Lady.

This medal is the Nation's highest honor conferred on museums and libraries. The award is given to institutions which demonstrate extraordinary and innovative approaches to public service, exceeding the expected levels of community outreach. Out of 33 well-deserved finalists, only 10 were selected to receive the medal.

The Boston Children's Museum is a center of family in Massachusetts and it comes as no surprise to me that this revered institution would receive the Nation's highest honor.

Children spend their whole day learning, and Boston Children's Museum provides resources for families and educators to help support that continuous discovery. It provides a welcoming, imaginative, child centered learning environment that supports families and promotes the healthy development of all children.

Boston Children's Museum is one of the oldest and largest children's museums in the world. It was founded in 1913 by a group of visionary educators as a center for the exchange of materials and ideas to advance the teaching of

science. For the past century, the museum has provided children with opportunities to engage in joyful discovery experiences that instill an appreciation of our world, develop foundational skills, and spark a lifelong love of learning.

The Museum has prided itself on developing exhibits and programs that emphasize hands on engagement and learning through experience. Children use play-based learning activities to spark their natural creativity and curiosity. The exhibits focus on science, culture, environmental awareness, health and fitness, and the arts. Museum educators also develop programs and activities that address literacy, performing arts, science and math, visual arts, cultures, and health and wellness.

Boston Children's Museum is a pioneer in early childhood education and development and works with research partners to gain a deeper understanding of how children learn, and how they develop physically, intellectually, and socio-emotionally. The museum has teamed up with researchers from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to create Play Lab—an exhibit featuring active research in cognitive development. They have also worked with Harvard University on research involving developmental studies and social cognition. Additionally, they have worked with researchers from Boston College to explore the psychology of the arts and children's understanding of emotional development.

I would like to congratulate Carole Charnow, president and chief executive officer, and all the employees at the Boston Children's Museum on receiving the National Medal for Museum and Library Service.

For 100 years, their outstanding efforts have inspired lifelong learning for generations of children and have served as a model for the Nation in early childhood education and development. I believe that the Boston Children's Museum will continue to be the best children's museum in the world and I look forward to the innovation and leadership they will deliver over the next 100 years.●

CONGRATULATING JOHN ANTHONY SCIRE

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Dr. John Anthony Scire, who has been awarded the 2013 Dean's Award for Teaching by a Member of the Contingent Faculty of the University of Nevada, Reno. My home State of Nevada is proud and privileged to acknowledge an extraordinary educator and leader.

Since 1993, Dr. John Scire has dedicated himself to the students and faculty of the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Nevada, Reno, UNR, as an adjunct professor. His extensive education in areas of international relations, international finance, and political science has prepared him for his service to the students of UNR. Nevada is fortunate to have such great educational leadership serving the students across our great State.

Prior to working in higher education, Dr. John Scire served nearly three decades in the U.S. military. His work included intelligence, counterintelligence, and psychological warfare operations that were vital to maintaining the national security of our country. Dr. Scire, like all of our military men and women, dedicated his life to serve this great Nation, and I am grateful for his sacrifices.

I want to acknowledge and thank Dr. John Scire for his faithful service to our country, both in the classroom and protecting America. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. John Scire and celebrating the achievements of our Nation's teachers, administrators, and staff who help guide our students to educational excellence.●

TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT TIMOTHY HALL

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Sergeant Timothy Hall, an extraordinary Nevadan who sacrificed his well-being in defense of this great Nation. The State of Nevada and the U.S. Army are proud and grateful for his selfless service and dedication to protecting our freedom.

Sergeant Hall put service to his Nation above his personal safety in 2010 when he was deployed to Afghanistan. He was willing to stand up and defend the United States in some of the harshest conditions. Just 6 months into Sergeant Hall's deployment, he was critically wounded in an enemy mortar attack that resulted in the loss of both his legs. Since then, Sergeant Hall has endured more than 60 surgeries and countless hours of rehabilitation.

In Sergeant Hall, I see the values of integrity, service, and excellence that define the brave men and women in our Armed Forces. It is these virtues that will define the rest of his life as he continues to adapt to the civilian world as a disabled veteran in his hometown of Hawthorne, NV. Sergeant Hall is the kind of patriot who, at the end of the day, is a hero that dedicated himself wholly to the most professional fighting force the world has ever known. America is an exceptional nation because of heroes like Sergeant Hall who are dedicated to securing our freedom no matter what the situation, no matter what the challenge.

All of our Nation's service men and women know all too well the price that is paid for freedom. Each and every day, our troops are serving the United States to protect our liberties. They dedicate their lives in service and constantly make grave sacrifices to ensure the safety of our country. For all who served and all who continue to serve, I cannot thank you enough, and you will continue to have my unwavering support.

I ask my colleagues to stand with me in honoring Sergeant Hall's service to our Nation. Let us continue to be mindful of our dedicated service members who fight to protect and preserve the ideals of freedom and democracy.●

RECOGNIZING VIVA FLORIDA 500

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the events taking place in my home State of Florida commemorating five centuries of historic and cultural significance.

Five hundred years ago Spanish explorer Juan Ponce de León led an expedition from the island of Puerto Rico in search of new territory for Spain to claim. Ponce de León laid claim to the new territory they found, calling the site La Florida because of the lush floral beauty that he saw. From our beautiful sandy beaches, to our rivers and lakes, to the Everglades in South Florida, our State remains true to Ponce de León's first description.

Ponce de León's landing can be considered the first step in Florida's journey to become a part of our great country. Ponce de León was the first European to land on what is now the continental United States. His landing predates some of the most treasured historical sites and moments in the United States, including the English landing at Jamestown, VA, and the Pilgrims landing at Plymouth, MA.

It is also important to recognize the State of Florida's Native American population during these events. Native Americans inhabited territories in and around Florida prior to Ponce de León's arrival and continue to make a positive contribution to our State and its culture.

Since its founding over five centuries ago, Florida continues to display its rich history by contributing new ideas, culture, and events to the American experience. I am proud to come from a State with a deeply rooted history, and I celebrate the State of Florida's leadership both past and present.

Mr. President, colleagues, please join me in recognizing the State of Florida and its 500th anniversary.●

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW DOWNS

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Andrew Downs who, at age 15, has been named to the first ever National Youth Orchestra of the United States. Andrew is a native of Irondale, AL, and is a sophomore at the Alabama School of Fine Arts. He is the principal bassist for the Alabama Symphony Youth Orchestra.

The National Youth Orchestra of the United States of America is an initiative of Carnegie Hall's Weill Music Institute that brings together 120 of the most promising and talented young musicians from across the country to play together across the Nation and the globe. This year marks their inaugural session.

Andrew was selected out of a pool of 2,500 applicants from all 50 States, and is clearly one of Alabama's most talented young musicians. He is a member of the National Junior Honor Society and also plays the violin, cello, and piano. He hopes to one day pursue a career as a bass player for a symphony orchestra.

This talented young man will be the only Alabamian in the orchestra, as well as one of only 10 bassists selected. I am proud to represent a State that is home to promising young individuals such as Andrew, who are committed to displaying excellence in their education and the arts.

Further, I wish Andrew Downs all the best as he embarks on his journey playing with the National Youth Orchestra. This is a true honor bestowed upon a very deserving student.●

TRIBUTE TO HANNAH MUDD

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Hannah Mudd, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Hannah is a graduate of St. Vincent de Paul High School in Perryville, MO. Currently, she is attending Saint Mary's College, where she is majoring in political science and history. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Hannah for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KARINA KIEWEL

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Karina Kiewel, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Karina is a graduate of Dakota Valley High School in North Sioux City, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of Kansas, where she is majoring in political science and environmental studies. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Karina for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:29 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1071. An act to specify the size of the precious-metal blanks that will be used in the production of the National Baseball Hall of Fame commemorative coins.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 888. A bill to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–1378. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Liquidity and Funding'' (RIN3052–AC54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1379. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Wisconsin'' (Docket No. APHIS–2012–0075) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1380. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Updates to the List of Plant Inspection Stations'' (Docket No. APHIS–2012–0099) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1381. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Dinotefuran; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions; Technical Amendment'' (FRL No. 9384–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1382. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9384–3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1383. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Data Requirements for Antimicrobial Pesticides'' (FRL No. 8886–5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1384. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Carol M. Pottenger, United States Navy Reserves, and her advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1385. A communication from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2013 Report to Congress on Vulnerability Assessments for Fiscal Year 2012 and Military Construction Requirements for the Then-Current Future Years Defense Plan''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1386. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2013 Report to Congress on Sustainable Ranges''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1387. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1388. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2012 Statement on System of Internal Controls, audited financial statements, Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm, and Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance with Government Auditing Standards; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1389. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Kuwait; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1390. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1391. A communication from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Order Imposing Recordkeeping and Reporting Obligations on Certain U.S. Financial Institutions with Respect to Transactions Involving Halawi Exchange Co. as a Financial Institution of Primary Money Laundering Concern'' (RIN1506–AA63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 26, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1392. A communication from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Order Imposing Recordkeeping and Reporting Obligations on Certain U.S. Financial Institutions with Respect to Transactions Involving Kassem Rmeiti and Co. for Exchange as a Financial Institution of Primary Money Laundering Concern'' (RIN1506–AA63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 26, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1393. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA–2013–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1394. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management

Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA–2013–0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1395. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Identity Theft Red Flags Rules'' (RIN3235–AL26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1396. A communication from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2012 management reports; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1397. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the North Slope Science Initiative; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1398. A communication from the Administrator of the U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1399. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Segregation of Lands—Renewable Energy'' (RIN1004–AE19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 26, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1400. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Geologic Sequestration of Carbon Dioxide: Draft Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program Class VI Well Plugging, Post-Injection Site Care, and Site Closure Guidance''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1401. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Delegation of New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada'' (FRL No. 9806–3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1402. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Listing of Substitutes for Ozone-Depleting Substances—Fire Suppression and Explosion Protection'' (FRL No. 9800–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1403. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule: Revision to Best Available Monitoring Method Request Submission Deadline for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems Source Category'' (FRL No. 9806–7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1404. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant New Use Rule on Ethoxylated, Propoxylated Diamine Diaryl Substituted Phenylmethane Ester with Alkenylsuccinate, Dialkylethanolamine Salt'' (FRL No. 9885–1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1405. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Georgia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions'' (FRL No. 9806–9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1406. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to Control of Air Pollution from Nitrogen Compounds from Stationary Sources'' (FRL No. 9808–2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1407. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Approval of Texas Low Emission Diesel Fuel Rule Revisions'' (FRL No. 9808–4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1408. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Consent Decree Requirements'' (FRL No. 9809–1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1409. A communication from the Acting United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report relative to the inclusion of Japan in the ongoing negotiations of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Agreement; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1410. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Relief from the Anti-cutback Requirements of 411(d)(6) for Certain ESOP Amendments'' (Notice 2013–17) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 26, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1411. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report concerning military assistance and military exports, including defence articles and defense services which where licensed for export under Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended (OSS–2013–0590); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1412. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13–053, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1413. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13–033, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1414. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–052); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1415. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–060); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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. MERKLEY:

S. 891. A bill to increase the employment of Americans by requiring State workforce agencies to certify that employers are actively recruiting Americans and that Americans are not qualified or available to fill the positions that the employer wants to fill with H–2B nonimmigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 892. A bill to amend the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 to impose sanctions with respect to certain transactions in foreign currencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 893. A bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 894. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend expiring authority for work-study allowances for individuals who are pursuing programs of rehabilitation, education, or training under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to expand such authority to certain outreach

services provided through congressional offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 895. A bill to improve the ability of the Food and Drug Administration to study the use of antimicrobial drugs in food-producing animals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 896. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 897. A bill to prevent the doubling of the interest rate for Federal subsidized student loans for the 2013–2014 academic year by providing funds for such loans through the Federal Reserve System, to ensure that such loans are available at interest rates that are equivalent to the interest rates at which the Federal Government provides loans to banks through the discount window operated by the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 898. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Albuquerque, New Mexico, to the Amy Biehl High School Foundation; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 899. A bill to establish a position of Science Laureate of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. 900. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to regulate payroll tax deposit agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 901. A bill to protect State and local witnesses from tampering and retaliation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 902. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to apply the provisions of the Act to certain Congressional staff and members of the executive branch; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. REED)):

S. 903. A bill to clarify State of residence requirements for aliens and nonimmigrant requirements for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 904. A bill to minimize the economic and social costs resulting from losses of life, property, well-being, business activity, and economic growth associated with extreme weather events by ensuring that the United States is more resilient to the impacts of extreme weather events in the short- and long-term, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 905. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to enhance existing programs providing mitigation assistance by encouraging States to adopt and actively enforce State building codes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 906. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the technologies through which a vehicle qualifies for the credit for new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 907. A bill to provide grants to better understand and reduce gestational diabetes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

S. 908. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the diagnosis and treatment of hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 909. A bill to amend the Federal Direct Loan Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for student loan affordability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 910. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Indian tribes to receive charitable contributions of apparently wholesome food; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. Res. 131. A resolution recommending the designation of a Presidential Special Envoy to the Balkans to evaluate the successes and shortcomings of the implementation of the Dayton Peace Accords in Bosnia and Herzegovina, to provide policy recommendations, and to report back to Congress within one year; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. Res. 132. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Department of Defense request for domestic Base Realignment and Closure authority in 2015 and 2017 is neither affordable nor feasible as of the date of agreement to this resolution and that the Department of Defense must further analyze the capability to consolidate excess overseas infrastructure and increase efficiencies by relocating missions from overseas to domestic installations prior to requesting domestic Base Realignment and Closure authority; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BURR, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. Res. 133. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress and the States should investigate and correct abusive, unsanitary, and illegal abortion practices; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. Res. 134. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that all incidents of abusive, unsanitary, or illegal health care practices should be condemned and prevented and the perpetrators should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 131

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 131, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured veterans and their spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 273

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 273, a bill to modify the definition of fiduciary under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to exclude appraisers of employee stock ownership plans.

S. 294

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 294, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 296, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate discrimination in the immigration laws by permitting permanent partners of United States citizens and lawful permanent residents to obtain lawful permanent resident status in the same manner as spouses of citizens and lawful permanent residents and to penalize immigration fraud in connection with permanent partnerships.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 309, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi

(Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 313, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the ''Doolittle Tokyo Raiders'', for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to add Vietnam Veterans Day as a patriotic and national observance.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 427, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to provide flexibility to school food authorities in meeting certain nutritional requirements for the school lunch and breakfast programs, and for other purposes.

S. 501

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 501, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 534

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes.

S. 545

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 545, a bill to improve hydropower, and for other purposes.

S. 548

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 548, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve and enhance the capabilities of the Armed Forces to prevent and respond to sexual assault and sexual harassment in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, a bill to establish a fund to make payments to the Americans held hostage in Iran, and to members of their families, who are identified as members of the proposed class in case number 1:08-CV–00487 (EGS) of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 579, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. COWAN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 623, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reset interest rates for new student loans.

S. 709

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 709, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, leading to better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 710

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 710, a bill to provide exemptions from municipal advisor registration requirements.

S. 731

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 731, a bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency to conduct an empirical impact study on proposed rules relating to the International Basel III agreement on general risk-based capital requirements, as they apply to community banks.

S. 742

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 742, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 761

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 761, a bill to promote energy savings in residential and commercial buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

S. 789

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. 789, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

S. 813

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 813, a bill to require that Peace Corps volunteers be subject to the same limitations regarding coverage of abortion services as employees of the Peace Corps with respect to coverage of such services, and for other purposes.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

S. 837

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 837, a bill to expand and improve opportunities for beginning farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes.

S. 845

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 845, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Professionals Educational Assistance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma

(Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 862, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 867

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 867, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for pharmacy benefits manager standards under the Medicare prescription drug program, to establish basic audit standards of pharmacies, to further transparency of payment methodology to pharmacies, and to provide for recoupment returns to Medicare.

S. 871

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. 871, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance assistance for victims of sexual assault committed by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 877

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 877, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to allow public access to research of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 878

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 878, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 886

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 886, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 888, a bill to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

AMENDMENT NO. 802

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 802 intended to be proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 803

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. COWAN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 803 proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 804

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 804 intended to be proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 805

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 805 proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 806

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 806 proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 810

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 810 intended to be proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 813

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 813 proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 813 proposed to S. 601, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 893. A bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am proud to introduce the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2013. I am also pleased to be joined by Ranking Member BURR and all of my colleagues on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in introducing this important legislation. I look forward to our continued work together to improve the lives of our Nation's veterans.

Effective December 1, 2013, this measure would direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to increase the rates of veterans' compensation to keep pace with a rise in the cost-of-living, should an adjustment be prompted by an increase in the Consumer Price Index, CPI. Referred to as the COLA, this important legislation would make an increase available to veterans at the same level as the increase provided to recipients of Social Security benefits.

Last year, I was proud to cosponsor the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2012, which provided a 1.7 percent increase in veterans' compensation. The annual COLA legislation is so important because it impacts vital benefits, including veterans' disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving spouses and children. In fiscal year 2014, it is projected that over 4.2 million veterans and survivors will receive compensation benefits.

As a longstanding advocate of our Nation's veterans, I understand the critical nature of these benefits as many recipients depend upon these tax-free payments to feed their families,

heat their homes, pay for prescription drugs, and to provide for the needs of spouses and children. We have an obligation to the men and women who have sacrificed so much to serve our country and who now deserve nothing less than the full support of a grateful Nation. The COLA brings us one step closer to fulfilling our Nation's promise to care for our brave veterans and their families.

We also must continue to ensure that these benefits are not diminished by the effects of inflation. For this reason, I strongly oppose the President's proposal to adopt the chained CPI. I am joined in opposition by nearly every major veterans' organization in America. The Gold Star Wives, The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans and many, many more all oppose the chained CPI.

I will do everything within my power as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to ensure we honor the promise we made to veterans and survivors. It is important that this country address our budget deficit, but there are fairer ways to do it than on the backs of disabled veterans—men and women who have already sacrificed so much for their country.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in honoring the promise that has been made to our Nation's veterans. We cannot allow this misguided attempt to balance the budget on the backs of those who have so proudly served our Nation diminish the benefits provided to veterans and their survivors.

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. 893

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 ''Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) RATE ADJUSTMENT.—Effective on December 1, 2013, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase, in accordance with subsection (c), the dollar amounts in effect on November 30, 2013, for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount under section 1162 of such title.

(4) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a) through (d) of section 1311 of such title.

(5) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO CHILDREN.—Each of the dollar amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.—Each dollar amount described in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2013, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85–857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

(e) PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in subsection (b), as increased under subsection (a), not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2014.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 894. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend expiring authority for work-study allowances for individuals who are pursuing programs of rehabilitation, education, or training under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to expand such authority to certain outreach services provided through congressional offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am committed to ensuring we provide our Nation's veterans the opportunities they need to successfully transition back to civilian life. One of the programs afforded to veterans to assist them during this difficult time is the Department of Veterans Affairs' work-study program.

VA's work-study program provides veterans participating in several VA educational, vocational, and rehabilitation programs the opportunity to work alongside school certifying officials and State and Federal employees to assist veterans with VA benefits and services. In fiscal year 2012, this program assisted more than 10,000 veterans, who received approximately $25.7 million in work study payments. Under current law, this program is set to expire this year.

I am proud to introduce legislation that would extend VA's work-study program for three more years. This legislation would allow veterans to continue doing such important activities as conducting outreach programs with State Approving Agencies; working with a National Cemetery or a State Veteran's Cemetery; assisting in caring for veterans in State Homes; and working with school certifying officials, claims processors, and other state and federal employees to provide much needed benefits and services to our Nation's heroes.

VA has determined work-study participants do not have the authority to work in congressional offices, despite their successful service in such offices in the past. These veterans were critical to Congress' efforts to understand the needs of our Nation's veterans. They used congressional resources and personal experience to help veterans access earned benefits and services. This legislation would allow veterans to work in congressional offices to assist other veterans with casework issues, help congressional staff address the unique challenges facing our newest generation of veterans, and develop the knowledge and experience needed to successfully transition into the civilian workforce.

Our veterans have sacrificed so much in defense of this country. They deserve a seamless transition when they look to return to civilian life. This legislation would expand a program that has been so vital in preparing veterans to succeed in the civilian workforce.

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. 894

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN QUALIFYING WORK-STUDY ACTIVITIES FOR PURPOSES OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) EXTENSION OF EXPIRING CURRENT AUTHORITY.—Section 3485(a)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''June 30, 2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''June 30, 2016''.

(b) EXPANSION TO OUTREACH SERVICES PROVIDED THROUGH CONGRESSIONAL OFFICES.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(K) During the period beginning on June 30, 2013, and ending on June 30, 2016, the following activities carried out at the offices of Members of Congress for such Members:

''(i) The distribution of information to members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their dependents about the benefits and services under laws administered by the Secretary and other appropriate governmental and non-governmental programs.

''(ii) The preparation and processing of papers and other documents, including documents to assist in the preparation and presentation of claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary.''.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 30 each year, beginning with 2014 and ending with 2016, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report on the work-study allowances paid under paragraph (1) of section 3485(a) of title 38, United States Code, during the most recent one-year period for qualifying work-study activities described in paragraph (4) of such section, as amended by subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include, for the year covered by such report, the following:

(A) A description of the recipients of such work-study allowances.

(B) A list of the locations where qualifying work-study activities were carried out.

(C) A description of the outreach conducted by the Secretary to increase awareness of the eligibility of such work-study activities for such work-study allowances.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 897. A bill to prevent the doubling of the interest rate for Federal subsidized student loans for the 2013–2014 academic year by providing funds for such loans through the Federal Reserve System, to ensure that such loans are available at interest rates that are equivalent to the interest rates at which the Federal Government provides loans to banks through the discount window operated by the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, on July 1, the interest rate on new federally subsidized student loans is set to double from 3.4 to 6.8 percent. That means unless Congress acts, for millions of young people the cost of borrowing money to go to college will double.

The student debt problem in this country is a quiet but growing crisis. Today's graduates collectively carry more than $1 trillion in debt—more than all the outstanding credit card debt in the whole country. Doubling the interest rate on new student loans will just increase the pressure on our young people.

Keep in mind: these young people didn't go to the mall and run up charges on a credit card. They worked hard, they stayed in class, they learned new skills, and they borrowed what they needed to pay for their education. Their education will improve their opportunities in life, but their education will not just help these students. When they acquire more skills, these students help us build a strong and competitive economy and they strengthen our middle class.

Student interest rates are set to double in less than 2 months, but so far this Congress has done nothing—nothing—to address this problem. Some people say that we can't afford to help our kids through school by keeping student loan interest rates low. But right now, as I speak, the Federal Government offers far lower interest rates on loans, every single day—they just don't do it for everyone.

Right now, a big bank can get a loan through the Federal Reserve discount window at a rate of about 0.75 percent. But this summer a student who is trying to get a loan to go to college will pay almost 7 percent. In other words, the Federal Government is going to charge interest rates that are nine times higher than the rates for the biggest banks—the same banks that destroyed millions of jobs and nearly broke the economy. That isn't right. And that is why I am introducing legislation today to give students the same deal that we give to the big banks.

The Bank on Students Loan Fairness Act would allow students eligible for federally subsidized Stafford loans to borrow at the same rate the big banks get through the Federal Reserve discount window. For 1 year the Federal Reserve would make funds available to the Department of Education to make loans to students at the same low rates offered to the big banks. This will give students relief from high interest rates while giving Congress a chance to find a long-term solution.

Some may say we can't afford this proposal. I would remind them the Federal Government currently makes 36 cents in profit for every $1 it lends to students. Add up those profits and you'll find next year student loans will bring in $34 billion. Meanwhile, the banks pay interest that is one-ninth of the amount students will be asked to pay. That is just wrong. It doesn't reflect our values. We shouldn't be profiting from our students who are drowning in debt while we are giving a great deal to the big banks. We should be investing in our young people so they can get good jobs and grow the economy, so let's give them the same great deal the banks get.

Some explain that we give banks exceptionally low interest rates because the economy is still shaky and banks need access to cheap credit to continue the recovery. But our students are just as important as banks to a strong recovery, and the debt they carry poses a serious risk to that recovery. In fact, in March of this year, the Federal Reserve said because of the economic impact on family budgets, high levels of student debt pose a risk to our shaky economic recovery.

If the Federal Reserve can float trillions of dollars to large financial institutions at low interest rates to grow the economy, surely they can float the Department of Education the money to fund our students, keep us competitive, and grow our middle class.

Let's face it, banks get a great deal when they borrow money from the Fed. In effect, the American taxpayer is investing in those banks. We should make the same kind of investment in our young people who are trying to get an education. Lend them the money and make them pay it back, but give our kids a break on the interest they pay. Let's bank on students.

The Bank on Students Loan Fairness Act is my first stand-alone bill in the Senate. I am introducing this bill because our students are facing a crisis. We cannot stand by and simply watch. This is about our students, our economy, and our values. The Bank on Students Loan Fairness Act is a first step toward helping young people who are drowning in debt. Unlike the big banks, students don't have armies of lobbyists and lawyers. They have only their voices. And they call on us to do what is right.

I thank the Chair.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 909. A bill to amend the Federal Direct Loan Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for student loan affordability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Responsible Student Loan Solutions Act with Senator DURBIN to offer a long-term approach to setting student loan interest rates.

Congress must take swift action to prevent the doubling of the interest rate on need-based loans on July 1, 54 days away. We also need a new mechanism for setting interest rates on all federal student loans for the long term so that students and taxpayers are protected, and we need to take the time to get it right.

In April, I introduced the Student Loan Affordability Act to keep the rate on subsidized loans at 3.4 percent for the next 2 years. This would give Congress time to debate a long-term solution as part of the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Today, I am introducing legislation with Senator DURBIN and Congressman TIERNEY and Congressman COURTNEY to overhaul the mechanism for setting the interest rates on federal student loans. Instead of setting a numerical rate in law, which quickly becomes out of sync with the economic and interest rate environment, or locking borrowers into a fixed rate with no opportunity to refinance when rates drop, our proposal will offer adjustable rate loans for students and parents with the protection of a cap on the maximum interest rate that could be charged during periods of high interest rates.

In today's low interest rate environment, the fixed rates for student loans are too high, resulting in student loans generating a profit for the Federal Government. If we would have maintained the variable rate for student loans that was in law before 2006, the interest rate for students in repayment on their loans would be 2.39 percent this year. At today's fixed rates, they will pay 3.4 percent for subsidized loans and 6.8 percent for unsubsidized loans. The Federal Government provides student loans to increase the number of Americans who attain college degrees, not to generate revenue. Yet, according to CBO estimates, the Federal Government will save more than 36 cents for every dollar lent in the student loan programs for fiscal year 2013. CBO projects that the student loan programs will continue to generate savings on the backs of students through fiscal year 2023. We need to change this.

The Responsible Student Loan Solutions Act will offer adjustable rate loans for students and parents with a cap on the maximum interest rate that could be charged to protect borrowers during periods of high interest rates. Interest rates for need-based, subsidized loans will be capped at 6.8 percent. Rates for unsubsidized and parent loans will be capped at 8.25 percent. Rates will be set every year based on

the 91-day Treasury bill plus a percentage determined by the Secretary of Education to cover program administration and borrower benefits. The Secretary must set the rate so that the student loan programs are revenue neutral.

The Responsible Student Loan Solutions Act will also correct an inequity for undergraduate students who qualify for subsidized loans. Currently, a dependent undergraduate student can borrow up to $31,000 total. However, the maximum amount that can be subsidized is $23,000, which means that needy students often have to resort to more expensive unsubsidized loans to finance a part or the remainder of their education costs. The Responsible Student Loan Solutions Act will allow borrowers with demonstrated financial need to have up to the full loan limit in the lower cost subsidized program.

Finally, the Responsible Student Loan Solutions Act will allow borrowers with high fixed-rate federal student loans to refinance those loans into the new variable rate loan with a cap. This could be a real help to borrowers trying to make ends meet, considering that, under current conditions, rates calculated under a bill would be much lower than the fixed rates for unsubsidized loans 6.8 percent, PLUS loans made under the old bank-based program, 8.5 percent, and PLUS loans made through the Federal Direct Loan program 7.9 percent.

We need a multi-faceted approach to solving our student loan debt crisis, which reports from the Federal Reserve and others show is a drag on our economy. We cannot allow this generation of Americans to flounder, unable to buy a home or a car or secure credit or start a family under the weight of student debt.

