United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 14, 2013 No. 67

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER of Florida).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 14, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is farm bill week. Today, the Senate Agriculture Committee is marking up their version of the farm bill, and tomorrow the House Agriculture Committee will do the same. Although one bill is written by a Republican and the other is written by a Democrat, these two bills have one thing in common: they make hunger worse in America.

There are 50 million hungry Americans; 17 million are kids. Yet the Senate is going to mark up a bill that cuts over $4 billion from SNAP, our Nation's main antihunger program. But that cut pales in comparison to the cuts included in H.R. 1947, the House farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are going to mark up a farm bill that includes a $20 billion cut in SNAP—$20 billion. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we have 50 million hungry Americans, at a time when we have 17 million hungry kids, a Republican-led Congress is going to mark up a farm bill with $20 billion cuts in SNAP.

Mr. Speaker, we were elected to solve problems and help people, not make things worse. We were elected to help make lives better. We were elected to do the right thing. Cutting SNAP, making it harder for hungry Americans to put food on their tables, is the wrong thing. Taking $20 billion out of this program will do real harm to Americans who simply are trying to make ends meet.

Now, there are some in this House, some on the Agriculture Committee, who say this is about reducing error rates in the program, that this is good getting at fraud. Well, let me remind them that SNAP has one of the lowest error rates, if not the lowest error rates, in the Federal Government. That is something that we should be proud of, and it is something that we should celebrate.

Mr. Speaker, these cuts do not get at fraud. These cuts do not make the program more efficient. These cuts don't help reduce or end hunger in America. These cuts in this bill will make things worse. That's because the cuts in this bill will kick 2 million people off of SNAP. That's 2 million hungry Americans who currently rely on SNAP to help feed themselves and their families, and that's 2 million low-income Americans who are having trouble making ends meet.

These cuts will cause 850,000 households to see their SNAP benefit reduced by $90 a month—$90 a month. That's a big cut for poor families struggling to get by.

The cuts in this bill will cause 210,000 children to lose access to their free school meals. These 210,000 poor children currently receive free school meals because their parents can't afford to pay for their meals. But the cuts in this bill will result in 210,000 losing access to free school meals.

This bill even cuts the nutrition education program, a program that is designed to help educate SNAP beneficiaries about how to buy and prepare more nutritious foods. Imagine cutting this critical education program while obesity and access to unhealthy food is on the rise.

To put this in proper context, these cuts would come on top of an across-the-board cut in SNAP that every recipient will experience starting on November 1, 2013. Because SNAP has been used as an ATM to offset other worthy programs, a family of four will already be seeing their SNAP benefit cut by an average of $25.

So, to recap, not only will we see automatic cuts in SNAP this November, the House farm bill will make things worse by cutting $20 billion additionally from the program. This simply cannot stand.

Tomorrow, during the farm bill markup, I will offer an amendment that will restore these cuts. I hope that all my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee will vote for my amendment, and, if it fails, I hope they'll vote against the farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot just indiscriminately make hunger worse in the name of fiscal austerity. No, Mr. Speaker, we should look at these programs and ask ourselves: Are these programs working? Are they doing the job that they were designed to do? Are they succeeding or failing? And how can we make them work better? But that's not what we're doing.

Printed on recycled paper.

Do you know how many hearings we've had on SNAP in this Congress? Do you know how many the Agriculture Committee has held? None. That's right, the Agriculture Committee is about to cut $20 billion from SNAP, and we haven't had one single hearing. Yet there are 20 new members of the Agriculture Committee in this Congress, 20 new members who deserve the right to learn about these issues, including the details of SNAP and the impact of these cuts.

Mr. Speaker, this is not how we should be approaching this program. We should be holding hearings; we should ask questions; we should be thoughtful; and we should look at the program in an honest way, and our goal should be to end hunger now. Unfortunately, this bill, as written, is more about protecting big agribusiness and corporate welfare than it is about protecting hungry Americans who need help today.