We need to keep rates low in the short term—that means taking quick action to keep the rate from doubling in July. It also means over the long-term, setting rates in a way that does not add to the growth of student debt. I encourage our colleagues to join Senator DURBIN and me in cosponsoring the Responsible Student Loan Solutions Act to put in place a long-term approach to setting student loan interest rates that is fair to students and taxpayers. I also urge our colleagues to support taking immediate steps to reassure students and families that the rate on subsidized loans will not double this July.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 131—RECOMMENDING THE DESIGNATION OF A PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL ENVOY TO THE BALKANS TO EVALUATE THE SUCCESSES AND SHORTCOMINGS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DAYTON PEACE ACCORDS IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA, TO PROVIDE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS, AND TO REPORT BACK TO CONGRESS WITHIN ONE YEAR

Mr. BEGICH submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 131

Whereas, on December 14, 1995, the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (referred to in this resolution as ''BiH''), known as the Dayton Peace Accords, brought an end to the brutal conflict in that country that was marked by aggression and ethnic cleansing, including the commission of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide;

Whereas the Dayton Peace Accords define BiH as a country with three constituent peoples—Bosniaks, Croats, and Serbs—to be comprised of two internal entities known as the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) and Republika Srpska (RS), from which an extremely complex, fundamentally flawed system of governance and administration has been derived;

Whereas the Dayton Peace Accords included many compromises imposed by the need for quick action to preserve human life and bring an end to the conflict in BiH, and as a result may have hindered efforts to develop efficient and effective political institutions capable of overcoming the challenges required to become an integral member of the Euro-Atlantic community of nation-states;

Whereas, since the signing of the Dayton Peace Accords, the Government and people of BiH have been working in partnership with the international community to achieve progress in building a peaceful and democratic society based on the rule of law, respect for human rights, and a free market economy;

Whereas BiH demonstrated its commitment to the shared values of democracy, security, and stability by joining the Partnership for Peace program of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in December 2006;

Whereas BiH received a conditional Membership Action Plan status in NATO in April 2010 pending completion of specific military and political reforms;

Whereas the Government of BiH took the first important step on the road toward European Union (EU) membership by signing a Stabilization and Association Agreement (SAA) with the EU in June 2008;

Whereas, despite these notable achievements, the Government and people of BiH continue to face significant challenges in their efforts at integrating into Euro-Atlantic institutions and the country's economy continues to decline;

Whereas the Council of Europe's Venice Commission concluded that the current constitutional arrangements in BiH are not conducive to the efficient or rational functioning of state institutions, hindering the pace of the country's accession to NATO and the EU;

Whereas the Government of BiH has the obligation to implement the ruling of the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of Sejdić-Finci from 2009 with regard to the election to the Presidency and House of Peoples of BiH of Others, who are defined as those Bosnian citizens who are not primarily a member of the Dayton Accords' stipulated three constitutive peoples— the Serb Bosnians, the Croat Bosnians, and the Muslim Bosnians or Bosniaks;

Whereas reform at any level, including that originating from the implementation of the European Court of Human Rights ruling on the Sejdić-Finci Case, should take into account the protection of equal constitutional rights of all;

Whereas the elections in BiH should reflect the right of the constituent peoples and others to choose their legal representatives, who would therefore represent those people consistent with the founding provisions of the Dayton Peace Accords, as opposed to the existing practice, which allows for the representatives of one people to be elected by the members of other constituent peoples, hindering the political stability of BiH;

Whereas only the full protection of equal political, economic, legal, and religious rights of all the constituent peoples and others throughout the territory of BiH, including the inalienable right to return, will guarantee the future stability, functionality, and effectiveness of the country;

Whereas the number of Bosnian Croats has declined from 820,000 before the war to around 460,000 remaining in BiH today, as reported by the Catholic Church in BiH which has played an important role in protecting rights of Catholic Bosnian Croats and reporting problems and cases of destruction of personal and real property of both the Catholic Church and Croat returnees;

Whereas it is not acceptable that this negative demographic trend is reflected in the reduction of constitutional rights of Bosnian Croats, as that reduction directly causes political and administrative dysfunctionality of the country;

Whereas a functional BiH as a whole is not possible without a fully functional FBiH, one of the two entities established by the Dayton Peace Accords, both being ethnically and administratively composite;

Whereas FBiH's protracted poor functionality only exacerbates the existing predominant separatist tendency in the RS, the predominantly Serb entity of BiH, thus threatening the very integrity of the country as a whole;

Whereas continuous economic decline is a direct consequence of the fact that most of BiH's gross domestic product (GDP) is generated from the publicly owned companies, which are run at the RS and FBiH entity levels by political parties with enduring ethnocentric agendas reflecting their particular and non-common interests, preventing the further creation of much-needed free enterprise business development and closely integrated national internal markets;

Whereas the social fabric of BiH is the single most important victim of the war and ensuing political conflict, and the need for repair, strengthening, and further development of civil society is fundamental to the country's recovery and desired development;

Whereas the Republic of Croatia has clearly demonstrated that allegiance to democracy, market economy, rule of law, and respect for human and citizen rights is conducive to full integration into the Euro-Atlantic community, and the Government of Croatia continues to play an active role in contributing to BiH's political stability, internal integrity, and international viability;

Whereas all the other neighbors of BiH share the ambition to join the European Union; and

Whereas the future of BiH is in the European Union and NATO: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reiterates its support for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and legal continuity of BiH within its internationally recognized borders, as well as the equality of its three constituent peoples and others within an integrated multiethnic country;

(2) welcomes steps taken by the government of BiH towards integration into the Euro-Atlantic community and reiterates its position that this commitment is in the interests of the further stabilization of the region of southeastern Europe;

(3) emphasizes that it is urgent that BiH, as well as its internal political entities, all work toward the creation of an efficient and effective state able to meet its domestic and international obligations with effective and functional institutions, and that the national government of BiH—as well as the institutions of the entities—are able to instill necessary reforms in order to fulfill European Union and North Atlantic Treaty Organization membership requirements;

(4) reiterates its call that constitutional reform in BiH take the Dayton Peace Accords as its basis, but advance the principles of political, economic, legal, and religious equality and tolerance in order to rectify provisions that conflict with the European Charter of Human Rights and the ruling of the European Court of Human Rights, and to rectify the conditions to enable economic development and the creation of a single economic space, including through the fair and effective functioning of public companies so as to be consistent with the goal of successful EU membership;

(5) stresses the importance of privatization of the publicly owned enterprises through fully transparent international tenders prepared in close cooperation with the EU and the Office of the High Representative (OHR) as a means of avoiding the misplacement of political attention and energy toward running companies rather than providing effective service to the citizens of the country;

(6) commends the present focus of the United States Government in support of stronger civil society in BiH, and urges the Department of State to further increase endeavors in that regard;

(7) believes that the Department of State and the President must seek to address all these matters more emphatically in a manner that provides for a just evaluation of the current grievances of the three constituent peoples and the Others in the two entities of the BiH;

(8) believes that it is of paramount importance that the United States Government work closely with the EU in conceiving and implementing an accession process specifically made for BiH, which would link in a causal and firmly conditional way the internal integration of BiH with its phased integration into the EU;

(9) urges that it is substantially beneficial for the process of building up the functional capacities of BiH to the level of its full ability to enable membership in NATO and the EU, that the United States Government work closely with BiH's neighboring countries—especially those who are signatories to the Dayton Peace Accords—ensuring consistency along the lines of their own European ambitions so that they actively contribute to BiH's internal integration and political and administrative functionality conducive to BiH's successful membership in NATO and the EU;

(10) reiterates that a fully functional Federation of BiH entity is essential for the future of BiH as a functional and stable state and therefore any envisaged reform should take into account protection of the constitutional rights of all, including Bosnian Croats—demographically smallest of the three Dayton Peace Accords recognized constituent peoples in BiH—and prevent further weakening of their position;

(11) believes that it is important that the United States Government, together with other international actors, support countries of the region in fulfilling their obligations as agreed through the launching of the Sarajevo Process in 2005, reaffirmed in the 2011 Belgrade Declaration, as well as during the Donor Conference held in Sarajevo in April 2012, aimed at ending the protracted refugee and internal-displacement situation in the region of Southeast Europe and finding durable solutions for the refugees and internally displaced persons through the implementation of the Balkans Regional Housing Programme;

(12) reiterates its call that the United States should designate a Presidential Special Envoy to the Balkans who should work in partnership with the OHR, the EU, NATO, and the political leaders in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as with neighboring countries, to facilitate much needed reforms at all levels of government and society in BiH; and

(13) urges the Presidential Special Envoy, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, to submit to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report with targeted evaluations and discoveries, including to provide proposals on how to address any ongoing difficulties outlined above, as well as ways to overcome any remaining political, economic, legal, or religious inequalities in BiH.

SENATE RESOLUTION 132—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REQUEST FOR DOMESTIC BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE AUTHORITY IN 2015 AND 2017 IS NEITHER AFFORDABLE NOR FEASIBLE AS OF THE DATE OF AGREEMENT TO THIS RESOLUTION AND THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MUST FURTHER ANALYZE THE CAPABILITY TO CONSOLIDATE EXCESS OVERSEAS INFRASTRUCTURE AND INCREASE EFFICIENCIES BY RELOCATING MISSIONS FROM OVERSEAS TO DOMESTIC INSTALLATIONS PRIOR TO REQUESTING DOMESTIC BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE AUTHORITY

Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. BAUCUS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 132

Whereas the Department of Defense claims a 24 percent surplus in domestic military infrastructure and has requested domestic Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) rounds in 2015 and 2017;

Whereas Congress rejected a request for 2 BRAC rounds made by the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2013;

Whereas the Senate Armed Services Committee noted in title XXIV of Senate Report 112–173 to accompany S. 3254 of the 112th Congress, that a request by the Department of Defense for authority to conduct a domestic BRAC round must be preceded by a comprehensive evaluation of opportunities to obtain efficiencies through the consolidation of the overseas operations of defense agencies and possible relocation back to the United States;

Whereas the Base Structure Report for fiscal year 2012 of the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Installations and Environment, found that the Department of Defense has 666 military sites in foreign countries, including 232 in Germany, 109 in Japan, and 85 in South Korea;

Whereas the United States has developed an increased capacity to rapidly deploy around the globe, thereby reducing the strategic value of an overseas footprint based largely on Cold War geopolitics and an obsolete National Security Strategy;

Whereas the Government Accountability Office concluded in a 2007 study that the 2005 BRAC round was the most complex and costliest ever;

Whereas the Government Accountability Office found in a 2012 report entitled ''Military Base Realignments and Closures: Updated Costs and Savings Estimates from BRAC 2005'' that the 2005 BRAC round far exceeded estimated implementation costs, growing from $21,000,000,000 to $35,100,000,000, a 67 percent increase;

Whereas the Government Accountability Office found in the 2012 report that the estimated 20-year savings for the 2005 BRAC round decreased by 72 percent from $35,600,000,000 to $9,900,000,000;

Whereas the Government Accountability Office estimates that it will take until 2017 for the Department of Defense to recoup up-front implementation costs of BRAC 2005, 4 years longer than the BRAC Commission estimates and 12 years after the date of execution and initial investment;

Whereas the Department of Defense would spend $2,400,000,000 in a time of fiscal austerity to execute the proposed BRAC round in 2015;

Whereas the financial crisis in the United States continues to challenge local economies and a BRAC round would create more uncertainty and economic hardship for impacted communities still in the recovery process;

Whereas Federal budget uncertainty and the fiscal challenges a domestic BRAC round would bring to communities renders the significant $2,400,000,000 in up-front costs neither affordable nor feasible as of the date of agreement to this resolution; and

Whereas the lack of potential return on the significant investment required for a BRAC round may result in an inefficient use of taxpayer funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) as of the date of agreement to this resolution, the Department of Defense should not be granted authority for the requested 2015 and 2017 Base Realignment and Closure rounds;

(2) before granting the authority for the requested 2015 and 2017 BRAC rounds, the Department of Defense should achieve economic efficiencies by—

(A) closing and consolidating excess infrastructure and facilities in overseas locations; and

(B) reexamining relocation opportunities of overseas missions to United States military installations; and

(3) the Department of Defense is unwise to request a BRAC round when the economy of the United States is struggling to recover and negatively impacted communities are fighting to put citizens back to work.

SENATE RESOLUTION 133—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS AND THE STATES SHOULD INVESTIGATE AND CORRECT ABUSIVE, UNSANITARY, AND ILLEGAL ABORTION PRACTICES

Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BURR, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 133

Whereas the Declaration of Independence sets forth the principle that all people are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;

Whereas the dedication of the people of the United States to this principle, though at times tragically marred by institutions such as slavery and practices such as segregation and the denial of the right to vote, has summoned the people of the United States time and again to fight for human dignity and the common good;

Whereas the people of the United States believe that every human life is precious from its very beginning, and that every individual, regardless of age, health, or condition of dependency, deserves the respect and protection of society;

Whereas the people of the United States believe that early and consistent care for mothers, with due regard both for the well-being of expectant mothers and for the children they carry, is a primary goal of any sound health care policy in the United States;

Whereas no woman should ever be abandoned, by policy or practice, to the depredations of an unlicensed, unregulated, or uninspected clinic operating outside of the law with no regard for the mothers or children ostensibly under its care;

Whereas the Report of the Grand Jury in the Court of Common Pleas of the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania, certified on January 14, 2011, contains the results of a thorough investigation of the policies and practices of Dr. Kermit Gosnell and the Women's Medical Society of Philadelphia, which found multiple violations of law and public policy relating to abortion clinics, and recommended to the Pennsylvania Department of Health that these abortion clinics ''be explicitly regulated as ambulatory surgical facilities, so that they are inspected annually and held to the same standards as all other outpatient procedure centers'';

Whereas the Report of the Grand Jury documented a pattern, over a period of 2 decades, at the Women's Medical Society of Philadelphia of untrained and uncertified personnel performing abortions, non-medical personnel administering medications, grossly unsanitary and dangerous conditions, violations of law regarding storage of human remains, and, above all, instances of willful murder of infants born alive by severing their spinal cords;

Whereas the violations of law and human dignity documented at the Women's Medical Society of Philadelphia involved women referred to the facility by abortion facilities in a number of surrounding States, including Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina, and Delaware;

Whereas abortion clinics in a number of States, particularly Michigan and Maryland, and including 2 clinics at which Dr. Kermit Gosnell performed or initiated abortions and 2 Planned Parenthood facilities in Delaware, have been closed temporarily or permanently due to unsanitary conditions, and the Planned Parenthood facilities in Delaware have been described by former employees as resembling a ''meat market'';

Whereas the imposition of criminal and civil penalties on individuals and corporations involved in the deplorable practices described in this preamble is appropriate, but is not the only necessary response to such practices;

Whereas it is essential that the Federal Government and State and local governments take action to prevent dangerous conditions at abortion clinics;

Whereas government accountability means that officials whose duty it is to protect the safety and well-being of mothers accessing health care clinics must have their actions made public and their failures redressed;

Whereas the extent of, and purported justification for, legal and illegal abortions in the United States performed late in the second trimester of pregnancy and into and throughout the third trimester of pregnancy are not routinely reported by all States or by the Centers for Disease Control, and are therefore unknown;

Whereas women and children in the United States deserve better than the 56,145,920 abortions that have been performed in the United States since the Supreme Court rulings in *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, and *Doe v. Bolton*, 410 U.S. 179, in 1973; and

Whereas there is substantial medical evidence that an unborn child is capable of experiencing pain at 20 weeks after fertilization, or earlier: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Congress and States should gather information about and correct—

(A) abusive, unsanitary, and illegal abortion practices; and

(B) the interstate referral of women and girls to facilities engaged in dangerous or illegal second- and third-trimester procedures;

(2) Congress has the responsibility to—

(A) investigate and conduct hearings on—

(i) abortions performed near, at, or after viability in the United States; and

(ii) public policies regarding such abortions; and

(B) evaluate the extent to which such abortions involve violations of the natural right to life of infants who are born alive or are capable of being born alive, and therefore are entitled to equal protection under the law;

(3) there is a compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children beginning at least from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain, which is separate from and independent of the compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children beginning at the stage of viability, and neither governmental interest is intended to replace the other; and

(4) governmental review of public policies and outcomes relating to the issues described in paragraphs (1) through (4) is long overdue and is an urgent priority that must be addressed for the sake of women, children, families, and future generations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 134—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT ALL INCIDENTS OF ABUSIVE, UNSANITARY, OR ILLEGAL HEALTH CARE PRACTICES SHOULD BE CONDEMNED AND PREVENTED AND THE PERPETRATORS SHOULD BE PROSECUTED TO THE FULL EXTENT OF THE LAW

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 134

Whereas in recent years there have been rare and tragic incidents of willful violations of law, human dignity, and standards of care across a variety of health care settings that have exposed trusting patients to death and disease, and shocked the conscience of the United States, including—

(1) a physician at the Women's Medical Society of Philadelphia who is rightfully facing multiple criminal charges related to horrific practices;

(2) health care practitioners at the Endoscopy Center of Southern Nevada who exposed 40,000 patients to hepatitis C through unsanitary practices;

(3) an Oklahoma dentist who exposed as many as 7,000 patients to HIV and hepatitis B and C through unsanitary practices; and

(4) a nursing director at Kern Valley nursing home in California who, for her own convenience, inappropriately medicated patients using antipsychotic drugs, resulting in the death of at least 1 patient: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that all incidents of abusive, unsanitary, or illegal health care practices should be condemned and prevented and the perpetrators should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 814. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 815. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 816. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 817. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 818. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 819. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 820. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 821. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 822. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 823. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 824. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 825. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 826. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 827. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 828. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 829. Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 830. Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 831. Mr. BAUCUS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 832. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 601, supra.

SA 833. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra.

SA 834. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 835. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra.

SA 836. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 837. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 838. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 839. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 840. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 841. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 842. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 843. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 844. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 845. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 846. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 847. Mr. BAUCUS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 848. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 849. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 850. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 851. Mr. UDALL, of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. COWAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 852. Mr. UDALL, of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 853. Mr. UDALL, of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. COWAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 854. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 855. Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 856. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 857. Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 814. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2_____. PERIODIC BEACH RENOURISHMENT.

Section 103(d)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(d)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (e)(1), the non-Federal cost of the periodic nourishment of the project, or any measure for shore protection or beach erosion control for the project, that is authorized for construction before, on, or after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2013 shall be 65 percent.''.

SA 815. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2030.

SA 816. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2049(b)(5), strike subparagraph (C).

SA 817. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike title I.

SA 818. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1001 and insert the following:

SEC. 1001. PURPOSES; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are—

(1) to authorize projects that—

(A) are the subject of a completed report of the Chief of Engineers containing a determination that the relevant project—

(i) is in the Federal interest;

(ii) results in benefits that exceed the costs of the project;

(iii) is environmentally acceptable; and

(iv) is technically feasible; and

(B) have been recommended to Congress for authorization by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works;

(2) to authorize the Secretary—

(A) to review projects that require increased authorization; and

(B) to request an increase of those authorizations after—

(i) certifying that the increases are necessary; and

(ii) submitting to Congress reports on the proposed increases; and

(3) not to establish new precedent or congressional practices concerning the delegation of authority from Congress to the Executive Branch with respect to the authorization of water resources projects or funding amounts for projects.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should enact legislation to reduce wasteful spending, reform the earmark and project authorization processes under law, and address the long-term fiscal challenges in the United States; and

(2) on enactment of the legislation described in paragraph (1), Congress should resume the prudent authorization of projects consistent with law.

SA 819. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2049 and insert the following:

SEC. 2049. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) LIST OF PROJECTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3003 of Public Law 104–66 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note; 109 Stat. 734), each year, after the submission of the list under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a list of projects or separable elements of projects that have been authorized but that have received no obligations during the 5 full fiscal years preceding the submission of that list.

''(B) ADDITIONAL NOTIFICATION.—On submission of the list under subparagraph (A) to Congress, the Secretary shall notify—

''(i) each Senator in whose State and each Member of the House of Representatives in whose district a project (including any part of a project) on that list would be located; and

''(ii) each applicable non-Federal interest associated with a project (including any part of a project) on that list.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) MINIMUM FUNDING LIST.—At the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a list of—

''(A) projects or separable elements of projects authorized for construction for which funding has been obligated in the 5 previous fiscal years;

''(B) the amount of funding obligated per fiscal year;

''(C) the current phase of each project or separable element of a project; and

''(D) the amount required to complete those phases.

''(4) REPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2013, the Secretary shall compile and publish a complete list of all uncompleted, authorized projects of the Corps of Engineers, including for each project on that list—

''(i) the original budget authority for the project;

''(ii) the status of the project;

''(iii) the estimated date of completion of the project;

''(iv) the estimated cost of completion of the project; and

''(v) any amounts for the project that remain unobligated.

''(B) PUBLICATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit a copy of the list under subparagraph (A) to—

''(I) the appropriate committees of Congress; and

''(II) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(ii) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 30 days after providing the report to Congress under clause (i), the Secretary shall make a copy of the list available on a publicly accessible Internet site, in a manner that is downloadable, searchable, and sortable.''.

(b) INFRASTRUCTURE DEAUTHORIZATION STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall, in consultation with the States, Chief of Engineers, water resources associations, and other stakeholders, submit a report to Congress on options for establishing an appropriate and cost effective process for identifying authorized Corps of Engineers water resources projects, including those listed in the report described in section 1001(b)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(4)), that are no longer in the Federal interest and should be deauthorized.

SA 820. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike title X and insert the following:

TITLE X—SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING WATER AND WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING PROGRAMS

SEC. 10001. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING WATER AND WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of Congress that, instead of establishing a new, unfunded water infrastructure financing program during the period of significant Federal deficits in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, Congress should, to the extent fiscally prudent—

(1) maximize funding for existing water and wastewater infrastructure financing programs, including—

(A) the State water pollution control revolving funds established under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.); and

(B) the State drinking water treatment revolving loan funds established under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–12);

(2) abate restrictions on the use of private activity bonds on water and wastewater infrastructure projects; and

(3) take other fiscally appropriate actions to improve water and wastewater infrastructure in the United States.

SA 821. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2_____. IMPROVING PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER SUPPLY STORAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out activities—

(1) to ensure increased uniformity and flexibility in the development and administration of storage agreements with non-Federal interests for municipal or industrial water supply at Corps of Engineers projects pursuant to section 301 of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b); and

(2) to enable non-Federal interests to anticipate and accurately budget for annual operations and maintenance costs and, as applicable, repair, rehabilitation, and replacements costs, including through—

(A) the formulation by the Secretary of a uniform billing statement format for those storage agreements relating to operations and maintenance costs, and as applicable, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement costs, incurred by the Secretary, which, at a minimum, shall include—

(i) a detailed description of the activities carried out relating to the water supply aspects of the project;

(ii) a clear explanation of why and how those activities relate to the water supply aspects of the project; and

(iii) a detailed accounting of the cost of carrying out those activities;

(B) a review by the Secretary of the regulations and guidance of the Corps of Engineers relating to criteria and methods for the equitable distribution of joint project costs across project purposes in order to ensure nationwide consistency in the calculation of the appropriate share of joint project costs allocable to the water supply purpose; and

(C) a review by the Secretary of the procedures and processes of the Corps of Engineers for evaluating new requests for water supply storage reallocation and for developing water supply storage plans to accommodate the needs of non-Federal interests in order to increase the flexibility of those procedures and processes and enhance the coordination within the Corps of Engineers in communicating timely and unified responses to the requests of non-Federal interests.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the findings of the reviews carried out under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (a)(1) and any subsequent actions taken by the Secretary relating to those reviews.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include an analysis of the feasibility and costs associated with the provision by the Secretary to each non-Federal interest of not less than 1 statement each year that details for each water storage agreement described in subsection (a)(1) the estimated amount of the operations and

maintenance costs and, as applicable, the estimated amount of the repair, rehabilitation, and replacement costs, for which the non-Federal interest will be responsible in that fiscal year.

(3) EXTENSION.—The Secretary may delay the submission of the report under paragraph (1) for a period not to exceed 180 days after the deadline described in paragraph (1), subject to the condition that the Secretary submits a preliminary progress report to Congress not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 822. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE XII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 12001. AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL NATIONAL PARKS AND FEDERAL RECREATIONAL LANDS PASS PROGRAM.

The Secretary may participate in the America the Beautiful National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass program in the same manner as the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Reclamation, including the provision of free annual passes to active duty military personnel and dependents.

SA 823. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Section 2049(b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(6) APPLICATION.—For purposes of this subsection, water resources projects shall include environmental infrastructure assistance projects and programs of the Corps of Engineers.

SA 824. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 30___. BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the project for flood control on the Big Sunflower River, authorized by section 10 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the ''Flood Control Act of 1944'') (58 Stat. 895, chapter 665), the Secretary may install sediment structures throughout the watershed for water quality and aquatic restoration purposes.

(b) STRUCTURAL PRACTICES.—In carrying out the activities authorized under subsection (a), the Secretary shall use structural practices modeled on the structural practices provided by the Natural Resources Conservation Service Environmental Quality Incentives Program of the Department of Agriculture.

SA 825. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 3018, add the following:

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall not take effect until the date on which the Secretary certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives that the Governors of the States of Louisiana and Mississippi have submitted to the Secretary a written certification that the Governors have no objections to the adoption by the Secretary of the plan described in subsection (d) of section 7002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1270) (as amended by subsection (a)).

SA 826. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 3018, add the following:

(c) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section or an amendment made by this section constitutes an authorization for the design or construction of the East Land Bridge Levee, New Orleans.

SA 827. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 3018, add the following:

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall not take effect until the date on which the Secretary certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives that the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section will not increase, directly or indirectly, the flood risk of any property in a State other than the State of Louisiana.

SA 828. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 50_____. RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHEROKEE NATION OF OKLAHOMA REGARDING W.D. MAYO LOCK AND DAM, OKLAHOMA.

Section 1117 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–662; 100 Stat. 4236) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1117. W.D. MAYO LOCK AND DAM, OKLAHOMA.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma has exclusive authorization—

''(1) to design and construct 1 or more hydroelectric generating facilities at the W.D. Mayo Lock and Dam on the Arkansas River in the State of Oklahoma, subject to the requirements of subsection (b) and in accordance with the conditions specified in this section; and

''(2) to market the electricity generated from any such hydroelectric generating facility.

''(b) PRECONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Cherokee Nation shall obtain any permit required by Federal or State law before the date on which construction begins on any hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

''(2) REVIEW BY SECRETARY.—The Cherokee Nation may initiate the design or construction of a hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a) only after the Secretary reviews and approves the plans and specifications for the design and construction.

''(c) PAYMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION COSTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Cherokee Nation shall—

''(A) bear all costs associated with the design and construction of any hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a); and

''(B) provide any funds necessary for the design and construction to the Secretary prior to the Secretary initiating any activities relating to the design and construction of the hydroelectric generating facility.

''(2) USE BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary may—

''(A) accept funds offered by the Cherokee Nation under paragraph (1); and

''(B) use the funds to carry out the design and construction of any hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

''(d) ASSUMPTION OF LIABILITY.—The Cherokee Nation—

''(1) shall hold all title to any hydroelectric generating facility constructed under this section;

''(2) may, subject to the approval of the Secretary, assign that title to a third party;

''(3) shall be solely responsible for—

''(A) the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation of any such facility; and

''(B) the marketing of the electricity generated by any such facility; and

''(4) shall release and indemnify the United States from any claims, causes of action, or liabilities that may arise out of any activity undertaken to carry out this section.

''(e) ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may provide any technical and construction management assistance requested by the Cherokee Nation relating to the design and construction of any hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

''(f) THIRD PARTY AGREEMENTS.—The Cherokee Nation may enter into agreements with the Secretary or a third party that the Cherokee Nation or the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out this section.''.

SA 829. Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE XII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 12001. DONALD G. WALDON LOCK AND DAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Development Authority is a 4-State compact comprised of the States of Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee;

(2) the Tennessee-Tombigbee Authority is the regional non-Federal sponsor of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway;

(3) the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, completed in 1984, has fueled growth in the United States economy by reducing transportation costs and encouraging economic development; and

(4) the selfless determination and tireless work of Donald G. Waldon, while serving as administrator of the waterway compact for 21 years, contributed greatly to the realization and success of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, at an appropriate time and in accordance with the rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the lock and dam located at mile 357.5 on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway should be known and designated as the ''Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam''.

SA 830. Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 30___. PEARL RIVER BASIN, MISSISSIPPI.

Section 3104 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–114; 121 Stat. 1134) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood damage reduction, Pearl River Basin, including Shoccoe, Mississippi, authorized by section 401(e)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–662; 100 Stat. 4132), is modified to authorize the Secretary, subject to subsection (c), to construct the project generally in accordance with the plan described in the 'Pearl River Watershed, Mississippi, Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Statement Main Report', with an estimated Federal share of $133,770,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $72,030,000.''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES.—Before initiating construction of the project, the Secretary shall compare the level of flood damage reduction provided by the plan that maximizes national economic development benefits of the project and the locally preferred plan, to that portion of Jackson, Mississippi and vicinity, located below the Ross Barnett Reservoir Dam.''.

SA 831. Mr. BAUCUS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE XII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 12001. FOREST HIGHWAY PROGRAM UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

Section 204 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) FOREST HIGHWAY PROGRAM UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.—Until September 30, 2014, on request by a State, the Secretary or Secretary of the appropriate land management agency shall apply available and unobligated balances of funds allocated under the Forest Highway Program under subsection (b)(2), as in effect on July 6, 2012, to the non-Federal share of the cost of 1 or more projects selected under this section by the programming decisions committee of the State.''.

SA 832. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 305, strike lines 11 through 14 and insert the following:

''(i) CARGO CONTAINER.—The term 'cargo container' means a cargo container that is 1 Twenty-foot Equivalent Unit.

SA 833. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

In section 6004(i)(2), add at the end the following:

(C) MEASURES TO ASSESS EFFECTIVENESS.—Not later than 1 year after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement quantifiable performance measures and metrics to assess the effectiveness of the grant program established in accordance with subparagraph (A).

SA 834. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2043, add at the end the following:

(f) UTILIZATION OF EROSION CONTROL MATERIALS.—The Secretary shall encourage the utilization of materials and practices that are demonstrated to produce cost savings and project acceleration, including gabions, geosynthetics, and other erosion control materials, in applications, including—

(1) shoreline protection; and

(2) the storage and transportation of canal water as recommended by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation in the report entitled ''Canal-Lining Demonstration Project Year 10 Final Report''.

SA 835. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 548, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(10) RURAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT.—The term ''rural water infrastructure project'' means a project that—

(A) is described in section 10007; and

(B) is located in a water system that serves not more than 25,000 individuals.

On page 556, strike lines 1 through 3, and insert the following:

(2) ELIGIBLE PROJECT COSTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the eligible project costs of a project shall be reasonably anticipated to be not less than $20,000,000.

(B) RURAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.—For rural water infrastructure projects, the eligible project costs of a project shall be reasonably anticipated to be not less than $5,000,000.

SA 836. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 20___. STUDY OF VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY-BASED FLOOD INSURANCE OPTIONS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (referred to in this section as the ''Administrator'') shall conduct a study to assess options, methods, and strategies for making available voluntary community-based flood insurance policies through the National Flood Insurance Program.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The study conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) take into consideration and analyze how voluntary community-based flood insurance policies—

(i) would affect communities having varying economic bases, geographic locations, flood hazard characteristics or classifications, and flood management approaches; and

(ii) could satisfy the applicable requirements under section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a); and

(B) evaluate the advisability of making available voluntary community-based flood insurance policies to communities, subdivisions of communities, and areas of residual risk.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under paragraph (1), the Administrator may consult with the Comptroller General of the United States, as the Administrator determines is appropriate.

(b) REPORT BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that contains the results and conclusions of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations for—

(A) the best manner to incorporate voluntary community-based flood insurance policies into the National Flood Insurance Program; and

(B) a strategy to implement voluntary community-based flood insurance policies that would encourage communities to undertake flood mitigation activities, including the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of levees, dams, or other flood control structures.

(c) REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the Administrator submits the report required under subsection (b), the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) review the report submitted by the Administrator; and

(2) submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

(A) an analysis of the report submitted by the Administrator;

(B) any comments or recommendations of the Comptroller General relating to the report submitted by the Administrator; and

(C) any other recommendations of the Comptroller General relating to community-based flood insurance policies.