Mr. Speaker, we need to do something about hunger in America. I've urged the administration to host a White House conference on food and nutrition to come up with a plan to end hunger now. Hopefully, they will act on that soon. But for today and tomorrow, we must protect SNAP from needless, unnecessary, and harmful cuts. We must stand for the most vulnerable in our country, and we must end hunger now and not make it worse.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEWART) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all to whom the authority of government is given. Help them to meet their responsibilities, enlightened by Your eternal spirit.

We gather after celebrating Mother's Day. We thank You for the gift of self modeled by our mothers, who chose to place each of us before themselves in giving birth to us and nurturing us as we grew. May we all earn the pride of our mothers in the service we provide to the benefit of this Nation.

There are many serious issues confronting our Nation these days. May the truth be served and the Nation's interests be met in the proceedings of this day.

May all that is done this day 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. Will the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama 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.

OVERSIGHT IS A PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week was very revealing about misstatements of truth from the White House. On Wednesday, the administration was heavily criticized as the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform held a hearing, led by Chairman DARRELL ISSA, to investigate the Benghazi terrorist attack. Additionally, on Friday, the IRS secret operation to target conservative groups was admitted after 3 years of denial.

Thomas Jefferson once said, ''The whole art of government consists in the art of being honest.''

As a congressional body, the Members of the United States House and Congress have an obligation to carry out oversight responsibilities. When situations arise where there is administration misconduct, we must pursue investigations to protect the American people. I look forward to working with my colleagues by demanding answers to the countless questions of intentional misrepresentations.

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

SCOTTSBORO BOYS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I applaud the Alabama Legislature's Scottsboro Boys Act, which granted posthumous pardons to eight African American young men wrongfully accused in Alabama in 1931. The Scottsboro Boys case profoundly impacted America's civil rights movement and American law.

In two different landmark decisions, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the Constitution requires legal counsel for criminal defendants and held that arbitrarily excluding African Americans from jury pools was unconstitutional.

It is never too late to call wrong by its name. As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., wrote in his ''Letter from Birmingham Jail'':

> Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

I pray that the families of Olen Montgomery, Haywood Patterson, Ozie Powell, Willie Roberson, Charlie Weems, Eugene Williams, and Andy and Roy Wright may take comfort in Alabama's full acknowledgement of the innocence of these wrongfully accused young men.

OBAMACARE'S THREAT

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today not only as a Member of Congress, but as a concerned business owner angered by the fact that ObamaCare may be putting my companies at financial risk. Currently, those businesses employ over 120 people in the State of Oklahoma. Because of the size of these companies, when ObamaCare is fully implemented, it will mean an immediate cost of over $200,000 to that business.

I ran for Congress because I got fed up with the Federal Government becoming my biggest threat.

The President says he wants to grow the economy and encourage job creation, but in reality he is punishing those who are trying to thrive. As a business owner, you are penalized $100,000 for hiring that 50th employee.

ObamaCare is the number one threat to businesses in Oklahoma and across this country. This week we'll vote to repeal this law, along with its harmful new mandates and tax hikes.

For the sake of this country's job creators, we must repeal ObamaCare. I urge my colleagues to join me and America in putting America back in business.

SECRETARY SEBELIUS CONTINUES TO VIOLATE CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution allows the Congress, specifically the House of Representatives, to hold the purse strings of the Federal Government—not the executive branch, not the Federal agencies.

This week, we've heard reports that the Secretary of Health and Human Services has been calling executives

from the industries that she regulates asking them to donate money to a group called ''Enroll America,'' a private organization that makes the President's health care law a success by signing individuals up for coverage through exchanges.

The Antideficiency Act prohibits the Federal Government departments from making greater expenditures in a fiscal year than those provided by the Congress. So it begs the question: What is the Secretary promising to corporate executives in exchange for their funding of this ACA implementation? This continues the line of questionably ethical conduct by the Secretary all to further the administration's controversial agenda.

Let's review: in 2012, the U.S. Office of Special Counsel concluded that Secretary Sebelius violated the Hatch Act by campaigning for President Obama while traveling on official business; then they raided the ACA's Prevention and Public Health Fund; and now she is seeking money from businesses that she regulates to prop up the President's takeover of American health care.

ARE YOU KIDDING ME?