SA 837. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 50____. CAPE ARUNDEL DISPOSAL SITE, MAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Cape Arundel Disposal Site selected by the Department of the Army as an alternative dredged material disposal site under section 103(b) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1413(b)) (referred to in this section as the ''Site'') is reopened and shall remain open and available until the earlier of—

(1) the date on which the Site does not have any remaining disposal capacity; or

(2) the date on which an environmental impact statement designating an alternative dredged material disposal site for southern Maine has been completed.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The use of the Site as a dredged material disposal site under subsection (a) shall be subject to the conditions that—

(1) conditions at the Site remain suitable for the continued use of the Site as a dredged material disposal site; and

(2) the Site not be used for the disposal of more than 80,000 cubic yards from any single dredging project.

SA 838. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 308, strike lines 21 through 25, and insert the following:

''(II) are located in berths that are accessible to Federal channels;

''(iv) for environmental remediation related to dredging berths and Federal navigation channels; or

''(v) for capital investments in the infrastructure of eligible donor ports and goods movement corridors associated with eligible donor ports that mitigate the local impacts of the movement of goods, including traffic congestion, air pollution, infrastructure degradation, public safety threats, and other impacts identified by the Secretary.

SA 839. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Subtitle B—Extreme Weather Resilience

SEC. 11101. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Strengthening The Resiliency of Our Nation on the Ground Act'' or the ''STRONG Act''.

SEC. 11102. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Extreme weather has serious economic costs for Americans, American businesses, and State and local governments. Hurricanes, droughts, floods, tornadoes, extreme heat, and extreme cold cause death, result in loss of property and well-being, especially among the most vulnerable populations, and negatively impact business activity and economic growth.

(2) Superstorm Sandy, which devastated the Eastern United States in late October 2012, resulted in more than 100 deaths, the evacuation of hundreds of thousands of people from their homes, power outages affecting more than 8,500,000 homes, massive flooding, gasoline shortages, and a crippled regional energy and transportation infrastructure. As a result of this storm, Congress passed the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013, which appropriated $50,500,000,000 for post-Sandy recovery efforts.

(3) In the past 30 years, there have been more than 130 weather-related disasters in the United States that each generated at least $1,000,000,000 in damages or more than $880,000,000,000 in total standardized loss. In addition, there have been many other extreme weather events that generated less than $1,000,000,000 in damages, but still caused immeasurable harm to the Nation's citizens, infrastructure, and economy.

(4) Hurricane Katrina led to more than 1,800 deaths, property damage exceeding $80,000,000,000, more than $120,000,000,000 in Federal spending, and long-term impacts on the economy and livelihoods of those living in the Gulf Coast region.

(5) In 2011, one of the most severe and costly years for weather and climate on record, extreme weather hit every region in the United States, resulting in—

(A) prolonged droughts in the South and the West;

(B) deadly floods in the Southeast and Midwest;

(C) hundreds of devastating tornadoes across the United States;

(D) Hurricane Irene in the Northeast;

(E) more than $50,000,000,000 in weather-related damages;

(F) 14 extreme weather events, which resulted in more than $1,000,000,000 in damages each and caused a combined death toll of hundreds of people; and

(G) many other extreme weather events with lesser, but still significant, impacts.

(6) In 2012, in addition to Superstorm Sandy, the United States experienced—

(A) drought conditions in more than 60 percent of the contiguous United States at the peak of the drought, including more than 2,200 counties that have received disaster designations from the Secretary of Agriculture due to the drought;

(B) deadly floods in Minnesota, Tropical Storm Debby in Florida, and Hurricane Isaac in Louisiana;

(C) destructive wildfires on more than 9,000,000 acres across 37 States;

(D) power outages affecting more than 3,400,000 homes due to severe storms during the summer; and

(E) deadly heat waves, highlighted by July as the warmest month on record for the contiguous United States and more than 9,600 daily high temperature records broken during June, July, and August.

(7) These events and natural disaster trends, when combined with the volatility of weather, ongoing demographic changes, and development in high risk areas, indicate that the negative impacts of extreme weather events and natural disasters have the potential to increase over time. The fact that a significant number of people and assets continue to be located in areas prone to volatile and extreme weather indicates that these events will continue to be expensive and deadly if the United States fails to enhance its resiliency to such events. Recent studies show that the intensity and frequency of some types of, but not all, extreme weather events will likely increase in the future.

(8) Economic savings can be achieved by considering the impacts of extreme weather over the short- and long-term in the planning process. For example, a 2005 review of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation programs, conducted by the National Institute of Building Sciences' Multi-Hazard Mitigation Council,

found that every dollar spent on hazard mitigation yields a savings of $4 in future losses.

(9) There are several efforts currently underway at the Federal, regional, tribal, State, and local levels that have helped lay the foundation for a federally-coordinated effort to increase the Nation's resiliency to extreme weather events, such as the Hurricane Sandy Rebuilding Task Force, the Presidential Policy Directive on National Preparedness (referred to in this subtitle as ''PPD–8''), the National Preparedness System, the whole community approach led by the Department of Homeland Security, and the Silver Jackets Program by the Army Corps of Engineers. Other recent reports on this subject include the National Academies of Sciences' reports ''Disaster Resilience: A National Imperative'' and ''Building Community Disaster Resilience through Public-Private Collaboration''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subtitle is to minimize the economic and social costs and future losses of life, property, well-being, business activity, and economic growth by making the United States more resilient to the impacts of extreme weather events over the short- and long-term, thereby creating business and job growth opportunities by—

(1) ensuring that the Federal Government is optimizing its use of existing resources and funding to support State and local officials, businesses, tribal nations, and the public to become more resilient, including—

(A) encouraging the consideration of, and ways to incorporate, extreme weather resilience across Federal operations, programs, policies, and initiatives;

(B) promoting improved coordination of existing and planned Federal extreme weather resilience and adaptation efforts that impact extreme weather resilience and ensuring their coordination with, and support of, State, local, regional, and tribal efforts;

(C) minimizing Federal policies that may unintentionally hinder or reduce resilience, such as damaging wetlands or other critical green infrastructure, or lead Federal agencies to operate at cross purposes in achieving extreme weather resilience; and

(D) building upon existing related efforts, such as the Hurricane Sandy Rebuilding Task Force, the PPD–8, the National Preparedness System, and the whole community approach;

(2) communicating the latest understanding and likely short- and long-term human and economic impacts and risks of extreme weather to businesses and the public;

(3) supporting decision making that improves resilience by providing forecasts and projections, data decision-support tools, and other information and mechanisms; and

(4) establishing a consistent vision and strategic plan for extreme weather resilience across the Federal Government.

SEC. 11103. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) EXTREME WEATHER.—The term ''extreme weather'' includes severe and unseasonable weather, heavy precipitation, hurricanes, storm surges, tornadoes, other windstorms (including derechos), extreme heat, extreme cold, and other qualifying weather events as determined by the interagency group established under section 11104(a)(1).

(2) RESILIENCE.—The term ''resilience'' means the ability to prepare and plan for, absorb, recover from, and more successfully adapt to adverse events in a timely manner.

SEC. 11104. EXTREME WEATHER RESILIENCE GAP AND OVERLAP ANALYSIS.

(a) INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (referred to in this section as the ''Director''), with input from the Department of Homeland Security, shall establish and chair an interagency working group with Cabinet-level representation from all relevant Federal agencies.

(B) DUTIES.—The working group shall—

(i) come together to provide a strategic vision of extreme weather resilience;

(ii) conduct a gap and overlap analysis of Federal agencies' current and planned activities related to achieving short- and long-term resilience to extreme weather and its impacts on the Nation, such as storm surge, flooding, drought, and wildfires; and

(iii) develop a National Extreme Weather Resilience Plan in accordance with section 11105(a).

(2) ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION FROM EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.—The interagency working group established under paragraph (1) shall include representatives of the relevant offices and councils within the Executive Office of the President, including—

(A) the Office of Management and Budget;

(B) the National Security Staff;

(C) the Council of Economic Advisors;

(D) the Council on Environmental Quality; and

(E) the Domestic Policy Council.

(3) CONSULTATION WITH TRIBAL, STATE, AND LOCAL REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal interagency working group established under paragraph (1) shall work closely with an advisory group to take into account the needs of State and local entities across all regions of the United States. The advisory group shall consist of—

(i) 1 representative from the National Emergency Management Association;

(ii) 7 representatives from States and State associations; and

(iii) 8 representatives from local entities and associations, including representation from a tribal nation and at least 1 major metropolitan area.

(B) KEY SECTORS.—The representatives described in subparagraph (A) shall, in the aggregate, represent all of the key sectors set forth in subsection (b)(1).

(C) MEETINGS.—The Director shall meet with the representatives described in subparagraph (A) not fewer than 9 times during the development of—

(i) the gap and overlap analysis under this section; and

(ii) the National Extreme Weather Resilience Action Plan under section 11105.

(4) COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.—In carrying out the activities described in subsection (b), Federal agency representatives participating in the working group shall be forthright and shall fully cooperate with the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(5) DETAILEES.—Upon the request of the Director, each agency or entity referred to in paragraph (1) shall provide the working group with a detailee, without reimbursement from the working group, to support the activities described in subsection (b), section 11105, and section 11107(a). Such detailee shall retain the rights, status, and privileges of his or her regular employment without interruption.

(6) VOLUNTEER SERVICES.—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, the working group may investigate and use such voluntary services as the working group determines to be necessary.

(b) GAP AND OVERLAP ANALYSIS.—In conducting the gap and overlap analysis required under subsection (a)(1), Federal agency representatives shall—

(1) develop a Federal Government-wide working vision for resilience to the impacts of extreme weather events in the short- and long-term, in accordance with the purpose set forth in section 11102(b), through an effort led by the Director and the interagency working group, which includes goals and objectives for key sectors. Key sectors shall include—

(A) agriculture;

(B) forestry and natural resources management;

(C) water management, including supply and treatment;

(D) energy supply and transmission;

(E) infrastructure, including natural and built forms of water and wastewater, transportation, coastal infrastructure, and other landscapes and ecosystems services;

(F) public health and healthcare delivery, including mental health and hazardous materials management;

(G) communications, including wireless communications;

(H) housing and other buildings;

(I) national security;

(J) emergency preparedness;

(K) insurance; and

(L) other sectors that the Director considers appropriate;

(2) consider and identify the interdependencies among the key sectors when developing the vision referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) create summaries of the existing and planned efforts and programmatic work underway or relevant to supporting State and local stakeholders in achieving greater extreme weather resilience in the short and long term for each sector identified under paragraph (1) and across the sectors, specifically including summaries of—

(A) individual Federal agency programs, policies, regulations, and initiatives, and research and data collection and dissemination efforts;

(B) areas of collaboration and coordination across Federal agencies; and

(C) areas of coordination with State and local agencies, private entities, and regional cooperation;

(4) identify specific Federal programs, statutes, regulations, policies, and initiatives which may unintentionally hinder resilience efforts, including an analysis of disincentives, barriers, and incompatible programs, policies, or initiatives across agencies and sectors;

(5) examine how the severity and frequency of extreme weather events at the local and regional level may change in the future and communicate these potential risks to stakeholders;

(6) work together to identify and evaluate existing Federal tools and data to describe, analyze, forecast, and model the potential impacts identified under paragraph (5) and develop recommendations to strengthen their ability to provide reliable and accurate forecasts at the national, regional, State, and local levels;

(7) identify gaps and overlaps in Federal agency work, resources, and authorities that impair the ability of the United States to meet the vision for short- and long-term extreme weather resilience, by comparing the goals and objectives identified for each sector and across sectors with the summaries identified in paragraph (3), specifically identifying gaps relating to—

(A) individual Federal agency programs, policies, and initiatives, and research data collection and dissemination efforts;

(B) areas of collaboration and coordination across Federal agencies;

(C) areas of coordination with State and local agencies and private entities, and regional cooperation;

(8) determine potential measures to address the issues referred to in paragraph (4) and to address the gaps and overlaps referred to in paragraph (7) by—

(A) designating individual or multiple Federal agencies to address these gaps;

(B) building upon existing delivery mechanisms;

(C) evaluating options for programs, policies, and initiatives that may particularly benefit extreme weather resilience efforts, including the role of ecosystem-based approaches;

(D) recommending modifications to existing Federal agency programs, statutes, regulations, policies, and initiatives to better support extreme weather resiliency;

(E) requesting new authorities and resource requirements, if needed; and

(F) identifying existing Federal government processes that can be built upon to address the purpose of this subtitle; and

(9) establish, with the assistance of the General Services Administration or such other Federal agency as the Director may designate, a Federal advisory working group to provide ongoing collective input to the process.

(c) WORKING GROUP.—The Federal advisory working group established pursuant to subsection (b)(9) shall consist of relevant private sector, academic, State and local government, tribal nation, regional organization, vulnerable population, and nongovernmental representatives, with representation from each sector described in paragraph (1). The Director may designate an existing Federal advisory committee under which the working group would operate independently, with the same rights and privileges held by members of the advisory committee. The members of the working group established pursuant to subsection (b)(9) may not simultaneously serve as members of the advisory committee designated pursuant to this subsection. The activities of the working group should complement and not duplicate the stakeholder process conducted under PPD–8.

SEC. 11105. NATIONAL EXTREME WEATHER RESILIENCE ACTION PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Based on the results of the gap and overlap analysis conducted under section 11104, the Director, working with the interagency working group established under such section, and considering the efforts described in section 11102(a)(9), shall develop a National Extreme Weather Resilience Action Plan (referred to in this section as the ''Plan'')—

(1) to build upon existing Federal Government processes referred to in section 11104(b)(8)(F)—

(A) to address the results of the gap and overlap analysis under section 11104; and

(B) to incorporate the activities required under subsection (c);

(2) to best utilize existing resources and programs through improved interagency coordination and collaboration;

(3) to improve Federal coordination with existing regional entities, State and local governments, networks, and private stakeholders;

(4) to make data and tools accessible and understandable and to help facilitate information exchange for tribal, State, and local officials, businesses, and other stakeholders in a manner that addresses the needs expressed by these stakeholders;

(5) to facilitate public-private partnerships;

(6) to improve Federal agencies' economic analytical capacity to assess—

(A) the likelihood and potential costs of extreme weather impacts by region and nationally; and

(B) the relative benefits of potential resilience measures to multiple stakeholders;

(7) to provide tools to stakeholders—

(A) to conduct analyses similar to those described in paragraph (6); and

(B) to support decision-making;

(8) to support resiliency plans developed by State and local governments, regional entities, and tribal nations, to the extent possible; and

(9) to request further resources, if necessary, to fill in gaps to enable national resilience to extreme weather, including resilience of tribal nations, and particularly vulnerable populations, and the use of green infrastructure and ecosystem-based solutions.

(b) COOPERATION.—Any Federal agency representative contacted by the Director, in the course of developing the Plan, shall be forthright and shall fully cooperate with the Office of Science and Technology Policy, as requested.

(c) REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—

(1) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Plan shall include specific Federal agency and interagency responsibilities, identify potential new authorities, if necessary, and employ risk analysis—

(A) to address the gaps identified through the gap and overlap analysis; and

(B) to improve Federal interagency coordination and Federal coordination with State, regional, local, and tribal partners.

(2) AVAILABLE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES.—

(A) IDENTIFICATION.—The Director shall identify—

(i) existing Federal grant programs and other funding opportunities available to support State and local government extreme weather resiliency planning efforts; or

(ii) projects to advance extreme weather resiliency.

(B) PUBLICATION.—The Director shall publish the information described in subparagraph (A) in the information portal identified in paragraph (3).

(C) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Each participating agency shall—

(i) consider incorporating criteria or guidance into existing relevant Federal grant and other funding opportunities to better support State and local efforts to improve extreme weather resiliency; and

(ii) evaluate and modify existing Federal funding opportunities, as appropriate, to maximize the return on investment for predisaster mitigation activities.

(3) INFORMATION PORTAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Plan shall—

(i) include the establishment of an online, publicly available information portal for use by Federal agencies, their partners, and stakeholders, that directs users to key data and tools to inform resilience-enhancing efforts; and

(ii) build off and be complementary to existing Federal efforts, including data.gov.

(B) MAINTENANCE.—The coordinating entity identified under paragraph (3) shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining the information portal.

(C) INFORMATION SUPPLIED.—Information shall be supplied as requested by Federal agencies, their partners, academia, and private stakeholders, in coordination with regional, State, local, and tribal agencies.

(D) CONTENTS.—The information portal established under this paragraph shall direct users to coordinated and systematic information on—

(i) best or model practices;

(ii) data;

(iii) case studies;

(iv) indicators;

(v) scientific reports;

(vi) resilience and vulnerability assessments;

(vii) guidance documents and design standards;

(viii) incentives;

(ix) education and communication initiatives;

(x) decision support tools, including risk management, short- and long-term economic analysis, and predictive models;

(xi) planning tools;

(xii) public and private sources of assistance; and

(xiii) such other information as the coordinating entity considers appropriate.

(4) COORDINATING ENTITY.—The Plan shall include the identification of a Federal agency, interagency council, office, or program, which participated in the gap and overlap analysis and Plan development. Such entity shall—

(A) coordinate the implementation of the Plan;

(B) track the progress of such implementation; and

(C) transfer responsibilities to another Federal agency, interagency council, office, or program to serve as the coordinating entity if the entities participating in the working group agree that circumstances necessitate such a change.

(5) RESILIENCY OFFICER.—Each Federal agency that assists with the gap and overlap analysis required under section 11104 shall designate, from among the agency's senior management, a Senior Resiliency Officer, who shall—

(A) facilitate the implementation of the agency's responsibilities under paragraph (1);

(B) monitor the agency's progress and performance in implementing its responsibilities under paragraph (1);

(C) report the agency's progress and performance to the head of the agency and the coordinating entity identified under paragraph (3); and

(D) serve as the agency lead in ongoing coordination efforts within the Federal agency and between the coordinating entity, other Federal agencies, public and private partners, and stakeholders.

(d) PUBLICATION.—

(1) DRAFT PLAN.—Not later than 420 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall publish a draft of the Plan developed under this section in the Federal Register.

(2) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—During the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the draft Plan is published under paragraph (1), the Director shall—

(A) solicit comment from the public; and

(B) conduct a briefing for Congress to explain the provisions contained in the draft Plan.

(3) FINAL PLAN.—Not later than 120 days after the end of the public comment period described in paragraph (2), the Director shall publish the final Plan in the Federal Register.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 630 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall begin implementing the final Plan published under subsection (d)(3).

(f) FINANCING.—To the extent possible—

(1) Federal funding should be used to leverage private sector financing for resilience building activities, consistent with the implementation of the Plan, through public-private partnerships; and

(2) Federal grant and loan programs of the Federal agencies participating in the interagency working group for this effort shall consider extreme weather resilience as a key factor when awarding funding, including the projected extreme weather risk to a project over the course of its expected life.

(g) TRIBAL, STATE, AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Plan may not place new unfunded requirements on State or local governments.

SEC. 11106. AUTHORIZATION OF OTHER ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Federal agencies are authorized to develop tools and disseminate information to improve extreme weather resilience in the key sectors set forth in section 11104(b)(1).

(b) OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY.—In conducting the gap and overlap analysis under section 11104 and developing the National Extreme Weather Resilience Action Plan under section 11105, the Director may carry out additional activities in support of the purpose of this subtitle.

SEC. 11107. REPORTS.

(a) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT.—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 Congress that—

(1) identifies existing Federal Government programs and policies related to disaster relief, response, and recovery that impede improving short- and long-term extreme weather resilience; and

(2) make recommendations for how the programs or policies could be structured differently to better support short- and long-term resilience after an extreme weather event.

(b) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a report to Congress that contains—

(1) the results of the gap and overlap analysis;

(2) the final National Extreme Weather Resilience Action Plan;

(3) an update on the implementation of the plan; and

(4) available resources for the sustained implementation of the plan.

(c) TRIENNIAL REPORTS.—Not later than 2 years after the submission of the report under subsection (a), and every 3 years thereafter, the coordinating entity identified under section 11105(c)(3), in cooperation with the interagency working group established under section 11104(a), shall submit a report to Congress that—

(1) contains an update of the National Extreme Weather Resilience Action Plan;

(2) describes the progress of the plan's implementation;

(3) improves upon the original analysis as more information and understanding about extreme weather events becomes available;

(4) establishes criteria for prioritization of activities described in the plan;

(5) reconsiders and makes changes to the plan based on the availability of new information described in paragraph (3); and

(6) identifies cost-effective changes to laws, policies, or regulations that could advance the purpose of this subtitle.

(d) FEMA REPORTS ON FUNDING.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) The Federal Emergency Management Agency grant programs are a key vehicle that exists to fund activities related to resiliency planning and projects.

(B) In order to ensure that the United States becomes more resilient to extreme weather, it is important to ensure that sufficient resources are available to support resiliency activities

(2) REPORTS.—At the end of each fiscal year, the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) shall submit a report to Congress that—

(A) identifies the amounts that were made available to the FEMA during such fiscal year for State and local entities to use for activities that support the purposes of this subtitle;

(B) identifies the amounts disbursed by FEMA to State and local entities during such fiscal year for such activities;

(C) describes the resources requested by State and local entities for activities that support the purposes of this subtitle; and

(D) identifies the difference between the amounts disbursed by FEMA and the amounts requested from FEMA by State and local entities.

SEC. 11108. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AMOUNTS FOR ANALYSIS, PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION, AND REPORTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2014 through 2016—

(1) to conduct the gap and overlap analysis required under section 11104;

(2) to conduct the activities required under section 11105, including the creation and maintenance of the information portal; and

(3) to prepare the reports to Congress required under subsections (b) and (c) of section 11107.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) shall remain available for the purposes set forth in such subsection through December 31, 2016.

SA 840. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 216, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 3019. FOUR MILE RUN, CITY OF ALEXANDRIA AND ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

Section 84(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–251; 88 Stat. 35) is amended by striking ''twenty-seven thousand cubic feet per second'' and inserting ''18,000 cubic feet per second, which—

''(A) includes wetland and fluvial habitat features; and

''(B) does not include freeboard''.

SA 841. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 20___. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NAVIGATION MAINTENANCE FOR SMALL HARBORS.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that the criteria used by the Secretary as of the date of enactment of this Act to determine funding for navigation maintenance projects does not allow small, remote, or subsistence harbors properly to compete for scarce navigation maintenance funds.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should revise the criteria described in subsection (a) to account for the impact of small, remote, and subsistence harbor projects on local and regional economies.

SA 842. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1004. NAVIGATION PROJECTS.

During the period beginning on October 1, 2012, and ending on September 30, 2017, the Secretary may carry out construction of a navigation project if—

(1) a Chief of Engineers report recommending implementation of the applicable project—

(A) is completed and submitted to Congress; and

(B) reflects a benefit-to-cost ratio of not less than 2:1; and

(2) the local sponsor of the applicable project will—

(A) advance an amount equal to the total Federal share of the cost of construction of the project; and

(B) seek reimbursement for the Federal share for future fiscal years, as described in the Chief of Engineers report.

SA 843. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1004. CONTINGENCY AUTHORIZATION FOR WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES PROJECTS.

During the period beginning on October 1, 2012, and ending on September 30, 2017, the Secretary may carry out construction of a project if—

(1) a Chief of Engineers report recommending implementation of the applicable project—

(A) is completed and submitted to Congress; and

(B) reflects a benefit-to-cost ratio of not less than 2:1; and

(2) the local sponsor of the applicable project will—

(A) advance an amount equal to the total Federal share of the cost of construction of the project; and

(B) seek reimbursement for the Federal share for future fiscal years, as described in the Chief of Engineers report.

SA 844. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1004. NAVIGATION PROJECTS.

During the period beginning on October 1, 2012, and ending on September 30, 2017, the

Secretary may carry out construction of a navigation project if—

(1) a Chief of Engineers report recommending implementation of the applicable project is completed and submitted to Congress; and

(2) the project is included in the initiative of the President entitled ''We Can't Wait'', as implemented by Executive Order 13604 (77 Fed. Reg. 18887 (March 28, 2012)).

SA 845. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1004. NAVIGATION PROJECTS.

During the period beginning on October 1, 2012, and ending on September 30, 2017, the Secretary may carry out construction of a navigation project if a Chief of Engineers report recommending implementation of the applicable project—

(1) is completed and submitted to Congress; and

(2) reflects a benefit-to-cost ratio of not less than 2:1.

SA 846. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 12001. PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(c)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''The Administrator'' and inserting ''Until such time as a permit under this section has been issued by the Secretary, the Administrator''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) takes effect on October 18, 1972.

SA 847. Mr. BAUCUS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 236, strike line 13 and insert the following:

(f) EFFECT OF SECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section replaces or provides a substitute for the authority to carry out projects under section 3110 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1135).

(2) FUNDING.—The amounts made available to carry out this section shall be used to carry out projects that are not otherwise carried out under section 3110 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1135).

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is

SA 848. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 20___. DELAY IN IMPLEMENTATION OF BIGGERT-WATERS FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2012 IN CERTAIN STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141; 126 Stat. 916) and the amendments made by that Act shall have no force or effect in New York or New Jersey until the date that is 1 year after the date on which the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency notifies Congress that all amounts contributed by the Federal Government under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program authorized under section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Assistance and Emergency Relief Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c) in response to Hurricane Sandy have been expended.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted as part of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141; 126 Stat. 916).

SA 849. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2015 and insert the following:

SEC. 2015. WATER SUPPLY.

Section 301(d) of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(d) Modifications'' and inserting the following:

''(d) APPROVAL OF CONGRESS OF MODIFICATIONS OF RESERVOIR PROJECTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A modification''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) ADDITIONAL APPROVAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in addition to the approval under paragraph (1), approval by Congress shall be required for any modification that provides storage for municipal or industrial water supply at a reservoir project (other than a project located in a State in which the Bureau of Reclamation operates reservoir projects as of April 1, 2013) with a conservation storage pool exceeding 200,000 acre-feet if, when considered cumulatively with all previous modifications of the project pursuant to this section, the modification would involve an allocation or reallocation of more than 5 percent of the conservation storage pool of the project.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Approval by Congress shall not be required under subparagraph (A) for any modification made pursuant to—

''(i) an interstate water compact approved by Congress; or

''(ii) a project-specific statutory authorization.''.

SA 850. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE XII—CLEAN WATER COOPERATIVE FEDERALISM

SECTION 12001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act of 2013''.

SEC. 12002. STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.

(a) STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.—Section 303(c)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(2) by striking ''(4)'' and inserting ''(4)(A)'';

(3) by striking ''The Administrator shall promulgate'' and inserting the following:

''(B) The Administrator shall promulgate''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A)(ii), the Administrator may not promulgate a revised or new standard for a pollutant in any case in which the State has submitted to the Administrator and the Administrator has approved a water quality standard for that pollutant, unless the State concurs with the Administrator's determination that the revised or new standard is necessary to meet the requirements of this Act.''.

(b) FEDERAL LICENSES AND PERMITS.—Section 401(a) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1341(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) With respect to any discharge, if a State or interstate agency having jurisdiction over the navigable waters at the point where the discharge originates or will originate determines under paragraph (1) that the discharge will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307, the Administrator may not take any action to supersede the determination.''.

(c) STATE NPDES PERMIT PROGRAMS.—Section 402(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1342(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR TO WITHDRAW APPROVAL OF STATE PROGRAMS.—The Administrator may not withdraw approval of a State program under paragraph (3) or (4), or limit Federal financial assistance for the State program, on the basis that the Administrator disagrees with the State regarding—

''(A) the implementation of any water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c); or

''(B) the implementation of any Federal guidance that directs the interpretation of the State's water quality standards.''.

(d) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR TO OBJECT TO INDIVIDUAL PERMITS.—Section 402(d) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) The Administrator may not object under paragraph (2) to the issuance of a permit by a State on the basis of—

''(A) the Administrator's interpretation of a water quality standard that has been

adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c); or

''(B) the implementation of any Federal guidance that directs the interpretation of the State's water quality standards.''.

SEC. 12003. PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.

(a) AUTHORITY OF EPA ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 404(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(c)'' and inserting ''(c)(1)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any permit if the State in which the discharge originates or will originate does not concur with the Administrator's determination that the discharge will result in an unacceptable adverse effect as described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.—The first sentence of section 404(g)(1) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(g)(1)) is amended by striking ''The Governor of any State desiring to administer its own individual and general permit program for the discharge'' and inserting ''The Governor of any State desiring to administer its own individual and general permit program for some or all of the discharges''.

SEC. 12004. DEADLINES FOR AGENCY COMMENTS.

Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is amended—

(1) in subsection (m) by striking ''ninetieth day'' and inserting ''30th day (or the 60th day if additional time is requested)''; and

(2) in subsection (q)—

(A) by striking ''(q)'' and inserting ''(q)(1)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) The Administrator and the head of a department or agency referred to in paragraph (1) shall each submit any comments with respect to an application for a permit under subsection (a) or (e) not later than the 30th day (or the 60th day if additional time is requested) after the date of receipt of an application for a permit under that subsection.''.

SEC. 12005. APPLICABILITY OF AMENDMENTS.

The amendments made by this title shall apply to actions taken on or after the date of enactment of this Act, including actions taken with respect to permit applications that are pending or revised or new standards that are being promulgated as of such date of enactment.

SEC. 12006. REPORTING ON HARMFUL POLLUTANTS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to Congress a report on any increase or reduction in waterborne pathogenic microorganisms (including protozoa, viruses, bacteria, and parasites), toxic chemicals, or toxic metals (such as lead and mercury) in waters regulated by a State under the provisions of this title, including the amendments made by this title.

SEC. 12007. PIPELINES CROSSING STREAMBEDS.

None of the provisions of this title, including the amendments made by this title, shall be construed to limit the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, to regulate a pipeline that crosses a streambed.

SEC. 12008. IMPACTS OF EPA REGULATORY ACTIVITY ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.

(a) ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS OF ACTIONS ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.—

(1) ANALYSIS.—Before taking a covered action, the Administrator shall analyze the impact, disaggregated by State, of the covered action on employment levels and economic activity, including estimated job losses and decreased economic activity.

(2) ECONOMIC MODELS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Administrator shall utilize the best available economic models.

(B) ANNUAL GAO REPORT.—Not later than December 31st of each year, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the economic models used by the Administrator to carry out this subsection.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—With respect to any covered action, the Administrator shall—

(A) post the analysis under paragraph (1) as a link on the main page of the public Internet Web site of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(B) request that the Governor of any State experiencing more than a de minimis negative impact post such analysis in the Capitol of such State.