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

Mr. MESSER. What a week, Mr. Speaker. A Benghazi coverup, the IRS targeting conservative groups, and now the Department of Justice found spying on the Associated Press. The scandals from this administration are coming so fast that the American people can barely keep up, and this pattern of arrogance, lies, and outright lawlessness should be disturbing to every American.

Mr. Speaker, the American people demand the truth, and this Congress is duty bound to make sure they get it. Congress must act now and investigate each of these scandals.

Some may call it political, but there is nothing political about keeping the oath of every Member of this Chamber to protect and defend the United States Constitution. And there is nothing political about working to ensure that none of these scandals gets swept under the rug.

□ 1410

IRS ACTIONS VIOLATE PUBLIC TRUST

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage at the behavior of the IRS.

Last week, the IRS admitted that it targeted organizations based on group names and political ideologies. Based on their conservative leanings, these organizations were often forced to divulge their donor lists and answer invasive questions about their affiliations, requirements the IRS did not extend to other groups seeking similar treatment under the Tax Code.

These actions are unacceptable. IRS officials cannot infringe on any person or organization's constitutional rights simply because of a difference in political ideology.

We expect our government to be a guardian of rights. Those responsible for this violation of the public's trust must be held accountable. IRS employees and officials are public servants, and those involved with this scandal have violated a fundamental precept of public service.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1703

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

NATIONAL BLUE ALERT ACT OF 2013

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 180) to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 180

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 ''National Blue Alert Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COORDINATOR.—The term ''Coordinator'' means the Blue Alert Coordinator of the Department of Justice designated under section 4(a).

(2) BLUE ALERT.—The term ''Blue Alert'' means information relating to the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer in the line of duty sent through the network.

(3) BLUE ALERT PLAN.—The term ''Blue Alert plan'' means the plan of a State, unit of local government, or Federal agency participating in the network for the dissemination of information received as a Blue Alert.

(4) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ''law enforcement officer'' shall have the same meaning as in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b).

(5) NETWORK.—The term ''network'' means the Blue Alert communications network established by the Attorney General under section 3.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 3. BLUE ALERT COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.

The Attorney General shall establish a national Blue Alert communications network within the Department of Justice to issue Blue Alerts through the initiation, facilitation, and promotion of Blue Alert plans, in coordination with States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other appropriate entities.

SEC. 4. BLUE ALERT COORDINATOR; GUIDELINES.

(a) COORDINATION WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—The Attorney General shall assign an existing officer of the Department of Justice to act as the national coordinator of the Blue Alert communications network.

(b) DUTIES OF THE COORDINATOR.—The Coordinator shall—

(1) provide assistance to States and units of local government that are using Blue Alert plans;

(2) establish voluntary guidelines for States and units of local government to use in developing Blue Alert plans that will promote compatible and integrated Blue Alert plans throughout the United States, including—

(A) a list of the resources necessary to establish a Blue Alert plan;

(B) criteria for evaluating whether a situation warrants issuing a Blue Alert;

(C) guidelines to protect the privacy, dignity, independence, and autonomy of any law enforcement officer who may be the subject of a Blue Alert and the family of the law enforcement officer;

(D) guidelines that a Blue Alert should only be issued with respect to a law enforcement officer if—

(i) the law enforcement agency involved—

(I) confirms—

(aa) the death or serious injury of the law enforcement officer; or

(bb) the attack on the law enforcement officer and that there is an indication of the death or serious injury of the officer; or

(II) concludes that the law enforcement officer is missing in the line of duty;

(ii) there is an indication of serious injury to or death of the law enforcement officer;

(iii) the suspect involved has not been apprehended; and

(iv) there is sufficient descriptive information of the suspect involved and any relevant vehicle and tag numbers;

(E) guidelines—

(i) that information relating to a law enforcement officer who is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty should be provided to the National Crime Information Center database operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 534 of title 28, United States Code, and any relevant crime information repository of the State involved;

(ii) that a Blue Alert should, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with law enforcement agencies of States and units of local governments), be limited to the geographic areas most likely to facilitate the apprehension of the suspect involved or which the suspect could reasonably reach, which should not be limited to State lines;