(b) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator concludes under subsection (a)(1) that a covered action will have more than a de minimis negative impact on employment levels or economic activity in a State, the Administrator shall hold a public hearing in each such State at least 30 days prior to the effective date of the covered action.

(2) TIME, LOCATION, AND SELECTION.—A public hearing required under paragraph (1) shall be held at a convenient time and location for impacted residents. In selecting a location for such a public hearing, the Administrator shall give priority to locations in the State that will experience the greatest number of job losses.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—If the Administrator concludes under subsection (a)(1) that a covered action will have more than a de minimis negative impact on employment levels or economic activity in any State, the Administrator shall give notice of such impact to the State's Congressional delegation, Governor, and Legislature at least 45 days before the effective date of the covered action.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) COVERED ACTION.—The term ''covered action'' means any of the following actions taken by the Administrator under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.):

(A) Issuing a regulation, policy statement, guidance, response to a petition, or other requirement.

(B) Implementing a new or substantially altered program.

(3) MORE THAN A DE MINIMIS NEGATIVE IMPACT.—The term ''more than a de minimis negative impact'' means the following:

(A) With respect to employment levels, a loss of more than 100 jobs. Any offsetting job gains that result from the hypothetical creation of new jobs through new technologies or government employment may not be used in the job loss calculation.

(B) With respect to economic activity, a decrease in economic activity of more than $1,000,000 over any calendar year. Any offsetting economic activity that results from the hypothetical creation of new economic activity through new technologies or government employment may not be used in the economic activity calculation.

SA 851. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. COWAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 101, strike lines 4 through 14 and insert the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The project development procedures under this section apply to project studies initiated after the date on which the Secretary—

''(A) certifies to Congress that the cost to construct the water resources projects authorized for construction, but not completed on the date on which the certification is made, by the Chief of Engineers by any Act of Congress relating to water resources development, flood control, or rivers and harbors is less than $20,000,000,000 (adjusted for inflation as of the date on which the certification is made); and

''(B) determines that an environmental impact statement is required.

SA 852. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 6, lines 24 and 25, strike ''the date of enactment of this Act'' and insert ''December 31, 2016''.

SA 853. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. COWAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 138, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 2034. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The authority provided by section 2032 of this Act and section 2045 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2348) (as amended by section 2033 of this Act) shall constitute a pilot program, the authority for which terminates on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—Prior to the date on which authority is terminated under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that describes the effectiveness of the authority described in subsection (a) in streamlining projects.

SA 854. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 289, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 291, line 11, and insert the following:

SEC. 7005. REVISION TO THE INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND FINANCING RATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 4042(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(A) The Inland Waterways Trust Fund financing rate is 29 cents per gallon.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to uses during calendar quarters beginning more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 855. Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 20___. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.

Section 404(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) Subject to subsection (c) of this section'' and inserting the following:

''(b) SPECIFICATION OF DISPOSAL SITES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c)'';

(2) by striking ''Secretary (1) through'' and inserting the following:

''Secretary—

''(A) through'';

(3) by striking ''section 403(c), and (2) in any case where such guidelines under clause (1) alone'' and inserting the following:

''section 403(c); and

''(B) in any case in which the guidelines described in subparagraph (A)''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) END-USER CONSIDERATION.—For a determination of whether to issue a permit under this section, the lack of a specified end-user for a site shall not be considered under subsection (a)(3)(iv) of section 230.12 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2013), to be a lack of sufficient information to make a reasonable judgment as to whether the proposed discharge will comply with the guidelines contained in subsection (a) of that section (as in effect on that date of enactment), if the jurisdiction for which the permit application is submitted—

''(A) meets all applicable requirements of paragraph (1) and section 230.12(a) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2013); and

''(B) is, or is located in, a county with a 5-year average unemployment rate of not less than 10 percent.''.

SA 856. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 6, lines 24 and 25, strike ''the date of enactment of this Act'' and insert ''December 31, 2016''.

SA 857. Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 71, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 2024. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF GREAT LAKES PROJECTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Great Lakes Navigation System is a unique resource that supports waterborne commerce critical to the national economy; and

(2) in managing the Great Lakes Navigation System, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, should recognize—

(A) the connectivity and interrelationships among the projects; and

(B) the factors that threaten safe navigation conditions throughout the Great Lakes Navigation System, including lake level fluctuations and shoaling caused by major storm events.

(b) DEFINITION OF GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION SYSTEM.—In this section, the term ''Great Lakes Navigation System'' has the meaning given the term in section 210(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (as added by section 8004(a)).

(c) MANAGEMENT OF THE GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION SYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To sustain the most effective and efficient operation and maintenance of the Great Lakes Navigation System, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall manage and allocate funding for all of the individually authorized commercial navigation projects in the Great Lakes Navigation System as components of a single, comprehensive system, recognizing the interdependence of the projects.

(2) CARGO MEASUREMENTS.—Cargo measurements for the purpose of prioritizing annual operations and maintenance budget resources for the Great Lakes Navigation System, and for any of the component projects of the System, shall aggregate the tonnage of all components of the System.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 8, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''The Role of Immigrants in America's Innovation Economy.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 8, 2013, at 11:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 8, 2013, at 10 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing entitled ''Curbing Federal Agency Waste and Fraud: New Steps to Strengthen the Integrity of Federal Payments.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 8, 2013, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 8, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 8, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 106 Dirksen Senate Office building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Strengthening the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem for Minority Women.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Airland of the Armed Services Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 8, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

Mrs. BOXER. 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 May 8, 2013, at 9 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Cyber Threats: Law Enforcement and Private Sector Responses.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the Distrcit of Columbia of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 8, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The Role of the Private Sector in Preparedness and Emergency Response.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommitte on Seapower of the Armed Services Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 8, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Senate Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 8, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 39 and 41; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; 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 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 related statements 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANIMAL DRUG AND ANIMAL GENERIC DRUG USER FEE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 31, S. 622.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 622) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 622) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 622

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 ''Animal Drug and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Reauthorization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS; REFERENCES IN ACT.

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

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents; references in Act.

TITLE I—FEES RELATING TO ANIMAL DRUGS

Sec. 101. Short title; finding.
Sec. 102. Definitions.
Sec. 103. Authority to assess and use animal drug fees.
Sec. 104. Reauthorization; reporting requirements.
Sec. 105. Savings clause.
Sec. 106. Effective date.
Sec. 107. Sunset dates.

TITLE II—FEES RELATING TO GENERIC ANIMAL DRUGS

Sec. 201. Short title; finding.
Sec. 202. Authority to assess and use generic new animal drug fees.
Sec. 203. Reauthorization; reporting requirements.
Sec. 204. Savings clause.
Sec. 205. Effective date.
Sec. 206. Sunset dates.

(b) REFERENCES IN ACT.—Except as otherwise specified, amendments made by this Act to a section or other provision of law are amendments to such section or other provision of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).

TITLE I—FEES RELATING TO ANIMAL DRUGS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE; FINDING.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the ''Animal Drug User Fee Amendments of 2013''.

(b) FINDING.—Congress finds that the fees authorized by the amendments made in this title will be dedicated toward expediting the animal drug development process and the review of new and supplemental animal drug applications and investigational animal drug submissions as set forth in the goals identified, for purposes of part 4 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, in the letters from the Secretary of Health and Human Services to the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate as set forth in the Congressional Record.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 739 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j–11) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 739. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this part:

''(1) The term 'animal drug application' means an application for approval of any new animal drug submitted under section 512(b)(1). Such term does not include either a new animal drug application submitted under section 512(b)(2) or a supplemental animal drug application.

''(2) The term 'supplemental animal drug application' means—

''(A) a request to the Secretary to approve a change in an animal drug application which has been approved; or

''(B) a request to the Secretary to approve a change to an application approved under section 512(c)(2) for which data with respect to safety or effectiveness are required.

''(3) The term 'animal drug product' means each specific strength or potency of a particular active ingredient or ingredients in final dosage form marketed by a particular manufacturer or distributor, which is uniquely identified by the labeler code and product code portions of the national drug code, and for which an animal drug application or a supplemental animal drug application has been approved.

''(4) The term 'animal drug establishment' means a foreign or domestic place of business which is at one general physical location consisting of one or more buildings all of which are within 5 miles of each other, at which one or more animal drug products are manufactured in final dosage form.

''(5) The term 'investigational animal drug submission' means—

''(A) the filing of a claim for an investigational exemption under section 512(j) for a new animal drug intended to be the subject of an animal drug application or a supplemental animal drug application; or

''(B) the submission of information for the purpose of enabling the Secretary to evaluate the safety or effectiveness of an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application in the event of their filing.

''(6) The term 'animal drug sponsor' means either an applicant named in an animal drug application that has not been withdrawn by the applicant and for which approval has not been withdrawn by the Secretary , or a person who has submitted an investigational animal drug submission that has not been terminated or otherwise rendered inactive by the Secretary.

''(7) The term 'final dosage form' means, with respect to an animal drug product, a finished dosage form which is approved for administration to an animal without substantial further manufacturing. Such term includes animal drug products intended for mixing in animal feeds.

''(8) The term 'process for the review of animal drug applications' means the following activities of the Secretary with respect to the review of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions:

''(A) The activities necessary for the review of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions.

''(B) The issuance of action letters which approve animal drug applications or supplemental animal drug applications or which set forth in detail the specific deficiencies in animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, or investigational animal drug submissions and, where appropriate, the actions necessary to place such applications, supplements or submissions in condition for approval.

''(C) The inspection of animal drug establishments and other facilities undertaken as part of the Secretary's review of pending animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions.

''(D) Monitoring of research conducted in connection with the review of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions.

''(E) The development of regulations and policy related to the review of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions.

''(F) Development of standards for products subject to review.

''(G) Meetings between the agency and the animal drug sponsor.

''(H) Review of advertising and labeling prior to approval of an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application, but not after such application has been approved.

''(9) The term 'costs of resources allocated for the process for the review of animal drug applications' means the expenses in connection with the process for the review of animal drug applications for—

''(A) officers and employees of the Food and Drug Administration, contractors of the Food and Drug Administration, advisory committees consulted with respect to the review of specific animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, or investigational animal drug submissions, and costs related to such officers, employees, committees, and contractors, including costs for travel, education, and recruitment and other personnel activities;

''(B) management of information and the acquisition, maintenance, and repair of computer resources;

''(C) leasing, maintenance, renovation, and repair of facilities and acquisition, maintenance, and repair of fixtures, furniture, scientific equipment, and other necessary materials and supplies; and

''(D) collecting fees under section 740 and accounting for resources allocated for the review of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions.

''(10) The term 'adjustment factor' applicable to a fiscal year refers to the formula set forth in section 735(8) with the base or comparator month being October 2002.

''(11) The term 'person' includes an affiliate thereof.

''(12) The term 'affiliate' refers to the definition set forth in section 735(11).''.

SEC. 103. AUTHORITY TO ASSESS AND USE ANIMAL DRUG FEES.

Section 740 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j–12) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 740. AUTHORITY TO ASSESS AND USE ANIMAL DRUG FEES.

''(a) TYPES OF FEES.—Beginning in fiscal year 2004, the Secretary shall assess and collect fees in accordance with this section as follows:

''(1) ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATION AND SUPPLEMENT FEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each person that submits, on or after September 1, 2003, an animal drug application or a supplemental animal drug application shall be subject to a fee as follows:

''(i) A fee established in subsection (c) for an animal drug application, except an animal drug application subject to the criteria set forth in section 512(d)(4).

''(ii) A fee established in subsection (c), in an amount that is equal to 50 percent of the amount of the fee under clause (i), for—

''(I) a supplemental animal drug application for which safety or effectiveness data are required; and

''(II) an animal drug application subject to the criteria set forth in section 512(d)(4).

''(B) PAYMENT.—The fee required by subparagraph (A) shall be due upon submission of the animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application.

''(C) EXCEPTION FOR PREVIOUSLY FILED APPLICATION OR SUPPLEMENT.—If an animal drug application or a supplemental animal drug application was submitted by a person that paid the fee for such application or supplement, was accepted for filing, and was not approved or was withdrawn (without a waiver or refund), the submission of an animal drug application or a supplemental animal drug application for the same product by the same person (or the person's licensee, assignee, or successor) shall not be subject to a fee under subparagraph (A).

''(D) REFUND OF FEE IF APPLICATION REFUSED FOR FILING.—The Secretary shall refund 75 percent of the fee paid under subparagraph (B) for any animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application which is refused for filing.

''(E) REFUND OF FEE IF APPLICATION WITHDRAWN.—If an animal drug application or a supplemental animal drug application is withdrawn after the application or supplement was filed, the Secretary may refund the fee or portion of the fee paid under subparagraph (B) if no substantial work was performed on the application or supplement after the application or supplement was filed. The Secretary shall have the sole discretion to refund the fee under this paragraph. A determination by the Secretary concerning a refund under this paragraph shall not be reviewable.

''(2) ANIMAL DRUG PRODUCT FEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each person—

''(i) who is named as the applicant in an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application for an animal drug product which has been submitted for listing under section 510; and

''(ii) who, after September 1, 2003, had pending before the Secretary an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application,

shall pay for each such animal drug product the annual fee established in subsection (c).

''(B) PAYMENT; FEE DUE DATE.—Such fee shall be payable for the fiscal year in which the animal drug product is first submitted for listing under section 510, or is submitted for relisting under section 510 if the animal drug product has been withdrawn from listing and relisted. After such fee is paid for that fiscal year, such fee shall be due each subsequent fiscal year that the product remains listed, upon the later of—

''(i) the first business day after the date of enactment of an appropriations Act providing for the collection and obligation of fees for such fiscal year under this section; or

''(ii) January 31 of each year.

''(C) LIMITATION.—Such fee shall be paid only once for each animal drug product for a fiscal year in which the fee is payable.

''(3) ANIMAL DRUG ESTABLISHMENT FEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each person—

''(i) who owns or operates, directly or through an affiliate, an animal drug establishment;

''(ii) who is named as the applicant in an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application for an animal drug product which has been submitted for listing under section 510; and

''(iii) who, after September 1, 2003, had pending before the Secretary an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application,

shall be assessed an annual establishment fee as established in subsection (c) for each animal drug establishment listed in its approved animal drug application as an establishment that manufactures the animal drug product named in the application.

''(B) PAYMENT; FEE DUE DATE.—The annual establishment fee shall be assessed in each fiscal year in which the animal drug product named in the application is assessed a fee under paragraph (2) unless the animal drug establishment listed in the application does not engage in the manufacture of the animal drug product during the fiscal year. The fee under this paragraph for a fiscal year shall be due upon the later of—

''(i) the first business day after the date of enactment of an appropriations Act providing for the collection and obligation of fees for such fiscal year under this section; or

''(ii) January 31 of each year.

''(C) LIMITATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An establishment shall be assessed only one fee per fiscal year under this section, subject to clause (ii).

''(ii) CERTAIN MANUFACTURERS.—If a single establishment manufactures both animal drug products and prescription drug products, as defined in section 735(3), such establishment shall be assessed both the animal drug establishment fee and the prescription drug establishment fee, as set forth in section 736(a)(2), within a single fiscal year.

''(4) ANIMAL DRUG SPONSOR FEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each person—

''(i) who meets the definition of an animal drug sponsor within a fiscal year; and

''(ii) who, after September 1, 2003, had pending before the Secretary an animal drug application, a supplemental animal drug application, or an investigational animal drug submission,

shall be assessed an annual sponsor fee as established under subsection (c).

''(B) PAYMENT; FEE DUE DATE.—The fee under this paragraph for a fiscal year shall be due upon the later of—

''(i) the first business day after the date of enactment of an appropriations Act providing for the collection and obligation of fees for such fiscal year under this section; or

''(ii) January 31 of each year.

''(C) LIMITATION.—Each animal drug sponsor shall pay only one such fee each fiscal year.

''(b) FEE REVENUE AMOUNTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (c), (d), (f), and (g)—

''(A) for fiscal year 2014, the fees required under subsection (a) shall be established to generate a total revenue amount of $23,600,000; and

''(B) for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018, the fees required under subsection (a) shall be established to generate a total revenue amount of $21,600,000.

''(2) TYPES OF FEES.—Of the total revenue amount determined for a fiscal year under paragraph (1)—

''(A) 20 percent shall be derived from fees under subsection (a)(1) (relating to animal drug applications and supplements);

''(B) 27 percent shall be derived from fees under subsection (a)(2) (relating to animal drug products);

''(C) 26 percent shall be derived from fees under subsection (a)(3) (relating to animal drug establishments); and

''(D) 27 percent shall be derived from fees under subsection (a)(4) (relating to animal drug sponsors).

''(c) ANNUAL FEE SETTING; ADJUSTMENTS.—

''(1) ANNUAL FEE SETTING.—The Secretary shall establish, 60 days before the start of each fiscal year beginning after September 30, 2003, for that fiscal year, animal drug application fees, supplemental animal drug application fees, animal drug sponsor fees, animal drug establishment fees, and animal drug product fees based on the revenue amounts established under subsection (b) and the adjustments provided under this subsection.

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—For fiscal year 2015 and subsequent fiscal years, the revenue amounts established in subsection (b) shall be adjusted by the Secretary by notice, published in the Federal Register, for a fiscal year, by an amount equal to the sum of—

''(A) one;

''(B) the average annual percent change in the cost, per full-time equivalent position of the Food and Drug Administration, of all personnel compensation and benefits paid with respect to such positions for the first 3 of the preceding 4 fiscal years for which data are available, multiplied by the average proportion of personnel compensation and benefits costs to total Food and Drug Administration costs for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 fiscal years for which data are available; and

''(C) the average annual percent change that occurred in the Consumer Price Index for urban consumers (Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV; not seasonally adjusted; all items less food and energy; annual index) for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 years for which data are available multiplied by the average proportion of all costs other than personnel compensation and benefits costs to total Food and Drug Administration costs for the first 3 years of the preceding 4 fiscal years for which data are available.

The adjustment made each fiscal year under this paragraph shall be added on a compounded basis to the sum of all adjustments made each fiscal year after fiscal year 2014 under this paragraph.

''(3) WORKLOAD ADJUSTMENT.—For fiscal year 2015 and subsequent fiscal years, after the revenue amounts established in subsection (b) are adjusted for inflation in accordance with paragraph (2), the revenue amounts shall be further adjusted for such fiscal year to reflect changes in the workload of the Secretary for the process for the review of animal drug applications. With respect to such adjustment—

''(A) such adjustment shall be determined by the Secretary based on a weighted average of the change in the total number of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications for which data with respect to safety or effectiveness are required, manufacturing supplemental animal drug applications, investigational animal drug study submissions, and investigational animal drug protocol submissions submitted to the Secretary;

''(B) the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the fees resulting from such adjustment and the supporting methodologies; and

''(C) under no circumstances shall such adjustment result in fee revenues for a fiscal year that are less than the fee revenues for that fiscal year established in subsection (b), as adjusted for inflation under paragraph (2).

''(4) FINAL YEAR ADJUSTMENT.—For fiscal year 2018, the Secretary may, in addition to other adjustments under this subsection, further increase the fees under this section, if such an adjustment is necessary, to provide for up to 3 months of operating reserves of carryover user fees for the process for the review of animal drug applications for the first 3 months of fiscal year 2019. If the Food and Drug Administration has carryover balances for the process for the review of animal drug applications in excess of 3 months of such operating reserves, then this adjustment will not be made. If this adjustment is necessary, then the rationale for the amount of the increase shall be contained in the annual notice setting fees for fiscal year 2018.

''(5) LIMIT.—The total amount of fees charged, as adjusted under this subsection, for a fiscal year may not exceed the total costs for such fiscal year for the resources allocated for the process for the review of animal drug applications.

''(d) FEE WAIVER OR REDUCTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall grant a waiver from or a reduction of one or more fees assessed under subsection (a) where the Secretary finds that—

''(A) the assessment of the fee would present a significant barrier to innovation because of limited resources available to such person or other circumstances;

''(B) the fees to be paid by such person will exceed the anticipated present and future costs incurred by the Secretary in conducting the process for the review of animal drug applications for such person;

''(C) the animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application is intended solely to provide for use of the animal drug in—

''(i) a Type B medicated feed (as defined in section 558.3(b)(3) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)) intended for use in the manufacture of Type C free-choice medicated feeds; or

''(ii) a Type C free-choice medicated feed (as defined in section 558.3(b)(4) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation));

''(D) the animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application is intended solely to provide for a minor use or minor species indication; or

''(E) the sponsor involved is a small business submitting its first animal drug application to the Secretary for review.

''(2) USE OF STANDARD COSTS.—In making the finding in paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary may use standard costs.

''(3) RULES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In paragraph (1)(E), the term 'small business' means an entity that has fewer than 500 employees, including employees of affiliates.

''(B) WAIVER OF APPLICATION FEE.—The Secretary shall waive under paragraph (1)(E) the application fee for the first animal drug application that a small business or its affiliate submits to the Secretary for review. After a small business or its affiliate is granted such a waiver, the small business or its affiliate shall pay application fees for all subsequent animal drug applications and supplemental animal drug applications for which safety or effectiveness data are required in the same manner as an entity that does not qualify as a small business.

''(C) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall require any person who applies for a waiver under paragraph (1)(E) to certify their qualification for the waiver. The Secretary shall periodically publish in the Federal Register a list of persons making such certifications.

''(e) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY FEES.—An animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application submitted by a person subject to fees under subsection (a) shall be considered incomplete and shall not be accepted for filing by the Secretary until all fees owed by such person have been paid. An investigational animal drug submission under section 739(5)(B) that is submitted by a person subject to fees under subsection (a) shall be considered incomplete and shall not be accepted for review by the Secretary until all fees owed by such person have been paid. The Secretary may discontinue review of any animal drug application, supplemental animal drug application or investigational animal drug submission from a person if such person has not submitted for payment all fees owed under this section by 30 days after the date upon which they are due.

''(f) ASSESSMENT OF FEES.—

''(1) LIMITATION.—Fees may not be assessed under subsection (a) for a fiscal year beginning after fiscal year 2003 unless appropriations for salaries and expenses of the Food and Drug Administration for such fiscal year (excluding the amount of fees appropriated for such fiscal year) are equal to or greater than the amount of appropriations for the salaries and expenses of the Food and Drug Administration for the fiscal year 2003 (excluding the amount of fees appropriated for such fiscal year) multiplied by the adjustment factor applicable to the fiscal year involved.

''(2) AUTHORITY.—If the Secretary does not assess fees under subsection (a) during any portion of a fiscal year because of paragraph (1) and if at a later date in such fiscal year the Secretary may assess such fees, the Secretary may assess and collect such fees, without any modification in the rate, for animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, investigational animal drug submissions, animal drug sponsors, animal drug establishments and animal drug products at any time in such fiscal year notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) relating to the date fees are to be paid.

''(g) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2)(C), fees authorized under subsection (a) shall be collected and available for obligation only to the extent and in the amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts. Such fees are authorized to be appropriated to remain available until expended. Such sums as may be necessary may be transferred from the Food and Drug Administration salaries and expenses appropriation account without fiscal year limitation to such appropriation account for salary and expenses with such fiscal year limitation. The sums transferred shall be available solely for the process for the review of animal drug applications.

''(2) COLLECTIONS AND APPROPRIATION ACTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The fees authorized by this section—

''(i) subject to subparagraph (C), shall be collected and available in each fiscal year in an amount not to exceed the amount specified in appropriation Acts, or otherwise made available for obligation for such fiscal year, and

''(ii) shall be available to defray increases in the costs of the resources allocated for the process for the review of animal drug applications (including increases in such costs for an additional number of full-time equivalent positions in the Department of Health and Human Services to be engaged in such process) over such costs, excluding costs paid

from fees collected under this section, for fiscal year 2003 multiplied by the adjustment factor.

''(B) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary shall be considered to have met the requirements of subparagraph (A)(ii) in any fiscal year if the costs funded by appropriations and allocated for the process for the review of animal drug applications—

''(i) are not more than 3 percent below the level specified in subparagraph (A)(ii); or

''(ii)(I) are more than 3 percent below the level specified in subparagraph (A)(ii), and fees assessed for the fiscal year following the subsequent fiscal year are decreased by the amount in excess of 3 percent by which such costs fell below the level specified in subparagraph (A)(ii); and

''(II) such costs are not more than 5 percent below the level specified in subparagraph (A)(ii).

''(C) PROVISION FOR EARLY PAYMENTS.—Payment of fees authorized under this section for a fiscal year, prior to the due date for such fees, may be accepted by the Secretary in accordance with authority provided in advance in a prior year appropriations Act.

''(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2018, there is authorized to be appropriated for fees under this section an amount equal to the total revenue amount determined under subsection (b) for the fiscal year, as adjusted or otherwise affected under subsection (c) and paragraph (4).

''(4) OFFSET OF OVERCOLLECTIONS; RECOVERY OF COLLECTION SHORTFALLS.—

''(A) OFFSET OF OVERCOLLECTIONS.—If the sum of the cumulative amount of fees collected under this section for fiscal years 2014 through 2016 and the amount of fees estimated to be collected under this section for fiscal year 2017 (including any increased fee collections attributable to subparagraph (B)), exceeds the cumulative amount appropriated pursuant to paragraph (3) for the fiscal years 2014 through 2017, the excess amount shall be credited to the appropriation account of the Food and Drug Administration as provided in paragraph (1), and shall be subtracted from the amount of fees that would otherwise be authorized to be collected under this section pursuant to appropriation Acts for fiscal year 2018.

''(B) RECOVERY OF COLLECTION SHORTFALLS.—

''(i) FISCAL YEAR 2016.—For fiscal year 2016, the amount of fees otherwise authorized to be collected under this section shall be increased by the amount, if any, by which the amount collected under this section and appropriated for fiscal year 2014 falls below the amount of fees authorized for fiscal year 2014 under paragraph (3).

''(ii) FISCAL YEAR 2017.—For fiscal year 2017, the amount of fees otherwise authorized to be collected under this section shall be increased by the amount, if any, by which the amount collected under this section and appropriated for fiscal year 2015 falls below the amount of fees authorized for fiscal year 2015 under paragraph (3).

''(iii) FISCAL YEAR 2018.—For fiscal year 2018, the amount of fees otherwise authorized to be collected under this section (including any reduction in the authorized amount under subparagraph (A)), shall be increased by the cumulative amount, if any, by which the amount collected under this section and appropriated for fiscal years 2016 and 2017 (including estimated collections for fiscal year 2017) falls below the cumulative amount of fees authorized under paragraph (3) for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

''(h) COLLECTION OF UNPAID FEES.—In any case where the Secretary does not receive payment of a fee assessed under subsection (a) within 30 days after it is due, such fee shall be treated as a claim of the United States Government subject to subchapter II of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.

''(i) WRITTEN REQUESTS FOR WAIVERS, REDUCTIONS, AND REFUNDS.—To qualify for consideration for a waiver or reduction under subsection (d), or for a refund of any fee collected in accordance with subsection (a), a person shall submit to the Secretary a written request for such waiver, reduction, or refund not later than 180 days after such fee is due.

''(j) CONSTRUCTION.—This section may not be construed to require that the number of full-time equivalent positions in the Department of Health and Human Services, for officers, employees, and advisory committees not engaged in the process of the review of animal drug applications, be reduced to offset the number of officers, employees, and advisory committees so engaged.

''(k) ABBREVIATED NEW ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) to the extent practicable, segregate the review of abbreviated new animal drug applications from the process for the review of animal drug applications; and

''(2) adopt other administrative procedures to ensure that review times of abbreviated new animal drug applications do not increase from their current level due to activities under the user fee program.''.

SEC. 104. REAUTHORIZATION; REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 740A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j–13) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 740A. REAUTHORIZATION; REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

''(a) PERFORMANCE REPORT.—Beginning with fiscal year 2014, not later than 120 days after the end of each fiscal year during which fees are collected under this part, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report concerning the progress of the Food and Drug Administration in achieving the goals identified in the letters described in section 101(b) of the Animal Drug User Fee Amendments of 2013 toward expediting the animal drug development process and the review of the new and supplemental animal drug applications and investigational animal drug submissions during such fiscal year, the future plans of the Food and Drug Administration for meeting the goals, the review times for abbreviated new animal drug applications, and the administrative procedures adopted by the Food and Drug Administration to ensure that review times for abbreviated new animal drug applications are not increased from their current level due to activities under the user fee program.

''(b) FISCAL REPORT.—Beginning with fiscal year 2014, not later than 120 days after the end of each fiscal year during which fees are collected under this part, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the implementation of the authority for such fees during such fiscal year and the use, by the Food and Drug Administration, of the fees collected during such fiscal year for which the report is made.

''(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the reports required under subsections (a) and (b) available to the public on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration.

''(d) REAUTHORIZATION.—

''(1) CONSULTATION.—In developing recommendations to present to the Congress with respect to the goals, and plans for meeting the goals, for the process for the review of animal drug applications for the first 5 fiscal years after fiscal year 2018, and for the reauthorization of this part for such fiscal years, the Secretary shall consult with—

''(A) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

''(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

''(C) scientific and academic experts;

''(D) veterinary professionals;

''(E) representatives of patient and consumer advocacy groups; and

''(F) the regulated industry.

''(2) PRIOR PUBLIC INPUT.—Prior to beginning negotiations with the regulated industry on the reauthorization of this part, the Secretary shall—

''(A) publish a notice in the Federal Register requesting public input on the reauthorization;

''(B) hold a public meeting at which the public may present its views on the reauthorization, including specific suggestions for changes to the goals referred to in subsection (a);

''(C) provide a period of 30 days after the public meeting to obtain written comments from the public suggesting changes to this part; and

''(D) publish the comments on the Food and Drug Administration's Internet Web site.

''(3) PERIODIC CONSULTATION.—Not less frequently than once every 4 months during negotiations with the regulated industry, the Secretary shall hold discussions with representatives of veterinary, patient, and consumer advocacy groups to continue discussions of their views on the reauthorization and their suggestions for changes to this part as expressed under paragraph (2).

''(4) PUBLIC REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—After negotiations with the regulated industry, the Secretary shall—

''(A) present the recommendations developed under paragraph (1) to the Congressional committees specified in such paragraph;

''(B) publish such recommendations in the Federal Register;

''(C) provide for a period of 30 days for the public to provide written comments on such recommendations;

''(D) hold a meeting at which the public may present its views on such recommendations; and

''(E) after consideration of such public views and comments, revise such recommendations as necessary.