(iii) for law enforcement agencies of States or units of local government to develop plans to communicate information to neighboring States to provide for seamless communication of a Blue Alert; and

(iv) providing that a Blue Alert should be suspended when the suspect involved is apprehended or when the law enforcement agency involved determines that the Blue Alert is no longer effective; and

(F) guidelines for—

(i) the issuance of Blue Alerts through the network; and

(ii) the extent of the dissemination of alerts issued through the network;

(3) develop protocols for efforts to apprehend suspects that address activities during the period beginning at the time of the initial notification of a law enforcement agency that a suspect has not been apprehended and ending at the time of apprehension of a suspect or when the law enforcement agency involved determines that the Blue Alert is no longer effective, including protocols regulating—

(A) the use of public safety communications;

(B) command center operations; and

(C) incident review, evaluation, debriefing, and public information procedures;

(4) work with States to ensure appropriate regional coordination of various elements of the network;

(5) establish an advisory group to assist States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other entities involved in the network with initiating, facilitating, and promoting Blue Alert plans, which shall include—

(A) to the maximum extent practicable, representation from the various geographic regions of the United States; and

(B) members who are—

(i) representatives of a law enforcement organization representing rank-and-file officers;

(ii) representatives of other law enforcement agencies and public safety communications;

(iii) broadcasters, first responders, dispatchers, and radio station personnel; and

(iv) representatives of any other individuals or organizations that the Coordinator determines are necessary to the success of the network;

(6) act as the nationwide point of contact for—

(A) the development of the network; and

(B) regional coordination of Blue Alerts through the network; and

(7) determine—

(A) what procedures and practices are in use for notifying law enforcement and the public when a law enforcement officer is killed or seriously injured in the line of duty; and

(B) which of the procedures and practices are effective and that do not require the expenditure of additional resources to implement.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—The guidelines established under subsection (b)(2), protocols developed under subsection (b)(3), and other programs established under subsection (b), shall not be mandatory.

(2) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The guidelines established under subsection (b)(2) shall, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government), provide that appropriate information relating to a Blue Alert is disseminated to the appropriate officials of law enforcement agencies, public health agencies, and other agencies.

(3) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES PROTECTIONS.—The guidelines established under subsection (b) shall—

(A) provide mechanisms that ensure that Blue Alerts comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local privacy laws and regulations; and

(B) include standards that specifically provide for the protection of the civil liberties, including the privacy, of law enforcement officers who are seriously injured or killed in the line of duty and the families of the officers.

(d) COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—The Coordinator shall cooperate with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Transportation, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and appropriate offices of the Department of Justice in carrying out activities under this Act.

(e) RESTRICTIONS ON COORDINATOR.—The Coordinator may not—

(1) perform any official travel for the sole purpose of carrying out the duties of the Coordinator;

(2) lobby any officer of a State regarding the funding or implementation of a Blue Alert plan; or

(3) host a conference focused solely on the Blue Alert program that requires the expenditure of Federal funds.

(f) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Coordinator shall submit to Congress a report on the activities of the Coordinator and the effectiveness and status of the Blue Alert plans that are in effect or being developed.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 180, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Tomorrow, on the west front of the Capitol, we will honor those law enforcement officers killed last year in the line of duty. In 2012, 127 officers gave their lives while protecting America's public safety, including three officers in my home State of Virginia.

Although officer fatalities nationwide decreased by 23 percent from the previous year, 66 of those officers were killed in violent or deliberate attacks. Ambush attacks on police officers were the leading cause in fatal shootings, followed by traffic stops or pursuits, drug-related crimes, and robberies.

H.R. 180, the National Blue Alert Act of 2013, encourages an enhanced nationwide system for distribution of time-sensitive information to help identify a violent suspect when a law enforcement officer is injured or killed in the line of duty.

A Blue Alert broadcasts information and speeds apprehension. Blue Alerts use the same principle as Amber Alerts for missing children and Silver Alerts for missing seniors. The Blue Alert system is a cooperative effort among local, State, and Federal authorities, law enforcement agencies, and the general public.