''(5) TRANSMITTAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than January 15, 2018, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress the revised recommendations under paragraph (4) a summary of the views and comments received under such paragraph, and any changes made to the recommendations in response to such views and comments.

''(6) MINUTES OF NEGOTIATION MEETINGS.—

''(A) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Before presenting the recommendations developed under paragraphs (1) through (5) to Congress, the Secretary shall make publicly available, on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration, minutes of all negotiation meetings conducted under this subsection between the Food and Drug Administration and the regulated industry.

''(B) CONTENT.—The minutes described under subparagraph (A) shall summarize any substantive proposal made by any party to the negotiations as well as significant controversies or differences of opinion during the negotiations and their resolution.''.

SEC. 105. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Notwithstanding the amendments made by this title, part 4 of subchapter C of chapter

VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j–11 et seq.), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this title, shall continue to be in effect with respect to animal drug applications and supplemental animal drug applications (as defined in such part as of such day) that on or after October 1, 2008, but before October 1, 2013, were accepted by the Food and Drug Administration for filing with respect to assessing and collecting any fee required by such part for a fiscal year prior to fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 106. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2013, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later, except that fees under part 4 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended by this title, shall be assessed for all animal drug applications and supplemental animal drug applications received on or after October 1, 2013, regardless of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 107. SUNSET DATES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 740 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j–12) shall cease to be effective October 1, 2018.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 740A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j–13) shall cease to be effective January 31, 2019.

(c) PREVIOUS SUNSET PROVISION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 108 of the Animal Drug User Fee Amendments of 2008 (Public Law 110–316) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The Animal Drug User Fee Amendments of 2008 (Public Law 110–316) is amended in the table of contents in section 1, by striking the item relating to section 108.

(d) TECHNICAL CLARIFICATION.—Effective November 18, 2003, section 5 of the Animal Drug User Fee Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–130) is repealed.

TITLE II—FEES RELATING TO GENERIC ANIMAL DRUGS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE; FINDING.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the ''Animal Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2013''.

(b) FINDING.—The fees authorized by this title will be dedicated toward expediting the generic new animal drug development process and the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs, supplemental abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs, and investigational submissions for generic new animal drugs as set forth in the goals identified in the letters from the Secretary of Health and Human Services to the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate as set forth in the Congressional Record.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO ASSESS AND USE GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUG FEES.

Section 741 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j–21) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 741. AUTHORITY TO ASSESS AND USE GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUG FEES.

''(a) TYPES OF FEES.—Beginning with respect to fiscal year 2009, the Secretary shall assess and collect fees in accordance with this section as follows:

''(1) ABBREVIATED APPLICATION FEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each person that submits, on or after July 1, 2008, an abbreviated application for a generic new animal drug shall be subject to a fee as established in subsection (c) for such an application.

''(B) PAYMENT.—The fee required by subparagraph (A) shall be due upon submission of the abbreviated application.

''(C) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(i) PREVIOUSLY FILED APPLICATION.—If an abbreviated application was submitted by a person that paid the fee for such application, was accepted for filing, and was not approved or was withdrawn (without a waiver or refund), the submission of an abbreviated application for the same product by the same person (or the person's licensee, assignee, or successor) shall not be subject to a fee under subparagraph (A).

''(ii) CERTAIN ABBREVIATED APPLICATIONS INVOLVING COMBINATION ANIMAL DRUGS.—An abbreviated application which is subject to the criteria in section 512(d)(4) and submitted on or after October 1, 2013 shall be subject to a fee equal to 50 percent of the amount of the abbreviated application fee established in subsection (c).

''(D) REFUND OF FEE IF APPLICATION REFUSED FOR FILING.—The Secretary shall refund 75 percent of the fee paid under subparagraph (B) for any abbreviated application which is refused for filing.

''(E) REFUND OF FEE IF APPLICATION WITHDRAWN.—If an abbreviated application is withdrawn after the application was filed, the Secretary may refund the fee or portion of the fee paid under subparagraph (B) if no substantial work was performed on the application after the application was filed. The Secretary shall have the sole discretion to refund the fee under this subparagraph. A determination by the Secretary concerning a refund under this subparagraph shall not be reviewable.

''(2) GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUG PRODUCT FEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each person—

''(i) who is named as the applicant in an abbreviated application or supplemental abbreviated application for a generic new animal drug product which has been submitted for listing under section 510; and

''(ii) who, after September 1, 2008, had pending before the Secretary an abbreviated application or supplemental abbreviated application,

shall pay for each such generic new animal drug product the annual fee established in subsection (c).

''(B) PAYMENT; FEE DUE DATE.—Such fee shall be payable for the fiscal year in which the generic new animal drug product is first submitted for listing under section 510, or is submitted for relisting under section 510 if the generic new animal drug product has been withdrawn from listing and relisted. After such fee is paid for that fiscal year, such fee shall be due each subsequent fiscal year that the product remains listed, upon the later of—

''(i) the first business day after the date of enactment of an appropriations Act providing for the collection and obligation of fees for such fiscal year under this section; or

''(ii) January 31 of each year.

''(C) LIMITATION.—Such fee shall be paid only once for each generic new animal drug product for a fiscal year in which the fee is payable.

''(3) GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUG SPONSOR FEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each person—

''(i) who meets the definition of a generic new animal drug sponsor within a fiscal year; and

''(ii) who, after September 1, 2008, had pending before the Secretary an abbreviated application, a supplemental abbreviated application, or an investigational submission,

shall be assessed an annual generic new animal drug sponsor fee as established under subsection (c).

''(B) PAYMENT; FEE DUE DATE.—Such fee shall be due each fiscal year upon the later of—

''(i) the first business day after the date of enactment of an appropriations Act providing for the collection and obligation of fees for such fiscal year under this section; or

''(ii) January 31 of each year.

''(C) AMOUNT OF FEE.—Each generic new animal drug sponsor shall pay only 1 such fee each fiscal year, as follows:

''(i) 100 percent of the amount of the generic new animal drug sponsor fee published for that fiscal year under subsection (c) for an applicant with more than 6 approved abbreviated applications.

''(ii) 75 percent of the amount of the generic new animal drug sponsor fee published for that fiscal year under subsection (c) for an applicant with more than 1 and fewer than 7 approved abbreviated applications.

''(iii) 50 percent of the amount of the generic new animal drug sponsor fee published for that fiscal year under subsection (c) for an applicant with 1 or fewer approved abbreviated applications.

''(b) FEE AMOUNTS.—Subject to subsections (c), (d), (f), and (g), the fees required under subsection (a) shall be established to generate fee revenue amounts as follows:

''(1) TOTAL FEE REVENUES FOR APPLICATION FEES.—The total fee revenues to be collected in abbreviated application fees under subsection (a)(1) shall be $1,832,000 for fiscal year 2014, $1,736,000 for fiscal year 2015, $1,857,000 for fiscal year 2016, $1,984,000 for fiscal year 2017, and $2,117,000 for fiscal year 2018.

''(2) TOTAL FEE REVENUES FOR PRODUCT FEES.—The total fee revenues to be collected in generic new animal drug product fees under subsection (a)(2) shall be $2,748,000 for fiscal year 2014, $2,604,000 for fiscal year 2015, $2,786,000 for fiscal year 2016, $2,976,000 for fiscal year 2017, and $3,175,000 for fiscal year 2018.

''(3) TOTAL FEE REVENUES FOR SPONSOR FEES.—The total fee revenues to be collected in generic new animal drug sponsor fees under subsection (a)(3) shall be $2,748,000 for fiscal year 2014, $2,604,000 for fiscal year 2015, $2,786,000 for fiscal year 2016, $2,976,000 for fiscal year 2017, and $3,175,000 for fiscal year 2018.

''(c) ANNUAL FEE SETTING; ADJUSTMENTS.—

''(1) ANNUAL FEE SETTING.—The Secretary shall establish, 60 days before the start of each fiscal year beginning after September 30, 2008, for that fiscal year, abbreviated application fees, generic new animal drug sponsor fees, and generic new animal drug product fees, based on the revenue amounts established under subsection (b) and the adjustments provided under this subsection.

''(2) WORKLOAD ADJUSTMENT.—The fee revenues shall be adjusted each fiscal year after fiscal year 2014 to reflect changes in review workload. With respect to such adjustment:

''(A) This adjustment shall be determined by the Secretary based on a weighted average of the change in the total number of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs, manufacturing supplemental abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs, investigational generic new animal drug study submissions, and investigational generic new animal drug protocol submissions submitted to the Secretary. The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the fees resulting from this adjustment and the supporting methodologies.

''(B) Under no circumstances shall this workload adjustment result in fee revenues for a fiscal year that are less than the fee revenues for that fiscal year established in subsection (b).

''(3) FINAL YEAR ADJUSTMENT.—For fiscal year 2018, the Secretary may, in addition to other adjustments under this subsection, further increase the fees under this section, if such an adjustment is necessary, to provide

for up to 3 months of operating reserves of carryover user fees for the process for the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs for the first 3 months of fiscal year 2019. If the Food and Drug Administration has carryover balances for the process for the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs in excess of 3 months of such operating reserves, then this adjustment shall not be made. If this adjustment is necessary, then the rationale for the amount of the increase shall be contained in the annual notice setting fees for fiscal year 2018.

''(4) LIMIT.—The total amount of fees charged, as adjusted under this subsection, for a fiscal year may not exceed the total costs for such fiscal year for the resources allocated for the process for the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs.

''(d) FEE WAIVER OR REDUCTION.—The Secretary shall grant a waiver from or a reduction of 1 or more fees assessed under subsection (a) where the Secretary finds that the generic new animal drug is intended solely to provide for a minor use or minor species indication.

''(e) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY FEES.—An abbreviated application for a generic new animal drug submitted by a person subject to fees under subsection (a) shall be considered incomplete and shall not be accepted for filing by the Secretary until all fees owed by such person have been paid. An investigational submission for a generic new animal drug that is submitted by a person subject to fees under subsection (a) shall be considered incomplete and shall not be accepted for review by the Secretary until all fees owed by such person have been paid. The Secretary may discontinue review of any abbreviated application for a generic new animal drug, supplemental abbreviated application for a generic new animal drug, or investigational submission for a generic new animal drug from a person if such person has not submitted for payment all fees owed under this section by 30 days after the date upon which they are due.

''(f) ASSESSMENT OF FEES.—

''(1) LIMITATION.—Fees may not be assessed under subsection (a) for a fiscal year beginning after fiscal year 2008 unless appropriations for salaries and expenses of the Food and Drug Administration for such fiscal year (excluding the amount of fees appropriated for such fiscal year) are equal to or greater than the amount of appropriations for the salaries and expenses of the Food and Drug Administration for the fiscal year 2003 (excluding the amount of fees appropriated for such fiscal year) multiplied by the adjustment factor applicable to the fiscal year involved.

''(2) AUTHORITY.—If the Secretary does not assess fees under subsection (a) during any portion of a fiscal year because of paragraph (1) and if at a later date in such fiscal year the Secretary may assess such fees, the Secretary may assess and collect such fees, without any modification in the rate, for abbreviated applications, generic new animal drug sponsors, and generic new animal drug products at any time in such fiscal year notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) relating to the date fees are to be paid.

''(g) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2)(C), fees authorized under subsection (a) shall be collected and available for obligation only to the extent and in the amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts. Such fees are authorized to be appropriated to remain available until expended. Such sums as may be necessary may be transferred from the Food and Drug Administration salaries and expenses appropriation account without fiscal year limitation to such appropriation account for salary and expenses with such fiscal year limitation. The sums transferred shall be available solely for the process for the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs.

''(2) COLLECTIONS AND APPROPRIATION ACTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The fees authorized by this section—

''(i) subject to subparagraph (C), shall be collected and available in each fiscal year in an amount not to exceed the amount specified in appropriation Acts, or otherwise made available for obligation for such fiscal year; and

''(ii) shall be available to defray increases in the costs of the resources allocated for the process for the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs (including increases in such costs for an additional number of full-time equivalent positions in the Department of Health and Human Services to be engaged in such process) over such costs, excluding costs paid from fees collected under this section, for fiscal year 2008 multiplied by the adjustment factor.

''(B) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary shall be considered to have met the requirements of subparagraph (A)(ii) in any fiscal year if the costs funded by appropriations and allocated for the process for the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs—

''(i) are not more than 3 percent below the level specified in subparagraph (A)(ii); or

''(ii)(I) are more than 3 percent below the level specified in subparagraph (A)(ii), and fees assessed for the fiscal year following the subsequent fiscal year are decreased by the amount in excess of 3 percent by which such costs fell below the level specified in subparagraph (A)(ii); and

''(II) such costs are not more than 5 percent below the level specified in subparagraph (A)(ii).

''(C) PROVISION FOR EARLY PAYMENTS.—Payment of fees authorized under this section for a fiscal year, prior to the due date for such fees, may be accepted by the Secretary in accordance with authority provided in advance in a prior year appropriations Act.

''(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for fees under this section—

''(A) $7,328,000 for fiscal year 2014;

''(B) $6,944,000 for fiscal year 2015;

''(C) $7,429,000 for fiscal year 2016;

''(D) $7,936,000 for fiscal year 2017; and

''(E) $8,467,000 for fiscal year 2018;

as adjusted to reflect adjustments in the total fee revenues made under this section and changes in the total amounts collected by abbreviated application fees, generic new animal drug sponsor fees, and generic new animal drug product fees.

''(4) OFFSET.—If the sum of the cumulative amount of fees collected under this section for the fiscal years 2014 through 2016 and the amount of fees estimated to be collected under this section for fiscal year 2017 exceeds the cumulative amount appropriated under paragraph (3) for the fiscal years 2014 through 2017, the excess amount shall be credited to the appropriation account of the Food and Drug Administration as provided in paragraph (1), and shall be subtracted from the amount of fees that would otherwise be authorized to be collected under this section pursuant to appropriation Acts for fiscal year 2018.

''(h) COLLECTION OF UNPAID FEES.—In any case where the Secretary does not receive payment of a fee assessed under subsection (a) within 30 days after it is due, such fee shall be treated as a claim of the United States Government subject to subchapter II of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.

''(i) WRITTEN REQUESTS FOR WAIVERS, REDUCTIONS, AND REFUNDS.—To qualify for consideration for a waiver or reduction under subsection (d), or for a refund of any fee collected in accordance with subsection (a), a person shall submit to the Secretary a written request for such waiver, reduction, or refund not later than 180 days after such fee is due.

''(j) CONSTRUCTION.—This section may not be construed to require that the number of full-time equivalent positions in the Department of Health and Human Services, for officers, employees, and advisory committees not engaged in the process of the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs, be reduced to offset the number of officers, employees, and advisory committees so engaged.

''(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section and section 742:

''(1) ABBREVIATED APPLICATION FOR A GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUG.—The terms 'abbreviated application for a generic new animal drug' and 'abbreviated application' mean an abbreviated application for the approval of any generic new animal drug submitted under section 512(b)(2). Such term does not include a supplemental abbreviated application for a generic new animal drug.

''(2) ADJUSTMENT FACTOR.—The term 'adjustment factor' applicable to a fiscal year is the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers (all items; United States city average) for October of the preceding fiscal year divided by—

''(A) for purposes of subsection (f)(1), such Index for October 2002; and

''(B) for purposes of subsection (g)(2)(A)(ii), such Index for October 2007.

''(3) COSTS OF RESOURCES ALLOCATED FOR THE PROCESS FOR THE REVIEW OF ABBREVIATED APPLICATIONS FOR GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUGS.—The term 'costs of resources allocated for the process for the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs' means the expenses in connection with the process for the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs for—

''(A) officers and employees of the Food and Drug Administration, contractors of the Food and Drug Administration, advisory committees consulted with respect to the review of specific abbreviated applications, supplemental abbreviated applications, or investigational submissions, and costs related to such officers, employees, committees, and contractors, including costs for travel, education, and recruitment and other personnel activities;

''(B) management of information, and the acquisition, maintenance, and repair of computer resources;

''(C) leasing, maintenance, renovation, and repair of facilities and acquisition, maintenance, and repair of fixtures, furniture, scientific equipment, and other necessary materials and supplies; and

''(D) collecting fees under this section and accounting for resources allocated for the review of abbreviated applications, supplemental abbreviated applications, and investigational submissions.

''(4) FINAL DOSAGE FORM.—The term 'final dosage form' means, with respect to a generic new animal drug product, a finished dosage form which is approved for administration to an animal without substantial further manufacturing. Such term includes generic new animal drug products intended for mixing in animal feeds.

''(5) GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUG.—The term 'generic new animal drug' means a new animal drug that is the subject of an abbreviated application.

''(6) GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUG PRODUCT.—The term 'generic new animal drug product' means each specific strength or potency of a particular active ingredient or ingredients in final dosage form marketed by a particular manufacturer or distributor, which is uniquely identified by the labeler code and product code portions of the national drug code, and for which an abbreviated application for a generic new animal drug or a supplemental abbreviated application has been approved.

''(7) GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUG SPONSOR.—The term 'generic new animal drug sponsor' means either an applicant named in an abbreviated application for a generic new animal drug that has not been withdrawn by the applicant and for which approval has not been withdrawn by the Secretary, or a person who has submitted an investigational submission for a generic new animal drug that has not been terminated or otherwise rendered inactive by the Secretary.

''(8) INVESTIGATIONAL SUBMISSION FOR A GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUG.—The terms 'investigational submission for a generic new animal drug' and 'investigational submission' mean—

''(A) the filing of a claim for an investigational exemption under section 512(j) for a generic new animal drug intended to be the subject of an abbreviated application or a supplemental abbreviated application; or

''(B) the submission of information for the purpose of enabling the Secretary to evaluate the safety or effectiveness of a generic new animal drug in the event of the filing of an abbreviated application or supplemental abbreviated application for such drug.

''(9) PERSON.—The term 'person' includes an affiliate thereof (as such term is defined in section 735(11)).

''(10) PROCESS FOR THE REVIEW OF ABBREVIATED APPLICATIONS FOR GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUGS.—The term 'process for the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs' means the following activities of the Secretary with respect to the review of abbreviated applications, supplemental abbreviated applications, and investigational submissions:

''(A) The activities necessary for the review of abbreviated applications, supplemental abbreviated applications, and investigational submissions.

''(B) The issuance of action letters which approve abbreviated applications or supplemental abbreviated applications or which set forth in detail the specific deficiencies in abbreviated applications, supplemental abbreviated applications, or investigational submissions and, where appropriate, the actions necessary to place such applications, supplemental applications, or submissions in condition for approval.

''(C) The inspection of generic new animal drug establishments and other facilities undertaken as part of the Secretary's review of pending abbreviated applications, supplemental abbreviated applications, and investigational submissions.

''(D) Monitoring of research conducted in connection with the review of abbreviated applications, supplemental abbreviated applications, and investigational submissions.

''(E) The development of regulations and policy related to the review of abbreviated applications, supplemental abbreviated applications, and investigational submissions.

''(F) Development of standards for products subject to review.

''(G) Meetings between the agency and the generic new animal drug sponsor.

''(H) Review of advertising and labeling prior to approval of an abbreviated application or supplemental abbreviated application, but not after such application has been approved.

''(11) SUPPLEMENTAL ABBREVIATED APPLICATION FOR GENERIC NEW ANIMAL DRUG.—The terms 'supplemental abbreviated application for a generic new animal drug' and 'supplemental abbreviated application' mean a request to the Secretary to approve a change in an approved abbreviated application.''.

SEC. 203. REAUTHORIZATION; REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 742 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j–22) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 742. REAUTHORIZATION; REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

''(a) PERFORMANCE REPORTS.—Beginning with fiscal year 2014, not later than 120 days after the end of each fiscal year during which fees are collected under this part, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report concerning the progress of the Food and Drug Administration in achieving the goals identified in the letters described in section 201(b) of the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2013 toward expediting the generic new animal drug development process and the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs, supplemental abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs, and investigational submissions for generic new animal drugs during such fiscal year.

''(b) FISCAL REPORT.—Beginning with fiscal year 2014, not later than 120 days after the end of each fiscal year during which fees are collected under this part, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the implementation of the authority for such fees during such fiscal year and the use, by the Food and Drug Administration, of the fees collected during such fiscal year for which the report is made.

''(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the reports required under subsections (a) and (b) available to the public on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration.

''(d) REAUTHORIZATION.—

''(1) CONSULTATION.—In developing recommendations to present to Congress with respect to the goals, and plans for meeting the goals, for the process for the review of abbreviated applications for generic new animal drugs for the first 5 fiscal years after fiscal year 2018, and for the reauthorization of this part for such fiscal years, the Secretary shall consult with—

''(A) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

''(B) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

''(C) scientific and academic experts;

''(D) veterinary professionals;

''(E) representatives of patient and consumer advocacy groups; and

''(F) the regulated industry.

''(2) PRIOR PUBLIC INPUT.—Prior to beginning negotiations with the regulated industry on the reauthorization of this part, the Secretary shall—

''(A) publish a notice in the Federal Register requesting public input on the reauthorization;

''(B) hold a public meeting at which the public may present its views on the reauthorization, including specific suggestions for changes to the goals referred to in subsection (a);

''(C) provide a period of 30 days after the public meeting to obtain written comments from the public suggesting changes to this part; and

''(D) publish the comments on the Food and Drug Administration's Internet Web site.

''(3) PERIODIC CONSULTATION.—Not less frequently than once every 4 months during negotiations with the regulated industry, the Secretary shall hold discussions with representatives of veterinary, patient, and consumer advocacy groups to continue discussions of their views on the reauthorization and their suggestions for changes to this part as expressed under paragraph (2).

''(4) PUBLIC REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—After negotiations with the regulated industry, the Secretary shall—

''(A) present the recommendations developed under paragraph (1) to the congressional committees specified in such paragraph;

''(B) publish such recommendations in the Federal Register;

''(C) provide for a period of 30 days for the public to provide written comments on such recommendations;

''(D) hold a meeting at which the public may present its views on such recommendations; and

''(E) after consideration of such public views and comments, revise such recommendations as necessary.

''(5) TRANSMITTAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than January 15, 2018, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress the revised recommendations under paragraph (4), a summary of the views and comments received under such paragraph, and any changes made to the recommendations in response to such views and comments.

''(6) MINUTES OF NEGOTIATION MEETINGS.—

''(A) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Before presenting the recommendations developed under paragraphs (1) through (5) to Congress, the Secretary shall make publicly available, on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration, minutes of all negotiation meetings conducted under this subsection between the Food and Drug Administration and the regulated industry.

''(B) CONTENT.—The minutes described under subparagraph (A) shall summarize any substantive proposal made by any party to the negotiations as well as significant controversies or differences of opinion during the negotiations and their resolution.''.

SEC. 204. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Notwithstanding the amendments made by this title, part 5 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this title, shall continue to be in effect with respect to abbreviated applications for a generic new animal drug and supplemental abbreviated applications for a generic new animal drug (as defined in such part as of such day) that on or after October 1, 2008, but before October 1, 2013, were accepted by the Food and Drug Administration for filing with respect to assessing and collecting any fee required by such part for a fiscal year prior to fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 205. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2013, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later, except that fees under part 5 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended by this title, shall be assessed for all abbreviated applications for a generic new animal drug and supplemental abbreviated applications for a generic new animal drug received on or after October 1, 2013, regardless of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 206. SUNSET DATES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 741 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j–21) shall cease to be effective October 1, 2018.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 742 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j-22) shall cease to be effective January 31, 2019.

(c) PREVIOUS SUNSET PROVISION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 204 of the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–316) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–316) is amended in the table of contents in section 1, by striking the item relating to section 204.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 32, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 32) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 32) was agreed to.

RECOGNIZING TEACHERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 126 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 126) recognizing the teachers in the United States for their contributions to the development and progress of our country.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 126) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 9, 2013

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on May 9, 2013; 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 be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the time be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling final half; further, that following morning business the Senate resume consideration of S. 601, the Water Resources Development Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, we will continue to work through amendments to the bill during tomorrow's session. Senators will be notified when votes are scheduled.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

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 following the remarks of Senator HOEVEN of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Dakota.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Water Resources Development Act or the WRDA bill that we are considering on the Senate floor. I wanted to begin by thanking leadership on both sides of the aisle for moving this very important legislation to the floor so we can act on it.

This legislation is important because it funds vital infrastructure projects that make our country stronger, safer, and more competitive. I wish to begin by talking about one of those flood protection projects, permanent flood protection for the Red River Valley. The Fargo-Moorhead Area Diversion Project will establish permanent flood protection measures for the Red River Valley region of North Dakota and Minnesota.

It will, in essence, divert water around—actually water that is now almost an annual flood event—population centers, channel it safely downstream for both States. In fact, it will protect nearly one-quarter of a million people and billions of dollars of property in one of the Midwest's most dynamic, productive, and growing metro areas on both sides of the North Dakota-Minnesota border.

Furthermore, this vital infrastructure will not only protect lives and property, it will actually save the Federal Government money. This is very important at a time when we face deficits and debt, something we very much need to address.

So let me explain. This project will actually save the Federal Government money. When the waters threaten, as they have in 4 of the past 5 years, many agencies of the Federal Government are mobilized to protect life and property. That includes the Army Corps of Engineers, FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Coast Guard, even Customs and Border Protection, which has been called in to monitor the advancing waters of the flood from the air, and other agencies as well.

Those are just Federal agencies. In addition, we have State and local agencies that respond as well. Many of them also rely on Federal funding. That includes agencies such as emergency management, the National Guard, State departments of transportation, highway patrol, water commission, human services, departments of health, and many others.

The point is the flood fight requires a lot of work and it costs a lot of money. We are doing it every year. It involves the enormous task of building miles and miles—not feet, not yards, but miles of temporary earthen dams, dikes, and levees. That means moving heavy equipment such as backhoes, bulldozers, dump trucks, as well as tons and tons of dirt. It means activating the National Guard to devote its resources and equipment to the task of fighting the rising waters.

The flood fight also involves filling sandbags, literally millions of sandbags to protect homes and businesses. It involves deploying industrial pumps to try to move water out faster than it is moving into the cities. That, I tell you, is very fast at the height of the flood, thousands of cubic feet per second.

It means calling on local police and highway patrol officers to work overtime to direct traffic, provide security, and keep order. Ultimately it means paying out millions in taxpayer dollars year after year, and that is the point. We are fighting this flood every single year, and we are expending these dollars every single year.

Then there is another phase after the water recedes and then comes the cleanup: removing those dams, dikes, and levees, disposing of those millions of sandbags, cleaning the streets, repairing the damage, and addressing the multitude of costs and time-consuming tests necessary to get things back to normal. Again, as I have said, you are doing all of this on a temporary basis, and you have to do it all over again the following year. In fact, the expense of mounting a successful flood fight year

in and year out amounts to many millions of dollars every year.

For example, the successful flood fight of 2009 cost Fargo-Moorhead about $50 million. When you lose the flood fight, the cost is much greater in both human terms and in financial terms.

For example, in another community, a much smaller community, Minot, ND, lost the flood fight in 2011, destroying or damaging more than 4,000 homes and displacing thousands of people. The Federal Government has put more than $632 million—let me repeat—more than $632 million into the city's recovery efforts to date, and we are still not done.

A similar flood in the Fargo-Moorhead metro area would be far worse and far more expensive. The Army Corps of Engineers predicts a 500-year flood in the Red River Valley would cost more than $10 million in damage, and that doesn't even take into account the impact in terms of human cost and difficulty to families and to businesses.

Let's look at how the costs of such a flood are typically shared. This is very important when we do the cost-benefit analysis. Typically local government covers 15 percent of the cost. The State pays about 10 percent of the cost, and the Federal Government pays by far the largest share of the cost. The Federal Government is paying 75 percent of the cost every single year—oh, except, in severe disasters, FEMA recommends raising the 75-percent Federal share for public assistance, the repair of infrastructure, to 90 percent Federal cost after you meet a certain threshold.

When you have very significant damage and higher losses, now the Federal Government is picking up as much as 90 percent of the cost, particularly for the public infrastructure. That cost, in our case now, is incurred on a year-in and year-out basis.

In fact, Fargo-Moorhead has not only had to mount a flood fight but then conduct cleanup afterwards in 4 out of the last 5 years, including this spring. That is my point. That is exactly my point. With permanent flood protection, which is provided through the WRDA bill, we can break that cycle. With one-time spending we can protect people on a permanent basis and do so much more cost-effectively. Once you build it, you are done with the endless and traumatic sequence of fighting floods and cleaning up after them. Not only that, but the cost-sharing for permanent flood protection is lower for the Federal Government. The Federal share would be less than half of the cost of the permanent project, 45 percent of the permanent project. That compares with 75 to 90 percent the Federal Government is obliged to cover for the annual flood fight or, worse, if you lose the flood fight and you have that recovery effort.

We are saying for the permanent protection, the non-Federal share, Federal share 45 percent. The non-Federal share is more than half, which means State and local government will cover 55 percent of the cost, which is actually the majority of the project. We have already lined up those funds. At that local level and the State level, we are ready to go.

This is a two-State effort, as I said. That cost is incurred by the State of North Dakota, by local government, and Minnesota, and it breaks out as follows: Minnesota would cover about 10 percent of the non-Federal share or about $100 million. North Dakota will cover 90 percent of the non-Federal share, about $900 million, divided evenly between the State and local municipalities, each putting in about $450 million.

In the end you can't put a price on the kind of hardship and despair that losing a home or a business means after the fact. You can help to spare people that hardship in the first place with permanent flood protection.

That is what the Fargo-Moorhead diversion is all about, and that is why it is so important to North Dakota, to Minnesota, and to the Red River Valley region of the North. The Water Resources Development Act, however, does more. It is key to building and rebuilding vital water infrastructure projects throughout our Nation, projects that will make us stronger and safer.

Moreover, the WRDA bill includes streamlining provisions to help us complete worthy projects more cost effectively with less bureaucracy, with greater savings, and with less redtape. In addition, we work conscientiously through the process to make sure we do these vital projects right. They have been subjected to full corps review, including cost-benefit analyses, in an open and transparent way.

For all of these reasons and more, I urge my colleagues to support the Water Resources Development Act for the peace of mind permanent flood control and protection will give to the people of our region and other regions throughout the country.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:18 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 9, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE CITY OF GRANDVILLE FOR THEIR COMMENDABLE FLOOD RESPONSE

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding community of Grandville, Michigan.

From April 18 until April 22, more than nine inches of rain plagued West Michigan. It was called the "Tale of Two Floods" by local residents as flood-waters cascaded out of the Grand River and Buck Creek. Businesses were shutdown, residents were forced from their homes, and the entire downtown district was inaccessible.