A Blue Alert provides a description of an offender who is still at large and may include a description of the offender's vehicle and license plate information. Like Amber Alerts, Blue Alerts will help hinder the offender's ability to escape and will facilitate their capture.

This bill directs the Department of Justice to designate an existing officer as the Blue Alert national coordinator who will encourage those States that have not already done so to develop Blue Alert plans and establish voluntary guidelines. As of today, 18 States have Blue Alert networks in place. However, there are many examples where an integrated, nationwide Blue Alert system would save lives and help bring fugitive suspects to justice.

Following the tragic Boston Marathon bombing last month, one of the suspects shot and killed Patrol Officer Sean Collier of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Police Department. One of the subjects approached Officer Collier as he sat in his patrol car and opened fire on him without warning, striking him several times. The subjects then attempted to steal his service weapon but were thwarted by his secured holster.

The suspects then carjacked a vehicle and led police on a pursuit while throwing explosive devices at pursuing units. The pursuit ended in Watertown, Massachusetts, where one suspect was killed and a Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority police officer was shot and seriously wounded in a gun battle. The second suspect was captured in Watertown the following evening after another tense standoff.

The immediate aftermath of the Boston Marathon bombing demonstrates how criminals are becoming even more violent, and their contempt for law enforcement and the rule of law is more evident than ever. This year is already shaping up to be a devastating year for law enforcement fatalities. As compared with this time last year, line-of-duty deaths this year are up 21 percent. Law enforcement deaths by gunfire are up 7 percent compared with May 2012.

This bill encourages expansion of an integrated Blue Alert communications network throughout the United States, which would ensure that when tragedy strikes, the public is on notice and suspects can be more quickly apprehended and brought to justice. A nationwide

Blue Alert network will be particularly effective when a suspect flees across State lines.

I thank Mr. GRIMM of New York and Mr. REICHERT of Washington for their work on this bipartisan, bicameral legislation. An identical Senate measure is pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Supporters of this legislation include the National Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Sergeants Benevolent Association, and the National Association of Police Organizations.

This bill reaffirms our commitment to ensure the safety of our law enforcement men and women and the communities they serve to protect every day.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 180, the National Blue Alert Act. H.R. 180 will establish a coordinator within the Department of Justice to facilitate the issuance of Blue Alerts to help apprehend individuals suspected of killing or seriously injuring police officers. I support the bill because it provides critical support for a system that protects police officers and the public.

It's particularly timely that we consider this measure during National Police Week. National Police Week is a special occasion during which we recognize law enforcement officers and honor those who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

Since the first known line-of-duty death in 1791, more than 1,900 U.S. law enforcement officers have made the ultimate sacrifice. Today, there are more than 900,000 sworn law enforcement officers serving in the United States and, regrettably, on average one is killed in the line of duty every 57 hours.

Currently, 15 States, including my home State of Virginia, have Blue Alert systems that use media broadcasts and roadside message signs to disseminate, within their respective borders, time-sensitive information about those suspected of killing or seriously injuring Federal, State, or local law enforcement officers. In addition to those States, two more States are establishing Blue Alert systems this year.

The information disseminated by these systems—which can include descriptions of the suspect, the vehicle, and the license plate number—enables the public to assist the police in locating these perpetrators. H.R. 180 will enable more States to institute these valuable programs and require the Department of Justice to facilitate the dissemination of Blue Alerts across State lines and throughout specific geographic areas.

□ 1710

The Blue Alert program is similar to the Amber Alert program that helps us find missing children, and it makes sense that we would encourage similar expansion for the Blue Alert programs.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this important public safety measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM) and thank him for his authorship and sponsorship of this legislation.

Mr. GRIMM. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of my bill, H.R. 180, the National Blue Alert Act of 2013. As a former FBI special agent, it is a very unique honor for me to have the House consider this important legislation during National Police Week, where thousands of law enforcement officers from around the world converge on our Nation's Capitol to honor those that have paid the ultimate sacrifice to protect our citizens here at home.

On a personal note, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to New York Police Commissioner Ray Kelly and to all the brave men and women of the NYPD for their service to our great city. I encourage all my colleagues to treat every week as if it were National Police Week.