Grandville has been at an important place, geographically, on the Grand River since its founding. During West Michigan's logging days, the community of Grandville played a fundamental part at the river-bend by ensuring that the logs did not jam up as the Grand River turned north-west toward Grand Haven. Despite the difficult conditions created by the "Tale of Two Floods", Grandville's citizens yet again took care of the river-bend, putting forth a historic effort to both protect and clean up their city.

When faced with a time of crisis, the citizens, churches, and businesses of Grandville came together to care for their fellow residents and their community. Many individuals sacrificed for their neighbors and are worth acknowledging, but I was particularly struck by an act of generosity from eleven-year-old Emma Kukla. While on a bike ride to explore the damage, Emma and her mom came across a family carrying their remaining possessions from their flooded home. They volunteered their van to help the family move their salvaged belongings and Emma generously gave the last $20 from her wallet.

Emma embodies the spirit of Grandville, Michigan. The Grandville/Jenison Chamber of Commerce describes the community as one devoted to: "Faith, family, honesty, caring, respect, responsibility. That's Grandville. Since its inception, Grandville has given people a place they truly belong. They support each other, take pride in the community, and make Grandville a positive place to live."

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the city of Grandville for serving one another during a time of great need.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, on May 6, 2013, I missed three recorded votes on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 129, "aye" on rollcall 130, and "aye" on rollcall 131.

IN MEMORY OF RICHARD E. HUG

HON. ANDY HARRIS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Richard E. "Dick" Hug, who passed away on May 4, 2013. Dick was a friend of mine and was determined to make a difference in the State of Maryland and in the country through his civic involvement. I know he will be greatly missed by his family and those who knew him.

Dick was born January 11, 1935 in Paterson, New Jersey. After graduating from Duke University in 1956, Dick began his business career with Koppers Company, Inc. In 1973, Dick was named Corporate Vice President of Koppers. Dick went on to serve as President, Chairman, and Chief Executive Officer of Environmental Elements Corporation, a company specializing in air pollution control systems for the utility and industrial markets listed on the New York Stock Exchange in 1991. In 1995, Dick retired and remained a Director and Chairman Emeritus until the company's sale in 2005.

Dick was very active and well-known in the Maryland community serving as Chairman of the Maryland Chamber of Commerce, Maryland Business for Responsive Government, Leadership Maryland, the National Aquarium of Baltimore, the Kennedy Krieger Institute, the United Way of Central Maryland, and Duke University School of the Environment. Dick also served as Regent on the University of Maryland Board. In addition, Dick served on the Boards of the University System of Maryland Foundation, Loyola University of Maryland, AAA Maryland, the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra, and Bank of Annapolis. His philanthropy was well-known throughout the State.

Dick is survived by his wife of 56 years, Lois-ann Hug, a son Donald R. Hug and his wife Deborah H. Hug, and daughter Cynthia H. Marino and her husband Mark D. Marino, four grandchildren, David, Scott, and Stephanie Marino, and Leanne Hug. He is also survived by his sister, Barbara H. Overstreet and her husband Ronald N. Overstreet.

Dick's absence will be felt throughout the community, but his service will not be forgotten. I ask those here today to join me in honoring Richard E. "Dick" Hug.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT RIVER ROAD

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the Great River Road; one of our Nation's most historic and extensive scenic byways.

Spanning nearly 3,000 miles from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, the Great River Road traces its origins back to a time when Franklin Roosevelt was President and the automatic transmission was the cutting edge of automotive technology. In 1938, governors from 10 States came together to form the planning commission for what was initially envisioned as a continuous national parkway extending along the entire length of the Mississippi River. Over the next two years the U.S House of Representatives Committee on Public Lands held hearings to authorize a feasibility study of the parkway concept. While popular, the idea was soon overshadowed in the wake of the Second World War.

More than a decade passed before a feasibility study was finally completed by the Bureau of Public Roads in 1951. Finding the construction of an entirely new parkway to be too expensive, the study offered an alternative proposition; the development of a scenic route built from the existing network of rural roads and highways that meandered and criss-crossed the Mississippi River. This route, now known as the Great River Road, is a testament to the cooperative effort of States and the Federal Government working together with local communities to preserve the many historic features and natural beauties of the Mississippi River Valley.

Today the Great River Road offers travelers not just a leisurely scenic drive but a unique and lasting journey through diverse communities and landscapes; from charming river towns to lush forests, from bluffs to the delta, from big city to sprawling rural vistas. The Great River Road is truly a national treasure. It is with great pride that I rise today to commemorate the 75 years of hard work and dedication that have gone into developing and preserving the Greater River Road so that it will continue to serve as a gateway to the rich heritage of the Mississippi River for future generations.

CONGRESSIONAL TRIBUTE FOR BIG SANDY COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Big Sandy

Community and Technical College as this progressive institute for post-secondary education celebrates a unique combination of anniversaries in 2013.

Seventy-five years ago, the Mayo Technical College was established in 1938. Fifty years ago, the Prestonsburg Community College was established in 1964. Finally, ten years ago, the two institutions merged in 2003, creating the Big Sandy Community and Technical College. I count it an honor to congratulate the founders of these institutions on this rare triple celebration of the combined 75th, 50th and 10th anniversaries.

The Big Sandy Community and Technical College is a tremendous resource in the Appalachian Mountains of eastern Kentucky, providing excellence in post-secondary education for students in Floyd, Johnson, Pike, Martin, and Magoffin Counties to pursue the dream of earning a college degree close to home, with four campus locations.

The Big Sandy Community and Technical College continues to carry on the mission of the institutions that laid its foundation by enriching the lives of thousands of students each year, dedicated to helping raise a generation from its heavy burden of poverty, and preparing them for successful careers and a better future for our rural region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me celebrating the tenth anniversary of the Big Sandy Community and Technical College and the tireless efforts of educators and leaders of the past that pioneered the path for quality post-secondary education in the mountains of eastern Kentucky over the last seventy-five years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall votes 129–131. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on all three votes.

RECOGNIZING THE HONOREES OF THE NIAGARA FALLS EDUCATION FOUNDATION

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize an exceptional group of individuals as they are honored by the Niagara Falls Education Foundation. Angelica, Theresa and Joseph DiCamillo, Joseph Calato, Douglas Moordian and Coach Pat Monti have made great investments in Niagara Falls. Their tireless work and generosity with their talents make them outstanding role models for current students.

Angelica, Theresa, and Joseph of the DiCamillo family are all proud alumni of Niagara Falls High School. Their parents, Tomasso and Addoloratata DiCamillo, opened the legendary DiCamillo bakery on 14th Street and Tronolone Place in Niagara Falls. When people visit Niagara Falls, their first stop is often DiCamillo's. As teenagers, Angelica, Theresa, and Joseph began working to support their family's business. Angelica began working in the bakery a few years after graduating high school, after managing the family grocery store. Theresa handled office responsibilities such as payroll and accounting as early as age 13, while attending school. Today, she and Angelica are the Senior Advisers to the company. Joseph began as a baker while in school, eventually becoming a driver for the family's company and staying involved for fifty-four years. Today, the company is operated by the next generation of the DiCamillo family.

Joseph Calato ensured Niagara Falls's place in music history. Joe became known as a passionate drummer while enrolled at Niagara Falls High School. Often, Joe became frustrated at how quickly the tips of his drumsticks deteriorated. One day, after returning home to Niagara Falls following his service in the Air Force, he put a plastic tip on the end of his drumstick, and created what is now known as the Regal Tip drumstick. Regal Tip is now a family business, producing drumsticks and brushes that are sold internationally from Niagara Falls.

Douglas Mooradian returned to Niagara Falls after spending four years pursuing higher education at SUNY Cortland and four years working in North Carolina for the Greensboro Coliseum Complex. As the Director of Marketing and Public Relations at Health System Services, a company based in Wheatfield, Doug has played an integral role in the growth of the company's Home Medical and Respiratory Equipment Division. Since returning home, Doug has immersed himself in the community, and has won honors such as ''Volunteer of the Year'' in 2009 from the Niagara Falls Boys' & Girls' Club. His mother, Kathy, father, Carl, sisters, Stacy and Wendy, and wife, Jennifer, are all proud Niagara Falls High School alumni.

Coach Patrick Monti spent twenty-five years as a basketball coach at LaSalle High School. While coaching at LaSalle High School, he compiled an impressive 423–112 record, and led the Explorers to two New York State Public High School Athletic Association Class A Championships in 1995 and 1996. In 1987, the Explorers completed a legendary unbeaten season, ending with a record of twenty-seven wins and zero losses. Coach Monti was known for his discipline, and beloved by the LaSalle High School community.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to recognize the work these individuals have done with the Niagara Falls public schools and in the greater Niagara Falls community. I am grateful for their wonderful talents and incredible generosity.

IN RECOGNITION OF 25 YEARS OF SERVICE BY THE SANTA BARBARA WOMEN'S POLITICAL COMMITTEE

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 25 years of service by the Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee and to commemorate the designation of May 15th as ''Founding Mother's Day'' within Santa Barbara County.

In 1988, a group of women convened the first meeting of the Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee, an organization founded to increase the number of women in local elected and appointed positions and to promote policies advancing women's status. Through their dedication to promote gender equality, the proportion of women holding local political office has increased dramatically and virtually all candidates for office in the Santa Barbara County have come to seek the group's endorsement.

Today, we celebrate the success of these Founding Mothers who have made it possible for women of every race, age, and class to contribute to the growth and vitality of Santa Barbara County. The Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee is a shining example of the potential for active local efforts to increase women's representation in leadership throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members join me in honoring the tireless work of the Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee.

INCREASING AMERICAN JOBS THROUGH GREATER EXPORTS TO AFRICA

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I chaired a Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations hearing that examined the issues surrounding U.S. exports to Africa, which are supposed to at least balance African exports to the United States. This included looking at existing obstacles to two-way trade with Africa. The hearing specifically examined the Increasing American Jobs Through Greater Exports to Africa Act of 2013 (H.R. 1777). The bill was reintroduced in the House by myself, Ranking Member KAREN BASS, and Congressman BOBBY RUSH on April 26th and was introduced in the Senate on April 11th as S. 718.

The purpose of H.R. 1777 (and S. 718) is to increase U.S. exports to Africa by 200 percent over the next decade. This bill does not replace AGOA. It complements it by providing for a rebalancing that makes it as beneficial to Americans as it is to Africans. The bill intends to reach its ambitious, but achievable, goal by taking several steps, including the creation of a comprehensive U.S.-Africa trade strategy and a coordinator to ensure that all U.S. agencies involved in trade work in concert with one another.

This legislation also calls for not less than 25 percent of available U.S. financing for trade deals to be devoted to facilitating U.S.-Africa trade. Furthermore, it encourages the descendants of Africa in this country, who largely operate small and medium-sized businesses, to play a greater role in trade with the countries in Africa.

Various studies show that every additional $1 billion in exports generates 6,000–7,000 new U.S. jobs. According to current data from the U.S. International Trade Administration export-supported jobs linked to manufacturing

account for an estimated 3.3 percent of my home state of New Jersey's total private-sector employment. More than one-sixth, or 17.2 percent, of all manufacturing workers in New Jersey depend on exports for their jobs.

But U.S. exports have suffered during the global economic downturn because traditional markets, such as in Europe, are buying fewer U.S. products. According to the USITA, we are the largest importer of African goods, receiving 20.2 percent of the continent's total global exports. However, U.S. exports to Africa fell sharply during the height of the global recession. From 2008 to 2009, U.S. exports to Africa dropped 45 percent from $78.3 billion to $42.8 billion.

According to statistics released by the U.S. Census Bureau, African exports to the United States since AGOA took effect in 2001 increased from $25.4 billion to $66.9 billion in 2012—an increase of more than 262 percent. By far, petroleum exports from Africa led the way with more than $28.6 billion in 2012. Meanwhile, Census Bureau statistics showed that U.S. exports to Africa increased from $12.1 billion in 2001 to $32.8 billion in 2012—an increase of 271 percent. Consequently, while U.S. exports to Africa showed a robust increase since the inception of AGOA, the U.S. trade deficit with Africa increased from $13.3 billion in 2001 to more than $34 billion last year.

The five most popular import sectors for African countries are: machinery and equipment, chemicals, petroleum products (including lubricating oils, plastics and synthetics fibers), scientific instruments and food products. That means that small and medium companies across the United States have commercial opportunities available in exporting goods and services to African countries. The African Development Bank estimates that one out of three Africans is considered to be in the middle class—that's nearly 314 million Africans who have escaped poverty and can now buy consumer goods, including those from the United States.

In the supermarkets and department stores that have sprung up across Africa in recent years, there are some American products already on the shelves, but there is space for more contributions from U.S. producers. Companies such as Proctor and Gamble have long realized the potential of African markets. Two years ago, Wal-Mart, the world's largest retail outlet, purchased South Africa's Massmart and its 288 stores in 14 African countries.

The Economist magazine created a significant buzz within the U.S.-Africa trade community two years ago when it announced that six of the world's 10 fastest growing economies in the first decade of this century were in Africa: Angola, Chad, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Nigeria and Rwanda. In the following five years, The Economist projected that seven of the top 10 fasted growing global economies would be African: the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Mozambique, Nigeria, Tanzania and Zambia.

Whether or not you agree with the popular slogan—Africa Is Rising—markets on the continent are attracting foreign trade and investment in increasing amounts. It is not only China that has its sights set on African markets. Countries as diverse as India, Japan, Brazil and Turkey all see the potential of selling their products in Africa.

The Anglo-Dutch consumer goods giant Unilever has long considered Africa a lucrative environment for consumer sales, earning a fifth of its profits in Africa until the 1970s, when it turned its main commercial attention to Asia. Now Unilever is back in Africa in force, selling $3.7 billion of everything from soup to soap. Frank Braeken, head of Unilever's Africa operations, said African consumers are underserved and overcharged. To meet the continent's need for personal care products for African skin and hair, Unilever developed its Motions range of products.

At our hearing on this legislation last spring, we heard from Luster Products, which produces items that fit that description. There is little reason why this company and other U.S. producers can't follow suit and meet the needs Unilever says are now unmet.

We will hear today from four witnesses with expertise on the opportunities and challenges faced by U.S. companies in trade with countries in Africa. We expect to learn why U.S. exports to Africa have not kept pace with U.S. imports from Africa and find out what Congress can do to better balance U.S.-Africa trade.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF TROOP ONE OF BRIDGETON

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, today I extend my personal congratulations and the recognition of the U.S. House of Representatives to Troop One of Bridgeton, NJ, which is celebrating its centennial anniversary as a chartered member of the Boy Scouts of America. Organized by Percy W. Owen in February 1913, Troop One has been honored by the national headquarters as one of the country's oldest troops with continuous service. It is the oldest charter in South Jersey with a roster of former scout masters and scouts exceeding one thousand.

Individual skills and societal benefits of scouting are well-known, with countless youth across the country becoming better citizens due to their experience. Leadership, ingenuity, integrity, compassion and cooperation are invaluable life skills that each scout is encouraged to learn and bring forward into their lives. Troop One, however, has always gone above and beyond those standard goals.

In addition to traditional activities, Troop One has long instilled a dedication to public service in their ranks. Throughout the past century, that dedication has been exemplified in Troop One's commitment to the greater Bridgeton community and the success of past scouts in their adult lives. From military officers and educators to medical professionals and business leaders, the critical life skills of such distinguished members in our nation can be traced back to their time at Troop One.

I join with the greater Bridgeton community and Boy Scouts across the country in congratulating Troop One for an outstanding one hundred years. As your impressive past is well-documented, it is your contributions today and to the youth of the future that reinforce your legacy.

RECOGNIZING THE FALLEN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS WHO LIVED OR SERVED IN PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY BETWEEN 1922 AND 2012

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor the sixteen fallen law enforcement officers who lived or served in Prince William County, Virginia, between 1922 and 2012. I commend the Prince William County Citizen Police Academy Alumni Association (PWCCPAAA) for their memorial and tribute service for these fallen heroes.

The PWCCPAAA was founded in 1993 under the leadership of former Police Chief Charlie Deane. The Association hosts a National Police Week and facilitates citizen training programs to promote interaction between the Police Department and county residents.

I would like to join the PWCCPAAA in memorializing the law enforcement officers who lost their lives protecting the public from harm and danger. It is my honor to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the fallen law enforcement officer who lived or served in Prince William County between 1922 and 2012:

Justice of the Peace Thomas Semms Meredith; July 22, 1922; Prince William County Circuit Court, Virginia.

Trooper Jackie M. Bussard; May 5, 1970; Virginia State Police.

Officer Paul T. White Jr.; October 27, 1973; Prince William County Police.

Investigator Claude Everett Seymour; April 25, 1975; Virginia State Police.

Trooper Johnny R. Bowman; August 19, 1984; Virginia State Police.

Sergeant John D. Conner, III; July 24, 1988; Manassas City Police.

Officer Philip M. Pennington; November 22, 1990; Prince William County Police.

Trooper Jose M. Cavazos; February 24, 1993; Virginia State Police.

Special Agent William H. Christian, Jr.; May 29, 1995; Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Detective John M. Gibson; July 24, 1998; United States Capitol Police.

Officer Marlon F. Morales; June 13, 2001; Washington D.C. Metropolitan Transit Police.

Second Lt. Francis Joseph Stecco; October 25, 2008; Fairfax County Police.

Special Agent Chad L. Michael; October 26, 2009; Drug Enforcement Administration.

Special Agent Forrest N. Leamon; October 26, 2009; Drug Enforcement Administration.

Officer Paul Michael Dittamo; October 30, 2010; Washington D.C. Metropolitan Police Department.

Officer Chris Yung; December 31, 2012; Prince William County Police.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these sixteen fallen law enforcement officers. I extend my personal appreciation to the Prince William County Citizens Police Academy Alumni Association for their continued dedication to strengthening the relationship between the Police Department and county residents. With this tribute, we honor the memories and lives of the officers and the sacrifices made by them and their families to keep our community safe.

HONORING JOHN AND GWEN SLOOP

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to honor Dr. John and Mrs. Gwen Sloop on the occasion of their retirement after 27 years of devoted service to First Presbyterian Church.

As senior pastor of First Presbyterian Church of Harrisonburg, Virginia, Dr. Sloop is a true spiritual leader dedicated to his flock. A powerful preacher, he is a man ''on fire'' for Jesus. He has been a champion for global missions and has lead dozens of others to follow him into the missionary field. He has been actively involved in Presbyterians for Renewal, the Presbyterian Coalition, the Confessing Church movement and has served on the board of the Presbyterian Outreach Foundation.

Mrs. Sloop has earned a reputation for her selflessness and kindness, routinely demonstrated by her outstanding work with children. Along with her husband, she attended Gordon-Conwell Seminary in Boston before transferring to Columbia Seminary in Atlanta, graduating in 1973. For 13 years they served the growing congregation of the Lithonia Presbyterian Church in the suburbs of Atlanta.

The Sloops are passionate about seeing the Presbyterian Church renewed and growing again. Under their stewardship, First Presbyterian has grown to more than 1,100 members and more than 500 attendees for Sunday services since they were called there in 1986. They are loving parents to three children and devoted grandparents to five grandchildren.

I have had the privilege of attending First Presbyterian Church under the direction of Dr. and Mrs. Sloop. I know them to be dearly beloved by the entire congregation. Though they will be truly missed, we know they will continue to inspire many more followers, just as they have inspired my family and me.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join with me today to recognize Dr. and Mrs. Sloop. Their generosity and commitment to leaving this world better than they found it is an inspiration to us all and deserving of the utmost gratitude. It is with great pride that I congratulate them on their retirement and wish them continued success and happiness in the next chapter of their lives together.

HONORING THE DUGAS FAMILY OF IBERIA PARISH FOR THEIR SERVICE DURING WORLD WAR II

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the service of the Antoine and Emma Dugas Family, who selflessly served as aircraft spotters during World War II in Iberia Parish, Louisiana. Their dedication to country, spending countless hours watching the skies of our Gulf Coast as a first line of defense against an aerial assault, deserves our thanks and recognition.

Emma and Antoine Dugas moved from the Atchafalaya Basin area to Lake Dauterive, Iberia Parish, in 1927 following the great floods that predated our Louisiana levee system. At the advent of the war, due to the rural, isolated location of their home, the family was approached by the U.S. Army Air Force to serve as aircraft spotters. This required studying and memorizing various types of aircraft by sight, filling out reports of their surveillance and calling in any observations of aircraft they might spot in the skies. The family faithfully carried out this duty from June 24, 1943 until the war's end in 1945.

Until now, Antoine and Emma Dugas, and their children, Claude ''Nook'' Dugas, Mabel ''Pie'' Broussard, Melba ''Eunice'' Dugas Verret, Antoine ''Tan'' Dugas, Jr., and John Gabriel ''Creed'' Dugas, have received no special recognition for their service. Today I would like to take the opportunity to recognize and thank these citizens for their service and hold them up as an example of sacrifice and dedication in service of our country.

This month, on May 19, 2013, the Dugas family will come together at Lake Fausse Pointe State Park—significant due to its approximate location as a midpoint between the Bayou Chene area where the family lived in the basin, and the Lake Dauterive area where the family moved to build their first home on land. As they remember their family history, we thank them for their service and commend them on a job well done.

DISCOVERY SCIENCE CENTER, SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 2013 NATIONAL MEDAL FOR MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICE

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today, the Discovery Science Center in Santa Ana, California will be presented with the 2013 National Medal for Museum and Library Service by the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

In recognition of their outstanding public service and dedicated community outreach to the families, schools and residents of Orange County, the Discovery Science Center will be given one of our nation's highest honors in the area of arts and humanities.

The Discovery Science Center exemplifies the innovative ways in which a museum can strengthen our communities and foster the creative and educational integrity in our youth. The humanities are an important part of our national fabric and institutions like the Discovery Science Center are inspiring, educating and leading our nation's future.

Congratulations Discovery Science Center and thank you for making Orange County proud.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL MPS AWARENESS DAY

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the National MPS Society for their 38 years of supporting families while searching for cures for this genetic disease. Mucopolysaccharidosis or MPS is a group of genetically determined lysosomal storage diseases that render the human body incapable of producing certain enzymes needed to break down complex carbohydrates. The damage caused by MPS on a cellular level adversely affects the body and damages the heart, respiratory system, bones, internal organs, and central nervous system. MPS often results in intellectual disabilities, short stature, corneal damage, joint stiffness, loss of mobility, speech and hearing impairment, heart disease, hyperactivity, chronic respiratory problems, and, most importantly, a drastically shortened life span. Symptoms of MPS are usually not apparent at birth and without treatment; the life expectancy of an individual affected begins to decrease at a very early stage in their life. Research towards combating MPS has resulted in the development of limited treatments for some of the MPS diseases.

I ask my colleagues and their staff to join me in recognizing May 15, 2013 as National MPS Awareness Day. This is an important time during which the MPS disease community will help increase the awareness of this devastating disease, as well as supporting research to improve treatments, find cures and receive early diagnosis. The MPS families are encouraged to reflect and support each other and to reach out to those families who have lost loved ones to MPS. By wearing their purple ribbons and sharing these ribbons within their community, they are increasing public awareness about this disease. This date is also the start of the National MPS Run/Walk season along with other local community activities to raise awareness along with money for research and for family assistance programs. I commend the National MPS Society and their many volunteers for an unwavering commitment to bring about awareness of this disease and to continue to advocate for federal legislation to streamline the regulatory processes and to speed effective treatments and cures for their loved ones. More must be done to find cures and effective treatments, but let us reflect on the importance of this day. I ask that all of my colleagues join me in commemorating National MPS Awareness Day.

INTRODUCTION OF THE VETERANS HOME LOAN REFINANCE OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Veterans Home Loan Refinance Opportunity Act of 2013. This bipartisan legislation improves the federal Qualified

Veterans Mortgage Bonds (QVMB) program to allow eligible States to use tax-free bond proceeds to refinance the home mortgages of our military veterans.

This legislation is necessary during our troubled economic times. QVMB home loan financing was not available to newly discharged veterans returning home from Iraq and Afghanistan until passage of the Heroes Earning Assistance Relief Tax Act of 2008 (H.R. 6081) in the 110th Congress.

Prior to 2008, some veterans may have taken out adjustable-rate mortgages (ARM) to purchase a home during the real estate boom earlier in the decade. It is only fair to them that they have the same opportunity as newly discharged veterans to take advantage of the low-interest, fixed rate mortgages available through QVMB financing.

For some veterans with a costly ARM or interest-only mortgage, this legislation could prevent a foreclosure.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this legislation includes an inflation index to ensure the QVMB program remains viable in the future.

I urge passage of the Veterans Home Loan Refinance Opportunity Act.

CELEBRATING PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our Nation's public servants and thank them for their invaluable contributions to our country.

In every community, federal employees work to make sure the government is effective, promote the common good and keep us safe. They are the people you call when you need help. As we celebrate Public Service Recognition Week, which started on Sunday, May 5, and ends on Saturday, May 11, I rise to express my gratitude to our civil servants for their tireless dedication and service.

Federal employees often get little recognition for their work, despite the fact that day in and day out many of them are repeatedly put in dangerous situations. From the Customs and Border Patrol and DEA agents working to combat illegal immigration and human trafficking and drug runners, to the FBI agents rescuing children who have been kidnapped and finding suspected terrorists—federal employees perform vital jobs that make our country a safer and better place.

Every day intelligence agents and Foreign Service officers on the front lines of duty sacrifice to defend democracy and keep us safe. The CIA agents who coordinated the raid to kill Osama bin Laden are federal employees. On the evening of the September 11, 2012 terrorist attack on the U.S. mission in Benghazi, Libya, the Foreign Service officers representing our government at the consulate and annex where the attack occurred were federal employees.

In addition to providing security abroad, federal employees regularly risk their lives to protect us here at home. Just last month, FBI and ATF agents worked diligently to track down the suspects in the Boston Marathon bombings. Without their hard work, we could not bring the individuals responsible for these unspeakable acts to justice.

It is also important to recognize that many federal employees who are not directly in harm's way graciously serve our Nation. Nurses and doctors at the VA who care for our veterans and wounded warriors, medical researchers at NIH searching for a cure for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's, and autism are all federal employees. The FDA inspectors who trace E. coli and salmonella outbreaks to ensure that our food is safe to eat are federal employees.

There are federal employees who propel our country to the forefront of scientific advancements. Scientists at Department of Energy labs, NASA astronauts, engineers and scientists all work to keep America competitive in the increasingly global economy. Meteorologists at weather service storm centers track hurricanes, tornadoes, tsunamis, and blizzards so that we can prepare for inclement weather and natural disasters.

Defense civilian riggers, machinists, refuelers, and engineers who repair sophisticated electronic weaponry systems at our Army depots, Air Force bases, and shipyards are the federal employees who support our military personnel. Air traffic controllers work to make sure we are safe when we travel. Federal firefighters protect homes and businesses when a lightning strike sets a national forest on fire. Park Service rangers facilitate safe hiking and camping in our national parks and tours of our national battlefields.

These are but a few of the essential services federal employees provide. I hope my colleagues will join me in thanking them for their service to ensure the safety and security of our Nation.

MIKE AND CORKY HALE STOLLER CIVIL RIGHTS MEMORIAL THEATER

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on April 27th, in Montgomery, Alabama, leaders of the civil rights movement and the Southern Poverty Law Center came together to dedicate the Mike Stoller and Corky Hale Stoller Civil Rights Memorial Theater.

It is appropriate that the theater is named for Mike and Corky because of their ongoing commitment to the civil rights movement. The Stollers are two of kind—in music, in activism, in their generosity of spirit.

Since the day Corky came to Mike's studio to record demos as a musician, they have been partners in every sense of the word: fighting together for liberty and justice for all, for the basic dignity of every human being.

Mike and Corky's values run deep. They are tireless in their work. They are idealistic and compassionate, dedicated and determined. They know what they believe and recognize what's needed to follow through and get the job done. Thanks to their boundless energy, their beautiful relationship with one another, and their friendship with so many others, they have made a difference in advancing the cause of civil rights.

At the opening of the theater dedicated in their names, we heard Chairman Emeritus of the NAACP Julian Bond's extraordinary presentation of how African Americans influenced and shaped musical history from around World War II to the days of Elvis Presley and beyond.

Through the story of music, he told the story of the civil rights movement—how music popular among Americans emerged from the compositions well-known among African Americans; how the attraction of American teenagers in the 1950s to traditionally African-American styles helped advance the movement and break down barriers among races.

What a fitting tribute to Mike and Corky Stoller, whose music made them famous and whose compassion made them special. When Mike joined Jerry Leiber to write ''Hound Dog,'' ''Jailhouse Rock,'' and countless other hits, he was helping sow the seeds of an effort that would connect communities through music, that would transform American culture, and that would grow with Mike and Corky's leadership for the cause of justice.

Now, Mike and Corky's names will remain inscribed on the Civil Rights Memorial Theater in Montgomery. Their legacy will be intertwined with the names of the men, women, and children remembered at the memorial, who gave their lives in the cause of freedom. Their theater will stand tall alongside the Wall of Tolerance and the wheel of water that reminds us of the biblical charge to ''let justice roll down like waters, righteousness like a mighty stream.''

At this theater and across the country, may all Americans associate the names of Mike Stoller and Corky Hale Stoller with their contributions to music and their leadership for civil rights.

TRIBUTE TO MR. ARTURO ALBERTO DIAZ, SENIOR OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION, MILITARY SEALIFT COMMAND

HON. SCOTT H. PETERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary contributions of Mr. Arturo Alberto Diaz, a public servant of the highest caliber who dedicated his entire life to the service of our nation. Over a career that exceeded three decades, Mr. Diaz selflessly served the United States Navy shipbuilding and maritime industry, contributing directly to the delivery of over 40 ships to the nation's maritime forces. Mr. Diaz passed away on December 24, 2012, but he has left behind a long and lasting legacy to our nation—both through his unparalleled technical contributions to the strength and flexibility of our Navy's surface fleet and through the generation of professionals that he has mentored throughout his time in federal service. Today, it is my great honor to recognize his achievements and thank his wife and family for his service.