Truly, it is the sacrifices made by these great individuals that inspired me to introduce this important legislation. During my career as a special agent in the FBI, I witnessed firsthand the danger posed by criminals who attack law enforcement officers, and the particular danger they pose on our communities. Time and time again, we have seen that if criminals are willing to attack a police officer to avoid apprehension, then there is absolutely no limit to the lengths they will go or the victims they will target to avoid justice.

According to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, 127 officers have been killed in the line of duty during 2012. We can take a look at States that had officers killed in the line of duty from Texas to Pennsylvania.

While it is impossible to completely transform the hazardous nature of the work our law enforcement officers do day in and day out, there are steps that we can take to enhance their safety and quickly apprehend those who put them at risk. The National Blue Alert Act does this by creating a national Blue Alert communications network within the United States Department of Justice. This will disseminate information on suspects who are being sought in connection with the death or injury of law enforcement officers.

I have had the distinct pleasure of working with some of the bravest men and women this country has to offer. I really believe that, similar to Amber Alert, Blue Alert would rapidly notify our law enforcement agencies. It will notify the media and the public so that we can have the help that we need to aid in the apprehension of some of the most violent criminals.

Additionally, this legislation would further encourage the expansion of the Blue Alert program beyond the handful of States where it is currently existing by helping the development of Blue Alert plans, regional coordination, and the development and implementation of new technologies to improve Blue Alert technologies.

This legislation is supported by many. It's supported by a number of law enforcement organizations, including the Sergeants Benevolent Association, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National Association of Police Officers, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, as well as the Fraternal Order of Police.

I am certain that the National Blue Alert Act will enhance the safety of our communities as well as the law enforcement officers who protect them, and I encourage its swift passage today in the full House of Representatives.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Does my colleague from Virginia have further speakers?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I do not have any further speakers at this time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM), my colleague from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. CONYERS, for their cooperation in bringing this bill to the floor during National Police Week.

As we join together on this bill, it is my hope that we can continue to work in a bipartisan fashion on other measures that will assist law enforcement officers and find sensible solutions to the problems of crime that face our communities.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I thank my friend and colleague from Virginia, the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, for his leadership on this bipartisan effort, as well as Ranking Member CONYERS, Mr. GRIMM, and Chairman SENSENBRENNER of the subcommittee as well for their efforts.

I can't think of a more appropriate time to honor police, during National Police Week, or in a more appropriate way than by passage of this legislation, which will not only allow law enforcement to more effectively communicate in these situations where police officers are in jeopardy or have been harmed, but also in circumstances that will allow everyone in this country to become involved.

With the availability of smartphones and other devices and social media like Twitter and Facebook and YouTube

and other means that people now have of communicating that they didn't have just a few years ago, the word can get out to everyone to be on the lookout for people who are committing crimes. This will help us to apprehend criminals and prevent crimes, and we very much urge our colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and the representative from Houston, which lays claim to one of the most effective police departments in the nation, and a co-sponsor of the legislation, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 180, the "National Blue Alert Act of 2013." I support this bill as a good and necessary measure. Everyday, more than 900,000 officers protect and serve the people of the United States. Every 57 hours, one of these men and women die in the line of duty. These officers deserve nothing less than a system that ensures an efficient method to support and protect them, and to bring justice to those who would harm them. It is for this reason that I support the legislation before us.

The National Blue Alert Act directs the Attorney General to establish a national communications network within the Department of Justice to disseminate information when an officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, and assign a Department of Justice officer to act as the national coordinator of the Blue Alert Network. The Blue Alert system is modeled after the Amber Alert and the Silver Alert programs, which have been very successful in finding abducted children and missing seniors. Currently 18 states, including my home state of Texas, have local Blue Alert programs in operation.

The National Blue Alert Coordinator will provide assistance to states and local governments using Blue Alert plans; establish voluntary guidelines for states and local governments for developing these plans; develop protocols for efforts to apprehend suspects; work with states to ensure regional coordination of various elements of the network; and establish advisory groups, to assist states, local governments, law enforcement agencies and other entities in initiating, facilitating, and promoting Blue Alerts through the network.