Mr. Diaz's pursuit of a life of public service began in 1972 at the Admiral Farragut Academy in New Jersey, where he spent three years and ultimately achieved the Battalion Executive Officer position his senior year. Upon graduation, he entered the United States

Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York, receiving a Bachelor of Science degree in Marine Engineering in 1979 and a Third Assistant Engineer License from the U.S. Coast Guard. While attending the United States Merchant Marine Academy, he further achieved the rank and position of Regimental Executive Officer his senior year. He served with distinction as a U.S. Coast Guard officer from 1979 to 1984 before joining the federal civil service, where he went to work for the Navy as a civilian Construction Representative for the Military Sealift Command (MSC). Mr. Diaz rose through the chain of command to become the MSC Senior Owner's Representative for New Construction. During his tenure, he became widely known as an unparalleled expert in his field, working tirelessly to ensure that the operator's needs were integrated throughout the ship design and construction process.

Mr. Diaz had a long and distinguished career of innovative thinking and aggressive execution of shipbuilding programs across the entire spectrum of military sealift new construction and conversion. A man of uncommon character and boundless passion, he was highly respected throughout the naval shipbuilding and ship operations community as a visionary leader, team builder, and technical problem solver. Since joining federal service in 1984, he held a variety of technical and key leadership roles throughout his professional career. He also provided strong technical consultation to groups such as the National Shipbuilding Research Program and the Marine Engineering and Shipyard Management Program, where he worked tirelessly with his peers throughout government and industry across the globe to promote the open interchange of ideas and information and constantly improve shipbuilding and conversion processes and technology. When technical assistance was required on both U.S. Navy and Military Sealift Command ships, the Navy often called upon Mr. Diaz for his support. The expert technical leadership and ship design, construction, and ship operational knowledge that he shared throughout his career contributed to hundreds of millions of dollars in taxpayers' savings in ship acquisition and annual operation costs over the life of the forty ships that he was responsible for delivering to the Navy's Military Sealift Command. Beyond the shipbuilding programs with which he was actively involved and which serve as tangible evidence of his commitment and technical acumen, perhaps his most lasting and profound legacy will be the development he fostered and advocated in emerging leaders in naval shipbuilding. He left a lasting impression on countless young professionals who will exemplify his leadership principles throughout their promising careers. Simply put, he brought out the best in them and cultivated a love of the trade. Throughout his distinguished federal service career, he has been honored with numerous awards for his exceptional service, including Superior and Meritorious Civilian Service Medals, Navy Unit Commendation, and other prominent citations.

Mr. Diaz's contributions to our nation extend far beyond his material achievements and specific accomplishments. He was an inspiration to all who served with him, government and industry alike, ensuring that all members of his team were keenly aware of their importance to the Navy and the true appreciation that he held for their efforts. His unique ability to recognize talent and to foster respect and camaraderie throughout the workforce has had an enormous influence on everyone he met and will continue to steer the course of our Navy well into the future. One of his most memorable quotes is "Friends build ships." Mr. Diaz recognized both the arm's length nature of government and industry negotiations as well as the necessity for teamwork. During a challenging time in the completion of the lead ship of the Navy's new Joint High Speed Vessel (JHSV), Mr. Diaz provided a compilation of "22 Attributes of a Good Team" to help bring the team together. The soundness of his observations regarding teams is clearly reflected in the teamwork that exists in the shipbuilding community today, as well as through the scores of young engineers who are now carrying forth his legacy into the next generation of ships for the Navy.

Mr. Diaz's tireless leadership and lifelong commitment to Navy shipbuilding new construction and conversion have earned him the deep respect of his peers and shipmates throughout the Military Sealift Command, Navy acquisition, and commercial shipbuilding community. His was a life of courage and consequence—a life devoted to the security of our nation. Mr. Diaz touched the lives of all who knew him, and it is my great honor to recognize him posthumously for his service. I know my colleagues join me in thanking his wife, Lisa, for sharing him with us these many years and wish her fair winds and following seas.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ISABELLA CATHERINE INGLES

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the enormous contributions of a true American patriot: Isabella Catherine Ingles (nee Hankel). Isabella has done a lot with her life: she is a wife, a mother, a grandmother, a World War II veteran, and so much more. She is a great example of what we call the "greatest generation."

Isabella was born in Chicago, Illinois, in 1921, and graduated from Senn High School. A few short years afterwards, the United States was attacked at Pearl Harbor and entered into World War II. Isabella felt the need to contribute to the war effort, and enlisted in the United States Navy in early 1944. After basic training, she attended the Control Tower Operator School, and graduated second in her class. Isabella was stationed in the Pacific Northwest, and spent the next two years working in the control tower at Naval Air Station Pasco, in Washington State. While stationed here, Isabella met her future husband, Roy Ingles, who was at the time serving as an Aviation Chief Machinist Mate, and had survived the sinking of the USS *Lexington* during the Battle of the Coral Sea.

Isabella left the Navy in 1946, having achieved the rank of Specialist (Control Tower Operator) First Class, and returned to her home in Chicago. Roy soon followed and the two were married on her birthday the next year.

Isabella Ingles has kept very busy in the years since. Settling in Des Plaines, Illinois, Isabella and Roy had two boys and two girls. Following in their parents' footsteps, both of her sons went on to serve, joining the United States Air Force. After raising her children, Isabella became a Certified Occupational Therapy Assistant, and worked with senior citizens in her local community as the Activities Director for a local assisted living facility. Since then, she has continued to contribute. Isabella is a long time volunteer all over our community: helping with the Des Plaines Self Help Closet & Pantry, visiting the local Veterans Administration hospital and volunteering for over six decades with the Women's Service League.

On behalf of myself and a grateful nation, I want to thank Isabella Catherine Ingles for all that she has done for our nation: for her service, her sacrifices, and for all the contributions she has made to our community. I want to welcome her, and all the other veterans participating in the "Honor Flights" to Washington, DC to visit the World War II Memorial.

CONGRATULATING DANIEL McCAULEY, M.D.

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Daniel McCauley, M.D. who was named as the recipient of the 2013 John Darroch Memorial Award for Physician of the Year by The Stanislaus Medical Society. He will be honored during a ceremony in Modesto, California on May 9, 2013.

Dr. McCauley was born and raised in Northern Ireland. He dreamed of joining the Merchant Marines but unable to pursue that career choice, he turned to medicine. He obtained his medical degree at the University College in Dublin, Ireland in 1968. He continued his education with residencies at Hammersmith Hospital and Kingston Hospital located in England and also, Boston City Hospital in Boston, Massachusetts.

For the last thirty years, Dr. McCauley has practiced in Turlock. He is known for being well trained, cooperative, dedicated, and having moral character with excellent clinical judgment. Dr. McCauley gives selflessly by providing indigent care throughout the Valley.

During his free time, Dr. McCauley is an avid reader and gardener. Dr. McCauley and his colleague enjoy sailing on the San Francisco Bay.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in praising Dr. Daniel McCauley for his significant contributions to the medical field and to the people of Stanislaus County.

HONORING THE 2013 INDUCTEES OF THE MAINE FRANCO-AMERICAN HALL OF FAME

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the four outstanding individuals

being inducted into the Maine Franco-American Hall of Fame this year. Father Jacques LaPointe of Madawaska, Dr. Lisa Marraché of Waterville, Cindy Larouck of Lewiston, and Judge Michael Cantara of Biddeford are representative of the enduring strength and influence of Maine's French heritage.

This year's inductees join the ranks of Maine's finest Franco-American leaders. Each of these honorees have made enormous contributions to the preservation and advancement of our state's unique history and culture.

Father Jacques LaPointe is a key member of the greater Madawaska community and a respected author on the history of the St. John Valley.

Lisa Marraché is an accomplished physician and legislator who has long worked to preserve French culture in Maine, including as a founder of the Franco-American Heritage Society of the Kennebec Valley.

Cindy Larouck is well-known across her hometown of Lewiston and the state of Maine for her efforts to share and revive her love of traditional Franco-American dance and music.

Michael Cantara is a highly regarded public servant, having previously served as Mayor of his hometown of Biddeford, York County District Attorney, Maine Public Safety Commissioner, and now as a District Court Judge. He has long been an unyielding force for the preservation of Maine's Franco-American heritage.

The Franco-American Hall of Fame will also posthumously honor five Mainers for their outstanding contributions to the State of Maine: Leon Albert Guimond, Adolphe and Napoleon Gingras, Louis Phillipe Gagne, and Camille Bolduc.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring these outstanding individuals as they are permanently and fittingly recognized for their tremendous contributions to the state of Maine and Franco-American culture.

TRIBUTE TO MARK PALMER

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, there are some who argue that the world's destinies are shaped by impersonal forces rather than by the courage and determination of individual men and women.

I believe that historians of that persuasion never met my friend, and freedom's friend, Mark Palmer. I rise to celebrate the life of Ambassador Mark Palmer, who died recently after a characteristically brave and uncomplaining twenty year battle against melanoma.

But for Mark's controversial determination while U.S. ambassador to Hungary that the barbed wire fences between Hungary and Austria should be severed in order to allow East Germans to leave the Communist orbit, the Berlin Wall might still be standing. But for his brave willingness to openly challenge Hungary's Communist government when conventional thinkers at the State Department and elsewhere were worried about the ''destabilizing'' effects of a Communist collapse, the Soviet Empire might still be in power. But for Mark's years of incomparably influential service as a speechwriter and pro-democracy advocate to three Presidents and six Secretaries of State, America might not have understood how the promotion of human rights, democracy and American values strategically tracks with the promotion of American national security interests.

There are many examples of how history was made by the man once described by The New York Times ''as the most active Western booster for economic and political liberalization'' of Communist dictatorships. They are examples of why, at the celebration of the 20th anniversary of Hungary's liberation from communist dictatorship, Mark was awarded a Commander's Cross of Hungary's Order of Merit because, as ''the right man at the right time at the right place . . . he rose to the occasion [of] shepherding democratic opposition . . . through . . . turbulent times by giving [it] legitimacy.'' They are reasons why Mark received three Presidential Awards and two Superior Honor Awards from the Department of State during a 26 year career as a Foreign Service officer.

A great moment in Mark Palmer's career—and proof of how his ideas have shaped events—was his role while in the Foreign Service as co-drafter of President Ronald Reagan's great 1982 Westminster Hall ''Democracy Crusade'' speech on democracy and human rights. The speech, whose every word had to be fought through a resistant bureaucracy, was a critical step in moving the United States from a policy of accepting and containing communism to what became the successful policy of peacefully challenging it. Thanks to Mark, the speech also led to the establishment of the National Endowment for Democracy—which he had proposed and later served as a key board member.

After his Foreign Service career, Mark served for nearly twenty years as Vice Chair of Freedom House, one of America's primary human rights organizations. He was honorary chair and co-founder of the International Management Center in Budapest, Hungary and served on the boards of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, the Georgetown University Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, the Budapest International Centre for Democratic Transition, the American Academy of Diplomacy, the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, the University of the District of Columbia, the Friends of Falun Gong, and the Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on Democracy Promotion.

Mark was the brains and inspiration behind another great institution whose positive impact will grow over the years. He helped to establish the Community of Democracies, a global assembly of democratic governments that now meets annually in support of democracy and human rights and to deepen the bonds between democratic governments. Mark served as Vice Chair of the Community's permanent operating body, its Council. As but one example of the Council's work and Mark's efforts on its behalf, he initiated and helped write increasingly influential training handbooks that guide U.S. diplomats and military officers to assist democratic promotion and transition. In Mark's honor, the Council established Palmer Prizes for contributions by diplomats to the advancement of democracy that were first awarded in 2011 to diplomats from seven countries for pro-human rights efforts in such nations as Belarus, Cuba and Zimbabwe.

A frequent author of policy and advocacy pieces to leading media outlets, and of expert testimony and counsel to Congress and the Executive Branch, Mark published in 2003 his groundbreaking Breaking the Real Axis of Evil: How to Oust the World's Last Dictators by 2025. In it, he argued for a revamping of U.S. foreign policy to make worldwide promotion of democracy a primary goal. Legislation based on the book was sponsored by Senator JOHN MCCAIN and my late colleague and fellow Palmer admirer Tom Lantos, and was signed into law by President George W. Bush on August 3, 2007. Entitled ''ADVANCE Democracy Act of 2007'', it was described by a scholar at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace as ''. . . the most important bill . . . on democracy promotion since the 1983 initiative to establish the National Endowment for Democracy . . .''

Mark's business career was as successful as his diplomatic career and was often focused on the same objectives. Knowing the critical value of free and unmonitored information in dictatorial and post-dictatorial countries, he founded Central European Media Enterprises Ltd. which, with local partners, established, owned and operated the first politically independent national television stations in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Romania, Ukraine and Poland. He was a co-founder of Television Development Partners and Signal One Media Corporation—ventures for the establishment of independent, commercial satellite TV channels in the Middle East. He chaired the advisory board of New Tang Dynasty Television, and strongly backed the launch of the first uncensored satellite TV broadcasts into China.

In what may prove as great a contribution to 21st century world freedom as those Mark made during the 20th century, he led the effort to establish a robust U.S. initiative to overcome the Internet firewalls of China, Iran and other closed society regimes. Mark knew what the world's dictators know—that Internet firewalls are present day equivalents of the brick and barbed wire walls he helped bring down in the 20th century. He knew what China's former Premier Hu Jintao has openly acknowledged—that the ability of closed society regimes to ''purify'' the Internet is critical to their ability to remain in power. Thus, when millions of house church Christians freely and safely conduct worship services over their mobile phones in China, and when hundreds of thousands of Iranians in and out of the country conduct interactive town meetings—as I believe will soon occur—this development will be a tribute to the vision that Mark inspired many of us to share during the latter part of his productive life.

Mark came early to his activism in the cause of human rights, participating during the early 1960s in Freedom Bus rides and other civil rights demonstrations while a student at Yale University, from which he graduated magna cum laude and Phi Beta Kappa. Taking similar action, Mark regularly sought out and met with dissidents in Moscow and Belgrade early in his career as a junior Foreign Service Officer. As a private citizen, he returned to Belgrade in 1996 to march with students against the criminal regime of then Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic.

Patriotism is said to be an honorable competition with one's ancestors, and Mark had many models that helped make him the man he became. He was born on July 14, 1941 in Ann Arbor, Michigan to the late Captain Robie

Ellis Palmer, USN and the late Katherine Hooker Palmer. His mother was the granddaughter of Civil War Colonel George W. Hooker, an Antietam Medal of Honor winner of the 4th Vermont Volunteers who was later appointed Assistant Adjutant General of Union Army Volunteers by President Lincoln. Not long after Mr. Palmer's birth, his father left to take command of the submarine USS *Pollack,* which operated in the Pacific theater and served in several dangerous missions in Japanese waters.

America—and the world—will miss Mark. But as my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know—Mark's legacy will be with us for years and generations to come. When men and women escape the chains of 21st century oppression, they will be in Mark Palmer's debt as we, his friends, will forever be.

Finally, in rising to celebrate Mark I rise as well to celebrate his cherished partner in all that he accomplished during his distinguished career—his wife of 47 years, Dr. Sushma Palmer.

TRIBUTE TO MICKEY EDWARDS

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a remarkable American, Mickey Edwards, who has been elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in recognition of his excellence in journalism, public affairs, and communication.

An Ohio native, Mr. Edwards has achieved continued success throughout his long career as a public servant. After receiving his education from the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma City University School of Law, he began his career in news media and public relations. He was later elected to represent the 5th Congressional District of Oklahoma for sixteen years and was a senior member of the House Republican leadership. He served as Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, was a member of both the House Appropriations and Budget Committees, and was the ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. After leaving Congress, he taught government and public policy at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, Harvard Law School, and Georgetown University's Public Policy Institute.

Mr. Edwards is a widely respected columnist and contributor whose work has appeared in news outlets including the Chicago Tribune, Los Angeles Times, San Francisco Examiner, the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, and The Washington Post, He is the author of two books, the co-author of a third, and has contributed chapters to several more publications.

Mr. Edwards has chaired several task forces for the Brookings Institution, the Council on Foreign Relations, and the Constitution Project. He has also been an adviser to the U.S. Department of State and is a member of the Princeton Project on National Security. He is currently a lecturer at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, is a vice president of the Aspen Institute, and is director of the Institute's Aspen-Rodel Fellowships in Public Leadership program. I came to know, like, and respect Mr. Edwards through the Aspen-Rodel program.

Mr. Edwards' impressive resume does not fully encompass the accomplishments of this extraordinary man. He continues to fight for cooperation between parties and for placing national interest ahead of political gain, encouraging and educating young Americans on the benefits of civil discourse and compromise. A man worthy of professional accolades and personal respect, Mr. Edwards is truly committed to his family, his community and his country. His is an example we should all strive to emulate. I am privileged to call him a friend and salute him for this tremendous and well-deserved honor.

YOM YERUSHALAYIM, JERUSALEM DAY

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 46 years ago today Israel liberated its capital city of Jerusalem during the Six-Day War, allowing Jews for the first time in decades to visit Judaism's holiest site, the Western Wall. That is why Jews across my home District in South Florida today are celebrating Yom Yerushalayim, Jerusalem Day.

In synagogues and community centers from Palm Beach, to Boca Raton, to Ft. Lauderdale, and indeed around the world, Jews are rejoicing with song, dance, and prayer, while also commemorating the solemn sacrifice of hundreds of Israeli soldiers whose lives were cut short in the Battle for Jerusalem.

Jerusalem has been the heart of the Jewish people for thousands of years. Through centuries of exile, Jerusalem remained the focal point of Jewish aspiration. In fact, Jews have always prayed toward the Western Wall regardless of where they stood geographically in the world.

That is why Israel's founding Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion said in 1947, ''No city in the world, not even Athens or Rome, ever played as great a role in the life of a nation for so long a time, as Jerusalem has done in the life of the Jewish people.''

IN RECOGNITION OF MT. MARIAH MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH'S 200TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my sincere congratulations to the congregation of Mt. Mariah Missionary Baptist Church in Omaha, Georgia as the church's membership and leadership celebrates a remarkable 200 years. The congregation of Mt. Mariah Missionary Baptist Church will celebrate this very significant anniversary with a Bicentennial Celebration on Sunday, May 12, 2013 at the Church in Omaha, Georgia.

Tracing its roots back to the antebellum era, the church was an illustration of the segregation and slavery practices of the South. From 1813 to 1856, the black community of Omaha worshipped with the white community although only a select number of blacks were allowed to attend church, including the overseer, the maids and the cooks. They had to sit in the back of the church and were not allowed to participate. As time passed, more members of the black community were allowed to attend the worship service but remained unsatisfied with the arrangement of services being held at Summer Hill Baptist Church, as it was known then.

After the Emancipation Proclamation was signed in 1865, the black community of Omaha was still discontented with the church service arrangement and called for a church of their own. In 1866, the white community had a church built within the city limits of Omaha and donated the old church to the black community. It was then used as both a school and a church and the name was changed to Mount Mariah Missionary Baptist Church.

In 1890, a church was built within the Omaha city limits for the black families living and working there so they wouldn't have to walk as far on Sunday and be tired for work on Monday. The church continued to grow and formed an organization named the ''Mt. Mariah Baptist Church Association.''

In 1911, the church bought six acres of land for $412.00 to build a new church, fellowship hall and cemetery. This structure stood until a tornado tore through the Omaha area and destroyed the church. Through the sadness and the tears came a firm resolve and an unyielding faith in the Lord to build a new church. After working hard to raise the funds, on November 9, 1947, the new church was dedicated with much prayer, song, and joy.

Throughout the years, the church was remodeled and improved with help, funds and donations from its members. It has seen many great leaders, each one leaving their lasting mark on the church. Today, under the leadership of Pastor Marcus B. Hunter, the prospering church looks back on 200 years of hardship, unending faith, and ultimate success.

The story of Mt. Mariah Missionary Baptist Church, which began during a dark and divided time in our nation's history, is a truly inspiring one of the dedication and perseverance of a faithful congregation of people who put all their love and trust in the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Mt. Mariah Missionary Baptist Church in Omaha, Georgia for their long history of coming together through the good and difficult times to praise and worship our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

HONORING THE DOS PALOS DIVINO ESPIRITO SANTO

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 90th ''Festa do Divino Espirito Santo'' or the Festival of the Divine Holy Spirit in Dos Palos, California. This annual festa is a lively gathering that promotes family reconciliation and peace, through prayer and charity.

The celebration began in the early 1920s when Azoreans began to emigrate from the Azore Islands to Dos Palos. In 1923 the Divino Espirito Santo, DES, Association was incorporated, and it stands as one of the city's oldest organizations. The Dos Palos DES has been successful over the past nine decades due to the donations and support from residents, business owners, dairymen, and ranchers. The organization is supported by individuals of all backgrounds and faiths. The money that DES raises goes to their annual celebrations, scholarships for young men and women, and parks for children. They also provide assistance to those who are in immediate need.

Dos Palos DES is known for its sense of community and comradeship. Neighbors are like family in Dos Palos, and there is no question that there is a sense of loyalty between everyone. Each year, the Festa do Divino Espirito Santo serves as a place for citizens to come together, appreciate their town, and enjoy each other's company. The traditional meal of sopas is served to over 2,000 people.

As someone with a strong Portuguese background and up-bringing, I truly admire all of the efforts made by Dos Palos DES. The individuals who have put together this wonderful celebration must be recognized for all of their hard work and dedication.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Festa do Divino Espirito Santo as residents from all over the Central Valley celebrate the 90th celebration. These wonderful traditions are passed down from generation to generation, and we can expect that Dos Palos DES will be hosting celebrations for many years to come.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT RECOVERY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2013

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, today I, along with Ranking Member DOGGETT and other Members of the Human Resources Subcommittee, introduce the International Child Support Recovery Improvement Act of 2013. This bill is nearly identical to H.R. 4282, which passed the House by voice vote on June 5, 2012, and serves as the implementing legislation for the Hague Convention on International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance. This multilateral treaty, to which the Senate provided its consent in 2010, provides for the structured exchange of information and consistent enforcement of international cases of child support.

The bill also builds on the Subcommittee's recent bipartisan efforts to standardize data within and across social programs. This includes applying to the child support enforcement program the same no-cost data standardization provision recently enacted in the child welfare, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and unemployment insurance programs.

The data provision is designed to recognize the need for standards in the exchange of data both across state-level programs and between states and the federal government. The goal is to better organize data within programs so that data can then be more easily shared across multiple human services programs that serve similar populations.

The data provision recognizes that multiple standards may well be needed to address different types of data exchanges, and that some data exchanges may already be standardized. It provides some authority to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to exercise some flexibility in situations where standardized systems are found to operate efficiently. Certain sectors, such as financial institutions, that interact with covered programs have well-established data exchange standards that need to be taken into account and should serve as the base for moving forward. In the case of child support, this data provision does not require that systems such as the Federal Parent Locator Service (FPLS) be retrofitted, but instead encourages incremental, cost-effective implementation of consistent data standards across human services programs.

I invite all Members to join me in supporting this important legislation and look forward to its speedy consideration. That way we can take the next step toward ratifying the Hague Convention so that more child support is collected in international cases, providing more children the financial support they deserve.

PROCLAIMING SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL ARSON AWARENESS WEEK

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support National Arson Awareness Week, which runs from May 5th–11th this year.

The United States Fire Administration (USFA) has made tremendous strides in educating the public about the dangers of Arson during its annual Arson Awareness Week. This year's theme, ''Reducing Residential Arson,'' is focused on ways for community members to come together and develop plans to combat arson in their neighborhoods. According to USFA, over 14,700 law enforcement agencies report 43,400 arsons every year.

This is an issue that hits home for my constituents in the city of Lewiston, who have endured three large fires during the past week. The fires have destroyed over 79 apartments and left roughly 200 people homeless. Firefighters from Lewiston and the surrounding communities have performed heroically to contain the fires and protect residents from harm. These brave men and women place themselves at enormous risk every day to keep us safe, and I applaud them for their efforts.

USFA is recommending a number of strategies to help communities better protect themselves against arson. Neighborhood cleanups have enabled residents to remove flammable materials and identify possible hazards. Groups have also had success by improving internal and external security for their homes and at abandoned properties. Working together, we can all help make our communities a safer place to live.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in recognizing National Arson Awareness Week for its role in helping our communities educate themselves about ways to combat arson.

DRURY UNIVERSITY'S THREE NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Drury University's Men's Basketball and Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving Teams on their national championships.

Drury University is the only school in the NCAA at any level in this 2012–13 school year to have won three national championships.

The Panthers Basketball Team won in dramatic fashion over Metro State to win 74–73 after they overcame a 17-point deficit to win on a last minute free throw in Atlanta, Georgia, on April 7. This is Drury's first NCAA-II National Basketball Championship, and it also marked Drury's 23rd straight win of the season. They won through their hard work and the sheer determination to win.

I want to commend Head Coach Steve Hesser, Assistant Coaches Ja Havens and Steven Gum, and Graduate Assistant Brandon Kimbrough for guiding the team through its extraordinary season. Coach Hesser did a remarkable job, and the National Association of Basketball Coaches honored Coach Hesser as its National D-II Coach of the Year, an award he certainly deserves.

Drury University's Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving Teams, coached by Brian Reynolds, swept the titles on March 9 in Birmingham, Alabama. This was the ninth straight national championship for the Drury Men—a record for NCAA Division II schools—and the fourth national title in the last five years for the Drury Women. I also want to commend Assistant Coach Jason Hite, Diving Coach Richard Hackett, Graduate Assistant Michal Winiewicz, and Graduate Assistant Marta Stepien for all their work this year.

I also congratulate Coach Reynolds, who was named National Coach of the Year for both the men's and women's competitions for his efforts this year. Coach Reynolds has developed a truly unique and dominant program.

The Springfield community is proud of the Drury teams for reaching such a high level of success. Drury University won three national titles and three national championships in the span of a month. Drury's national championships are remarkable achievements, and the teams will have memories to last a lifetime.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Drury Panthers on their outstanding athletic performances this year.

INTRODUCTION OF THE WATER QUALITY PROTECTION AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2013

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I join with 27 of my colleagues in introducing bipartisan legislation to make long,

overdue investments in our nation's water infrastructure systems that will benefit both our communities and our economy.

When it comes to America's infrastructure, the role of the Federal government is both critical and clear. Never has the need for Federal investment been greater, and in my district, perhaps more urgent both in the short term and long term.

As the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure heard at its Water Resources and Development Act hearing last month, America's waterways related infrastructure projects are in drastic need of Federal investment that will create jobs and benefit our economy. So too, will federal investment in our wastewater infrastructure systems provide economic benefits and create jobs while rebuilding and expanding our treatment systems. For every $1 billion this nation spends on wastewater infrastructure it can create as many as 33,000 jobs in communities across America while improving our public health and the environment. It is a win-win proposition.

Around the country, states report a need of close to $300 billion in wastewater treatment, pipe replacement and repair, and stormwater management projects over the next twenty years. This need is especially pressing in many cities and communities where pipes and sewage treatment facilities are reaching the end of their expected useful life.

Without a greater Federal investment, communities that cannot upgrade and expand their wastewater systems will find it harder to attract new business and build new homes. Existing businesses and homes will see treatment costs rise as short term fixes are sought. Current Federal appropriations that equal a small fraction of the identified need to modernize and repair these systems are clearly not sufficient. The time for a new approach to Federal investment and financing of these efforts is now.

The "Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2013" we are introducing today is intended to provide the "all of the above" approach to water infrastructure investment and financing that will be needed to close our current funding gaps. The bill renews the Federal commitment to addressing our Nation's substantial needs for wastewater infrastructure by investing $13.8 billion in the State Revolving Funds over the next five years. For decades, the SRFs have been the traditional mechanism for Federal wastewater infrastructure assistance.

Yet, also recognizing that significant additional resources will be necessary, the bill establishes two complementary new initiatives for the long-term, sustainable financing of wastewater infrastructure. The first is a direct loan and loan guarantee program and the second, a Clean Water Infrastructure Trust Fund. These proposals, when implemented in concert, would leverage billions of additional dollars to meet local wastewater infrastructure needs, create jobs, and protect our public health and environmental quality.

Meeting the critical water infrastructure investment needs of our local communities is a bipartisan issue, and indeed, this bill has bipartisan support. Members from both sides of the aisle recognize that the investments that we make will benefit our local constituents, the economies of our towns, cities, and States, and provide the added benefit of protecting public health and the overall condition of the environment.

I am pleased that this legislation has garnered bipartisan support for introduction, and I am also pleased that Republican and Democratic staff on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee have had several productive meetings to discuss this issue and explore a collaborative path forward. I look forward to working with Chairmen SHUSTER and GIBBS and Ranking Member RAHALL to advance long-term, sustained investment in our nation's wastewater infrastructure that has broad support from cities and communities around the country, industry, utilities, environmental groups, unions, equipment suppliers, and engineers.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this bill is good for America and American workers, and I urge my colleagues to join myself and my fellow cosponsors in supporting this very important legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BALANCING FOOD, FARM, AND THE ENVIRONMENT ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Balancing Food, Farm, and the Environment Act of 2013. This legislation modernizes the conservation title of the Farm Bill to better reflect farmers' needs and the priorities of the American public. I know from working with farmers in Oregon that many farmers are the best possible stewards of their land, and they are producing healthy, local food in ways that protect their livelihood, their farm, and the environment. The Farm Bill as a whole, however, does far too little to reward good stewardship, support sustainable farming practices, or meet conservation priorities.

The Balancing Food, Farm, and the Environment Act of 2013 leverages current Farm Bill programs to produce better environmental outcomes and increase ease of access for farmers. The bill prioritizes longer terms of protection for high-priority environmentally-sensitive lands, providing a better return for taxpayers and stability for farmers. It also makes clean water a higher priority in conservation programs, increasing protection and restoration for riverbanks. The Balancing Act targets wetlands and critical habitat to protect wildlife population. It increases access to program funding for farmers, and expands the funding available for technical assistance. It helps keep antibiotics out of our water and food by reducing grants to factory farms and by helping farmers transition to organic or less antibiotic intensive farming methods. Finally, the Balancing Act acknowledges that American farmers are experiencing impacts from climate change, and it provides funding for adaptation and mitigation of these effects.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to advance this legislation on behalf of our farmers, the millions of Americans who care about a safe, healthy, domestic food supply, and our grandchildren, who will live with the air, water, and soil we pass on to them.

CONGRATULATING THE PRESIDENTIAL SCHOLARS

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 49th class of U.S. Presidential Scholars, composed of 141 high school seniors who have excelled in academics or the arts. I am especially proud that a student from my district, James Y. Wang, has been selected as one of two students from Indiana for this prestigious honor.

These outstanding young people are selected by the White House Commission on Presidential Scholars as a result of their academic success, community service, leadership, and commitment to excellence. Each state will send a young man and a young woman to Washington, DC, on June 16, where they will receive a Presidential Scholar Medallion.