The National Blue Alert Coordinator will determine what procedures and practices to use in notifying law enforcement and the public when a law enforcement officer is killed or seriously injured in the line of duty and which procedures and practices are the most cost effective to implement.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that this legislation enjoys the strong support of the Fraternal Order of Police, and the National Sheriffs Association. As I stated, 18 states currently have a Blue Alert program in place, and it is time to expand this excellent program nationwide.

This bill will enhance officer safety, which should always be one of our major concerns. Since the first recorded line-of-duty death in 1791, more than 19,000 men and women have died in the line of duty. It saddens me that 1,665 of the names on the National Law Enforcement Memorial in Washington D.C. come from Texas. That is more than any other state. My city of Houston has lost 112 officers in the line of duty.

It should be clear to everyone that the regular dangers our officers face have only increased. The 40 deaths that have occurred in 2013 represent a 21% increase over the comparable period in 2012; and gun related deaths are up 7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, passage of H.R. 180, the Blue Alert Notice Act of 2013, will not prevent brave law enforcement officials from falling in the line of duty in the future, but it will help. If it saves the life of at least one policeman and enables him or her to return safely home to his loved ones, this legislation will have proven its value.

I urge all members of the House to join me in supporting H.R. 180, the National Blue Alert Notification Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 180, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. 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 motion will be postponed.

POLICY REGARDING INTERNET GOVERNANCE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1580) to affirm the policy of the United States regarding Internet governance.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1580

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Given the importance of the Internet to the global economy, it is essential that the Internet remain stable, secure, and free from government control.

(2) The world deserves the access to knowledge, services, commerce, and communication, the accompanying benefits to economic development, education, and health care, and the informed discussion that is the bedrock of democratic self-government that the Internet provides.

(3) The structure of Internet governance has profound implications for competition and trade, democratization, free expression, and access to information.

(4) Countries have obligations to protect human rights, whether exercised online or offline.

(5) The ability to innovate, develop technical capacity, grasp economic opportunities, and promote freedom of expression online is best realized in cooperation with all stakeholders.

(6) Proposals have been, and will likely continue to be, put forward at international regulatory bodies that would fundamentally alter the governance and operation of the Internet.

(7) The proposals would attempt to justify increased government control over the Internet and could undermine the current multistakeholder model that has enabled the Internet to flourish and under which the private sector, civil society, academia, and individual users play an important role in charting its direction.

(8) The proposals would diminish the freedom of expression on the Internet in favor of government control over content.

(9) The position of the United States Government has been and is to advocate for the flow of information free from government control.

(10) This Administration and past Administrations have made a strong commitment to the multistakeholder model of Internet governance and the promotion of the global benefits of the Internet.

SEC. 2. POLICY REGARDING INTERNET GOVERNANCE.

It is the policy of the United States to preserve and advance the successful multistakeholder model that governs the Internet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1580, sometimes called the Internet Freedom Bill.

The Internet is possibly the most important technological advancement since the printing press. Governments' hands-off approach has enabled the Internet's rapid growth and made it a powerful engine of social and economic freedom. This bipartisan bill is designed to combat recent efforts by some in the international community to regulate the Internet, which could jeopardize not only its vibrancy, but also the benefits that it brings to the entire world.

Nations from across the globe met at the December 2012 World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai. They considered changes to the international telecommunications regulations. The treaty negotiations were billed as a routine review of rules governing ordinary international telephone service. A number of countries, such as Russia, China, and Iran, sought to use the negotiations, however, to pursue regulation of the Internet through the International Telecommunication Union, a United Nations agency. None other than Russian President Vladimir Putin has been clear in his objective of ''establishing international control over the Internet using the monitoring and supervisory capabilities of the International Telecommunication Union.''

The developments in Dubai were not unanticipated. That is why leading up to the conference last year, the House

and Senate unanimously passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 50. That resolution expressed the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce should advocate ''the consistent and unequivocal policy of the United States to promote a global Internet free from government control and preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model that governs the Internet today.''