This achievement is a wonderful reflection of the quality of academic instruction in my district and of the hard work and dedication of the students. I would like to congratulate not only Mr. Wang, but also University High School in Carmel, Indiana, and Derek Thomas, who has been recognized as an outstanding educator.

As a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I know how important it is to our nation's future to encourage academic excellence in high schools across the country. We must do everything we can to support our great educators and train a generation of students ready to succeed in a dynamic 21st century economy.

The winners of this unique competition are an inspiration to their peers, educators, and parents throughout Indiana's 5th District and across the nation. Once again, congratulations to Mr. Wang, Mr. Thomas, and University High School. I am very proud of you.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT CONGRESS AND THE STATES SHOULD INVESTIGATE AND CORRECT ABUSIVE, UNSANITARY, AND ILLEGAL ABORTION PRACTICES

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I'm heartbroken as I've heard more and more about Dr. Kermit Gosnell's Philadelphia medical practice during the past few weeks. The brutal method Dr. Gosnell used to ensure death from a botched abortion, severing the spinal cord of a baby born alive, is disgusting. I pray we are all shocked and disturbed by what has been revealed about abortion during this trial.

While Dr. Gosnell stands trial, there are still over a million babies who die from abortion each year in the United States. That's almost 2 times more deaths than caused by cancer in the U.S. every year and 2 times more than heart disease. Abortion is taking an innocent life and we have to stand against it.

That's why I am introducing this House resolution to review public policies that led to the

illegal abortion practices of Dr. Kermit Gosnell and others. The resolution resolves that Congress and States should gather information about and correct abusive, unsanitary, and illegal abortion practices and the interstate referral of women and girls to facilities engaged in dangerous or illegal second- and third-trimester procedures.

The resolution also recognizes that there is substantial medical evidence that an unborn child is capable of experiencing pain at 20 weeks after fertilization, or earlier, and resolves that there is a compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children beginning at least from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain.

Life is precious, children are precious. People talk about choice when we talk about abortion, and we should encourage more Americans to choose life and protect the most innocent in our nation.

HONORING CHIEF JOHN STEVENS

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the leadership of John Stevens, former Chief of the Passamaquoddy and Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the State of Maine.

Chief Stevens is known throughout Maine as a man of great wisdom and compassion. His distinguished career in public service has led him to serve the state's native peoples in a variety of capacities. As a Tribal Councilor, John worked to strengthen Passamaquoddy cultural values and promote economic progress. During his terms as Chief, John worked effectively to combat unemployment and crippling debt. He also played an enormous role in the legal battle that would eventually result in Congressional Legislation to grant federal recognition to the Passamaquoddy, Penobscot, and Maliseet. Chief Stevens would also go on to serve as the first Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the State of Maine.

In addition to his devotion for the native peoples of Maine, John is also a proud veteran of the Korean War. He has often cited the war-devastated villages he encountered overseas as an inspiration behind his efforts to improve conditions for his own people. Today, the Passamaquoddy Tribe owns more than 200,000 acres of land in the State.

I consider myself privileged to have had the opportunity to work with John as a fellow public servant and as a friend. On May 9, 2013, Chief Joseph Socobasin, Vice Chief Clayton Sockabasin and the Indian Township Tribal Council will dedicate the Tribal Government Office Building in Chief Stevens' honor. I can think of no one more deserving of this tremendous honor.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in honoring Chief John Stevens for his long and remarkable career of public service.

NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of National Nurses Week. Nurses form the backbone of our nation's healthcare system. Patients depend upon nurses when they are at their most vulnerable, families entrust the care and comfort of their loved ones to their capable hands, and a happy and healthy nursing workforce means a happy and healthy American people.

This week is an opportunity for us to thank the roughly 3 million registered nurses in the United States, who provide the front-line patient contact that is critical to medical treatment that is effective and efficient—and they do so with a humanity that is refreshing. They provide understanding care to victims of domestic violence, a compassionate touch for family members who have lost a loved one, and the support and strength our wounded veterans need to recover.

As our nation looks towards implementing the Affordable Care Act, nurses will play a leading role in providing cost-effective, high-quality care to millions of new patients. One of the most important things we can do to control costs and improve patient outcomes is encourage and support both current and future members of the nursing profession. The current nursing shortage is a major hurdle that we must confront if we want to lead the world in health care quality and efficiency. By recruiting, training, and retaining the best nursing workforce that we possibly can, our nation will be investing in itself.

The acknowledged relationship between increased nurse staffing levels and decreased patient complications and reduced hospital stay lengths is too important to ignore. Shorter hospital stays means smaller premiums for all Americans. It also means fewer tax dollars being spent. But in more important terms, it means husbands and wives, fathers and mothers, sons and daughters who are around longer, with better quality of life. That is what nurses provide, and it is that for which I rise to say thank you.

IN CELEBRATION OF ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, to recognize the 21st anniversary of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month during the month of May. It is with great honor that I stand to commemorate the many accomplishments and contributions from Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. As leaders in business, education, STEM, military, medicine or the arts, Asian Americans have contributed to our nation's prosperity and culture. The story of the APA community is a testament to what is possible in America.

This year's theme is Building Leadership: Embracing Cultural Values and Inclusion which is definitely portrayed throughout this country and New York. The Asian Pacific American population is 18.2 million and expected to reach 20.9 million in the next five years. New York is home to 1.7 million Asian Pacific Americans and 10.1 percent of APA-owned businesses. Organizations in my congressional district in New York City, such as The Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans improve our communities with advocacy efforts for APAs, and cultural contributions. In addition, the Asian Pacific American Chamber of Commerce in New York has dedicated itself to the economic empowerment of APAs, and building the relationship between Asian and U.S. companies.

My colleagues in the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus and I are committed to fulfilling the various economic needs and civic engagement of the APA community as we work to secure comprehensive immigration reform and business empowerment opportunities for small business owners. Through strength and determination, the APA community has overcome prejudice, oppression and countless barriers to achieve enormous heights in America. I join Asian Pacific Americans in celebrating their heritage and their well-deserved successes.''

COMMEMORATING THE SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SULLY DISTRICT POLICE STATION SHOOTING

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it was seven years ago today that two Fairfax County police officers were killed outside the Sully District Police Station in a tragedy that galvanized our community. I was Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors at the time. Master Police Officer Michael Garbarino and Detective Vicki Armel showed tremendous courage, heroism, and self-sacrifice in protecting their fellow officers when a troubled young man launched an assault on the station with an arsenal of high-powered weapons. They were the first officers to be killed in the line of duty in the Fairfax County Police Department's 72-year history.

MPO Garbarino, 53, had just returned to the station and was sitting in his cruiser, preparing to go off duty, when he was shot. Detective Armel, 40, was at her car nearby, preparing to respond to a report of a carjacking. We later discovered that the shooter, 18-year-old Michael Kennedy, had a history of mental illness. The assailant stole a van and drove to the station armed with two rifles and five handguns. Detective Armel immediately returned fire, but she was fatally wounded when a high-powered round pierced her protective vest. She died on scene. Despite his injuries, MPO Garbarino was able to use his police radio to call for assistance and provide tactical information to responding officers that led to the killing of the shooter and prevented further casualties at the Sully Police Station. In standing their posts, they saved other lives.

MPO Garbarino was transported to the hospital in critical condition and succumbed to his injuries nine days later. He was a 23-year veteran of the Fairfax County Police Department.

He was a mentor to many young people in our community and regularly volunteered at one of the local alternative high schools. He is survived by his wife, Susan, their two children, his parents, and a sister.

Detective Armel was a 17-year law enforcement veteran. A graduate of Fairfax High School, she spent eight years with the Fairfax Sheriff's Department before transferring to the Police Department. She was active in the Mountain View Community Church in Culpeper, and she is survived by her husband, Tyler, who also serves as a detective in Fairfax, and their two children.

This tragedy was a grim reminder that we can never take for granted the outstanding work of our men and women in blue who put themselves in harm's way every day to keep our families and neighborhoods safe. The remarkable heroism and bravery displayed by MPO Garbarino and Detective Armel exemplifies the valor of all our public safety personnel and first responders and reflects their commitment to our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating the memory of these outstanding police officers and extending our condolences to their families. They and their brothers and sisters in the public safety community are deserving of our highest praise and appreciation.

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, today, we remember the Armenian people who lost their lives almost a century ago in the Armenian Genocide. In the first genocide of the 20th century, Ottoman officials arrested more than 200 Armenian leaders. Subsequently, 1.5 million Armenians were arrested and forced to march hundreds of miles to the present-day Syrian Desert. Men, women, and children were starved and tortured solely because of their faith and ethnicity.

Yet, there are some today who still choose not to recognize the atrocities that occurred between 1915 and 1923. But we know the truth. We know there were men, women, children, and families who were detained and ordered to march into the desert. We know there were those who were forced to escape their homes in search of safety. And we know there were those who never made it out.

Scripture says before you make comment about the speck in someone else's eye, remove the plank from your eye. Well, we certainly have a plank in our eye from the Administration and from the State Department, who is just refusing to do what is right in this area. So, we must first address and remove that plank in our eye and make the admission in this country and then we can call even more strongly on other countries, specifically Turkey.

We must continue to remember the injustice and acts of hatred that occurred almost a century ago. By doing so, we work to prevent a repetition of atrocities. And by continuing to hold events such as the annual commemoration, we make our voices heard. I can only hope that our acknowledgement and recognition of the crimes against humanity will set an example, paving the way for a peaceful resolution between the Turkey and Armenia. Thank you.

WELCOMING THE NINTH HONOR FLIGHT SOUTH ALABAMA TO WASHINGTON, DC

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2013

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize Honor Flight South Alabama and the World War II veterans. This very special organization is bringing its ninth flight to Washington, DC on May 8, 2013. I am honored to insert this tribute in the RECORD on the anniversary of the unconditional surrender of Germany to the allies.

Founded by the South Alabama Veterans Council, Honor Flight South Alabama is an organization whose mission is to fly heroes from Alabama to see their national memorial.

Nearly seven decades have passed since the end of World War II and, regrettably, it took nearly this long to complete work on the memorial that honors the spirit and sacrifice of the 16 million who served in the U.S. Armed Forces and the more than 400,000 who died. Sadly, many veterans did not live long enough to see this memorial, yet for those veterans still living, Honor Flight provides for many their first—and perhaps only—opportunity to see the National World War II Memorial, which honors their service and sacrifice.

During their time in their nation's capital, the veterans will visit the World War II Memorial, Arlington National Cemetery, and other memorials.

Mr. Speaker, the May 8, 2013, journey of heroes from South Alabama is an appropriate time for us to pause and thank them—and all of the soldiers who fought in World War II. They collectively—and literally—saved the world. They personify the very best America has to offer, and I urge my colleagues to take a moment to pay tribute to their selfless devotion to our country and the freedoms we enjoy.

I salute Sid Hamilton and L.C. Malone, veterans from Alabama's Second Congressional District who made the trip to Washington. May we never forget their valiant deeds and tremendous sacrifices.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 9, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 13

3 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Brian C. Deese, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SD–342

MAY 14

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms and the U.S. Capitol Police.

SD–138

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Marine Corps modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR–222

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013''.

SR–328A

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine Medicare physicians payments, focusing on advancing reform.

SD–215

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Homeland Security.

SD–342

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet

To hold hearings to examine the state of video.

SR–253

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S. 793, to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and S. 579, to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly.

S–116

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Coast Guard.

SD–138

Committee on Armed Services
To receive a closed briefing on the situation in Syria.
SVC–217
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine the ADA and entertainment technologies, focusing on improving accessibility from the movie screen to your mobile device.
SD–430
Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

3:15 p.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment
To hold hearings to examine returning private capital to mortgage markets, focusing on housing finance reform.
SD–538

MAY 15

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine United States Policy toward Iran; to be immediately followed by a closed briefing in SVC–217.
SD–419
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine performance management and congressional oversight, focusing on 380 recommendations to reduce overlap and duplication.
SD–342

10 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of Defense
To hold closed hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for National and Military Intelligence programs.
SVC–217
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine pending benefits legislation.
SR–418

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the National Institutes of Health.
SD–138
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Energy.
SD–192
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance
To hold hearings to examine improving cross border resolution to better protect taxpayers and the economy.
SD–538
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine advanced vehicle technology and its implications.
SR–253
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert D. Okun, and Michael Kenny O'Keefe, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.
SD–342
Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the views and priorities of Interior Secretary Jewell with regard to matters of Indian affairs.
SD–628

MAY 16

9:15 a.m.
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor, and any pending nominations.
SD–430

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the law of armed conflict, the use of military force, and the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force.
SD–106

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.
SD–430

2:30 p.m.
Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

MAY 22

10 a.m.
Joint Economic Committee
To hold hearings to examine the current economic outlook.
SH–216

2 p.m.
Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine the Medicare prescription drug program, focusing on 10 years later.
SD–366

JUNE 4

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet
To hold hearings to examine the state of wireless communications.
SR–253

JUNE 11

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SD–G50

11 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SD–G50

2 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SD–G50

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–232A

6 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–232A

JUNE 12

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–222

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–222

JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–222

JUNE 14

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–222

CORRECTION

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House and Senate met in a Joint Meeting to receive Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of South Korea.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3215–S3283

Measures Introduced: Twenty bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 891–910, and S. Res. 131–134. **Pages S3255–56**

Measures Passed:

Animal Drug and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Reauthorization Act: Senate passed S. 622, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs. **Pages S3275–82**

Use of Capitol Grounds: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 32, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition. **Page S3282**

Recognizing the Teachers of the United States: Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 126, recognizing the teachers of the United States for their contributions to the development and progress of our country, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S3282**

Measures Considered:

Water Resources Development Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S3217–28, S3240–48**

Adopted:

By 67 yeas to 32 nays (Vote No. 116), Whitehouse Amendment No. 803 (to Amendment No. 799), to create the National Endowment for the Oceans to promote the protection and conservation of United States ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes ecosystems. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having achieved 60 affirmatives votes, be agreed to.) **Pages S3217, S3223–27, S3228**

Boxer/Vitter Amendment No. 799, in the nature of a substitute. (By unanimous consent, the amendment will be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.) **Page S3217**

By a unanimous vote of 95 yeas (Vote No. 117), Brown Modified Amendment No. 813, to provide a multiagency effort to slow the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries. **Pages S3242–43**

Boxer (for Pryor) Modified Amendment No. 801, to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms. **Page S3247**

Boxer (for Pryor) Amendment No. 806, to provide a work-in-kind credit. **Page S3247**

Boxer (for Inhofe) Modified Amendment No. 835, to provide for rural water infrastructure projects. **Page S3247**

Boxer (for McCain) Amendment No. 833, to protect the American taxpayer by establishing metrics to measure the effectiveness of grants administered by the national levee safety program. **Page S3247**

Boxer (for Murray) Amendment No. 832, to modify the definition of the term "cargo container". **Page S3247**

Rejected:

By 56 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 115), Coburn Amendment No. 805 (to Amendment No. 799), to protect the right of individuals to bear arms at water resources development projects administered by the Secretary of the Army. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S3218–23, S3227**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the next amendment in order to the bill

be the following: Blunt Amendment No. 800; and that no second-degree amendments be in order to the amendment prior to votes on or in relation to the amendment. **Page S3228**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, May 9, 2013. **Page S3282**

Dick and Roman Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that, at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Republican Leader, Senate begin consideration of the nominations of Shelly Deckert Dick, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana, and Nelson Stephen Roman, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nominations, in the order listed; and that no further motions be in order to the nominations. **Page S3275**

Messages from the House: **Page S3254**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S3215, S3254**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3254–55**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3256–58**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3258–63**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3252–54**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S3263–74**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S3274–75**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—117) **Pages S3227–28, S3243**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:18 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, May 9, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3283.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: AIR FORCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Air Force, after receiving testimony from Michael B. Donley, Secretary of the Air Force, and General Mark A. Welsh III, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, both of the Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY AND IRS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Service and General Government concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service, after receiving testimony from Jacob J. Lew, Secretary, Steven T. Miller, Acting Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, and J. Russell George, Inspector General for Tax Administration, all of the Department of the Treasury.

APPROPRIATIONS: ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Army Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General Thomas P. Bostick, Chief of Engineers, Army Corps of Engineers, and Jo-Ellen Darcy, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, both of the Department of Defense; and Anne Castle, Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, and Michael L. Connor, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, both of the Department of the Interior.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland concluded a hearing to examine Army modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General William N. Phillips, Principal Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, and Director, Acquisition Career Management, and Lieutenant General James O. Barclay III, Deputy Chief of Staff, G–8, both of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower concluded a hearing to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Sean J. Stackley, Assistant Secretary for

Research, Development and Acquisition, Vice Admiral Allen G. Myers, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Integration of Capabilities and Resources, and Vice Admiral Kevin M. McCoy, Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command, all of the Department of the Navy, Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine strategic forces programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program, including observations on project and program cost estimating in the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Office of Environmental Management, after receiving testimony from Neile L. Miller, Acting Undersecretary for Nuclear Security, and Acting Administrator, Don L. Cook, Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, and John M. Richardson, USN, Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors, all of the National Nuclear Security Administration, and David Huizenga, Senior Advisor for Environmental Management, all of the Department of Energy; and David Trimble, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office.

IMMIGRANTS IN AMERICA'S INNOVATION ECONOMY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the role of immigrants in America's innovation economy, after receiving testimony from Jeffrey J. Bussgang, Flybridge Capital, and Harvard Business School, Boston, Massachusetts; Gwenne A. Henricks, Caterpillar Inc., Mossville, Illinois; Stuart Anderson, National Foundation for American Policy, Arlington, Virginia; and Ruchi Sanghvi, San Francisco, California.

BUSINESS MEETINGS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 306, to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 545, to improve hydropower, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 761, to promote energy savings in residential and commercial buildings and industry, with an amendment;

H.R. 267, to improve hydropower; and

H.R. 678, to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law.

INTEGRITY OF FEDERAL PAYMENTS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine curbing Federal agency waste and fraud, focusing on new steps to strengthen the integrity of Federal payments, after receiving testimony from Daniel I. Werfel, Controller, Office of Management and Budget; Patrick P. O'Carroll, Jr., Inspector General, and Marianna LaCanfora, Acting Deputy Commissioner for Retirement and Disability Policy, both of the Social Security Administration; Richard L. Gregg, Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; and Daniel Bertoni, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, Government Accountability Office.

PRIVATE SECTOR'S ROLE IN PREPAREDNESS AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia concluded a hearing to examine the role of the private sector in preparedness and emergency response, after receiving testimony from Elizabeth Zimmerman, Deputy Associate Administrator for the Office of Response and Recovery, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Michael Chodos, Associate Administrator for the Office of Entrepreneurial Development, Small Business Administration; Christopher Terzich, Regional Consortium Coordinating Council, Eau Claire, Wisconsin; Michael Merwarth, United Services Automobile Association, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the BuildStrong Coalition; and Daniel L. Stoecker, National Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster, Arlington, Virginia.

INDIAN WATER RIGHTS BILLS

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 434, to authorize and implement the water rights compact among the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation and the State of Montana, and S. 611, to make a technical amendment to the T'uf Shur Bien Preservation Trust Area Act, after receiving testimony from Senator Baucus; Kevin K. Washburn, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs; Calvin Joyner, Associate Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Jay Weiner, Montana Reserved Water Rights Compact Commission Staff Attorney, Helena; Shannon Augare, Blackfeet Nation, Browning, Montana; and Stuart Paisano, Pueblo of Sandia, Bernalillo, New Mexico.

CYBER THREATS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism concluded a hearing to examine cyber threats, focusing on law enforcement and private sector responses, after receiving testimony from Jenny A. Durkan, United States Attorney, Western District of Washington, and Joseph M. Demarest, Jr., Assistant Director, Cyber Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, both of the Department of Justice; Kevin Mandia, Mandiant Corporation, Alexandria, Virginia; and Stewart A. Baker, Steptoe and Johnson LLP, and Cheri F. McGuire, Symantec Corporation, both of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Patricia E. Campbell-Smith, of the District of Columbia, and Elaine D. Kaplan, of the District of Columbia, both to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and William H. Pryor, Jr., of Alabama, and Rachel Elise Barkow, of New York, both to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

MINORITY WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine strengthening the entrepreneurial ecosystem for minority women, after receiving testimony from Marie C. Johns, Deputy Administrator, Small Business Adminstration; Alejandra Y. Castillo, National Deputy Director, Minority Business Development Agency, Department of Commerce; Marc H. Morial, National Urban League, New York, New York; Sophia Parker, DSFederal, Inc., Gaithersburg, Maryland; Dixie Kolditz, Brighton Enterprises Inc., Battle Ground, Washington; Marianne Lancaster, Lancaster Packaging Inc., Hudson, Massachusetts; and Eva Longoria, Los Angeles.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 33 public bills, H.R. 1867–1899; and 4 resolutions, H. Res. 206–209 were introduced. **Pages H2532–35**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2535–36**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Meadows to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2487**

Recess: The House recessed at 9:04 a.m. for the purpose of receiving Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea. The House reconvened at 12:01 p.m., and agreed that the proceedings had during the Joint Meeting be printed in the Record. **Pages H2487, H2490**

Joint Meeting To Receive Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea: The House and Senate met in a joint session to receive Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea. She was escorted into the Chamber by a committee comprised of Representatives Cantor, McCarthy (CA), Walden, Lankford, Sessions, Royce, Camp, McKeon, Ros-Lehtinen, Brady (TX), Chabot, Granger, Reichert, Rogers (AL), Poe, Pelosi, Hoyer, Clyburn, Becerra, Crowley, Israel, Engel, Moran, Pascrell, Honda, Van Hollen, Matsui, Chu, Sewell, and Meng; and Senators Reid, Begich, Menendez, Cardin, McConnell, Cornyn, Barrasso, Murkowski, and Corker. **Pages H2487–90**

Full Faith and Credit Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 202, the rule that is providing for consideration of H.R. 807, to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached, by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 199 nays, Roll No. 139, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 199 nays, Roll No. 138.

Pages H2495–H2502, H2522–23

Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013: The House passed H.R. 1406, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector, by a recorded vote of 223 ayes to 204 noes, Roll No. 137.

Pages H2502–22

Rejected the Shea-Porter motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 200 ayes to 227 noes, Roll No. 136.

Pages H2520–21

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee

on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. **Pages H2502–03**

Agreed to:

Gibson amendment (printed in H. Rept. 113–51) that requires the GAO to submit a report to Congress on the usage of compensatory time allowed under the Act and detail any complaints filed or enforcement actions taken for alleged violations of the Act. The report will ensure Congress can monitor any potential abuse of the Act (by a yea-and-nay vote of 384 yeas to 42 nays, Roll No. 135). **Pages H2516–20**

H. Res. 198, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to yesterday, May 7th.

Recess: The House recessed at 3:32 p.m. and reconvened at 5 p.m. **Page H2519**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow. **Page H2523**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H2490.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2519–20, H2521, H2521–22, H2522–23 and H2523. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies held a hearing on Environmental Protection Agency Budget. Testimony was heard from Bob Perciasepe, Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

APPROPRIATIONS—ARMY BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on Army Budget. Testimony was heard from John M. McHugh, Secretary, United States Army; General Raymond T. Odierno, Chief of Staff, United States Army.

MEMBER'S DAY—FY 2014 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing on National Defense Priorities from Members for the FY 2014 National Defense Authorization Act. Testimony was heard from the following Representatives: Stivers; Takano; Nunes; Cartwright; Thompson, PA; Blackburn; Hudson; Pierluisi; Heck, WA; Kildee; Broun, GA; Lee; Fattah; Roskam; Barr; Young, AK; Ros-Lehtinen; Crawford; Posey; Jackson Lee; DeSantis; Gabbard; Sherman; Pingree, ME; Pocan; Gosar; and Al Green, TX.

BUDGET REQUEST FOR MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense Programs. Testimony was heard from Madelyn Creedon, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs, Department of Defense; J. Michael Gilmore, Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, Department of Defense; Vice Admiral James D. Syring, USN, Director, Missile Defense Agency.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health completed markup on H.R. 1407, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs; and legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain, and for other purposes. H.R. 1407 was forwarded, as amended; and legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain, and for other purposes was forwarded, as amended.

REAUTHORIZING THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing entitled "Reauthorizing the Defense Production Act". Testimony was heard from David J. Kaufman, Associate Administrator, Policy, Program Analysis and International Affairs, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Kevin J. Wolf, Assistant Secretary, Export Administration, Department of Commerce; Brett B. Lambert, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy, Department of Defense.

THREAT OF CHINA'S UNSAFE CONSUMABLES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats held a hearing entitled "The Threat of China's Unsafe Consumables". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TSA PROCUREMENT REFORM: SAVING TAXPAYER DOLLARS THROUGH SMARTER SPENDING PRACTICES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a hearing entitled ''TSA Procurement Reform: Saving Taxpayer Dollars Through Smarter Spending Practices''. Testimony was heard from Karen Shelton Waters, Assistant Administrator, Office of Acquisition, Transportation Security Administration; Paul Benda, Director, Advanced Research Projects Agency, Science and Technology Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; Stephen M. Lord, Director, Forensic Audits and Investigative Services, Government Accountability Office; and Charles K. Edwards, Deputy Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security.

DOI HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RULE: A RECIPE FOR GOVERNMENT WASTE, DUPLICATION AND DELAY

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''DOI Hydraulic Fracturing Rule: A Recipe for Government Waste, Duplication and Delay''. Testimony was heard from Alan Olson, Montana State Senate, Chairman, Senate Energy and Telecommunication Committee; Lynn D. Helms, Director, North Dakota Department of Mineral Resources; and public witnesses.

BENGHAZI: EXPOSING FAILURE AND RECOGNIZING COURAGE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Benghazi: Exposing Failure and Recognizing Courage''. Testimony was heard from Mark Thompson, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Counterterrorism, Department of State; and public witnesses.

RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW: HAVE EXISTING REGULATORY BURDENS ON SMALL BUSINESSES BEEN REDUCED

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Retrospective Review: Have Existing Regulatory Burdens on Small Businesses Been Reduced?''. Testimony was heard from Polly Trottenberg, Under Secretary for Transportation for Policy, Department of Transportation; Jeanne Hulit, Associate Administrator, Office of Capital Access, Small Business Administration; and Cheryl Cook, Chief Information Officer, Department of Agriculture.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on the following measures: H.R. 671, the ''Ruth Moore Act of 2013''; H.R. 1405, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include an appeals form in any notice of decision issued for the denial of a benefit sought; H.R. 570, the ''American Heroes COLA Act''; H.R. 1412, the ''Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act of 2013''; H.R. 357, the ''GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act of 2013''; and H.R. 602, the ''Veterans 2nd Amendment Protection Act''. The following measures were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 671; H.R. 1405; H.R. 1412; and H.R. 357. The following measures were ordered reported without amendment: H.R. 570; and H.R. 602.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE'S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES COMPLIANCE PROJECT

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled ''Internal Revenue Service's Colleges and Universities Compliance Project''. Testimony was heard from Lois Lerner, Director, Exempt Organizations Division, Internal Revenue Service.

Joint Meetings

IMMIGRATION

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded hearings to examine immigration and its contribution to our economic strength, after receiving testimony from Madeline Zavodny, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Georgia; and Steven A. Camarota, Center for Immigration Studies, Washington, D.C.

UKRAINE LEADERSHIP OF THE OSCE

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine Ukraine's leadership of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, focusing on finding new ways to address protracted regional conflicts, energy security, and human dimension issues such as human trafficking, tolerance, media freedom, democratic elections and election observation, and efforts to improve implementation of commitments regarding fundamental human rights and freedom, after receiving testimony from Leonid Kozhara, Foreign Minister of Ukraine and Chair-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Kyiv.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 9, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Agriculture, 10 a.m., SD–124.

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Departments of Defense and Navy, 2 p.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense policies and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session, 2:30 p.m., SR–222.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: business meeting to consider the nomination of Regina McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 9:15 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine pharmaceutical compounding, focusing on a proposed legislative solution, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 744, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, and the nominations of Srikanth Srinivasan, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Raymond T. Chen, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, and Jennifer A. Dorsey, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold hearings to examine pending health care legislation, 10 a.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on Air Force Budget, 9:30 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing on Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense Activities and Nuclear Forces Programs, 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing entitled ''American Energy Security and Innovation: Grid Reliability Challenges in a Shifting Energy Resource Landscape'', 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''Resolving International Parental Child Abductions to Non-Hague Convention Countries'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Boston Bombings: A First Look'', 9 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation, hearing on H.R. 1825, to direct Federal public land management officials to exercise their authority under existing law to facilitate use of and access to Federal public lands for fishing, sport hunting, and recreational shooting, and for other purposes; H.R. 586, the ''Denali National Park Improvement Act''; H.R. 995, the ''Organ Mountains National Monument Establishment Act''; and H.R. 1411, the ''California Coastal National Monument Expansion Act of 2013'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled ''Federal Government Approaches to Issuing Biometric IDs'', 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service, and the Census, hearing entitled ''Is OPM Processing Federal Worker Pension Claims on Time?'', 9:30 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Space; and Subcommittee on Research, hearing entitled ''Exoplanet Discoveries: Have We Found Other Earths?'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Health and Technology, hearing entitled ''The Health Insurance Fee: Impact on Small Businesses'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3, the ''Northern Route Approval Act''; and H.R. 1092, to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the ''Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center'', 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Human Resources, hearing entitled ''Letting Kids Be Kids: Balancing Safety with Opportunity for Foster Youth'', 9:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities, 9 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will continue consideration of S. 601, Water Resources Development Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, May 9

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H.R. 807—Full Faith and Credit Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E622
Bishop, Timothy H., N.Y., E623
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E624
Boustany, Charles W., Jr., La., E618
Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E624
Capps, Lois, Calif., E616
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E617, E625
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E625
Costa, Jim, Calif., E622
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E618
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E620
Fincher, Stephen Lee, Tenn., E624
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E622
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E626
Gerlach, Jim, Pa., E615
Harris, Andy, Md., E615
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E616
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E615
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E615
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E616
LoBiondo, Frank A., N.J., E617
Long, Billy, Mo., E623
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E618
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E620, E623, E625
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E619
Peters, Scott H., Calif., E619
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E625
Reichert, David G., Wash., E623
Roby, Martha, Ala., E626
Rogers, Harold, Ky., E615
Rokita, Todd, Ind., E622
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E618
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E618
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E620
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E616
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E619, E621

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*. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. 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.