□ 1720

Now, under that multi-stakeholder model, non-regulatory institutions seek input from the public and private sectors to develop best practices for managing the content, applications, and networks that make up the Internet. The Internet is organized from the ground up and not from the government handed down. This is not to say that government has no role in policing unlawful behavior. Illegal activity is no less illegal simply because someone has used digital tools to perpetrate the act. Child pornography, for example, is no less illegal if it is disseminated over the Internet rather than in photographs or magazines. There is a big difference, however, between punishing illegal acts committed over the Internet and government control of its management and operation. Refraining from regulating the underpinning of the Internet has allowed it to evolve quickly to meet the diverse needs of users around the world and to keep governmental or non-governmental actors from controlling the design of the network or the content it carries.

Buttressed by the unanimous passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 50, the United States and 54 other countries left Dubai without signing the treaty. Unfortunately, 89 nations did sign. The revised ITRs will be implemented by those nations, and that begins in January of 2015. Now, a number of upcoming conferences will present additional opportunities for countries to pursue international regulation of the Internet, including the World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum in Geneva, which starts today, and the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference in Busan, South Korea, in 2014.

The growing threat of such regulation prompted the subcommittee of which I chair, the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, to hold a joint hearing earlier this year with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Just as international opponents of an unregulated Internet are redoubling their efforts, so must we. That is why the hearing we held focused on draft legislation elevating the language of last year's resolution from a mere sense of Congress aimed at particular treaty negotiations to a generalized statement of U.S. law.

I want to thank Foreign Affairs Chairman ED ROYCE; Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations Subcommittee Chairman CHRIS SMITH; and Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade Subcommittee Chairman TED POE for their leadership and their help in calling attention to this important legislation and the issue broadly.

I also want to address the elephant in the room, if you will: the FCC's network neutrality regulations. As the legislation we consider today was moving through the subcommittee and then the full committee, some of my colleagues expressed concern that transforming the exact language of last year's unanimous resolution into law would somehow interfere with the FCC's network neutrality rules. In particular, they saw a conflict with the language in making it U.S. policy ''to promote a global Internet free from government control.''

Let me be clear: while I oppose the FCC's rules regulating the Internet, this legislation does not address those regulations. While statements of policy can help delineate the contours of statutory authority, they don't create statutorily mandated responsibilities. Nonetheless, in the interest of reaching bipartisan consensus and moving this important legislation forward, I agreed to drop the ''government control'' language. The result is the language you see today in H.R. 1580, which I introduced with Ranking Member ESHOO. This bill would make it U.S. policy ''to preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model that governs the Internet.''

Passing H.R. 1580 will show we are united against efforts by authoritarian nations to exert their grip on the Internet. For the sake of the Internet and the social and economic freedoms that it brings, I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

To my colleague and my chair on the subcommittee, thank you for your fine leadership and for your leadership on this legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 1580. As my colleague mentioned, it is a bill to affirm the policy of the United States to preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model that governs the Internet. It has worked. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. The Internet has been a unique and powerful driver of social and economic progress, and it is changing nearly every part of the American economy and society, everything from education to health care delivery to agriculture.

This is especially true for rural communities, where communications technology can have an even greater impact in areas where populations are small and distances are vast. The Internet enables connections from even the most far-flung corners of our country to people, goods, and services around the globe, allowing rural America to compete just as effectively in the 21st century digital economy.

A critical element of the Internet's success story has been the open manner in which the Internet is governed. Rather than relying on centralized control by governments, the Internet instead adopts a multi-stakeholder model in which all who have an interest can have a voice in the Internet's operation. Lately, however, the multi-stakeholder model towards Internet governance has been under assault on the global stage.

At the World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai last December, as my colleague mentioned, the International Telecommunication Union adopted several proposals that could fundamentally alter the way the Internet operates. These proposals undermine the successful decentralized approach to Internet governance and impose a government-controlled management regime, thereby threatening citizens' access to content and information via the Internet as well as the global free flow of information online.

I am pleased that Congress unanimously passed a resolution last year urging the administration to preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model. That's what governs the Internet today. That's what we want to govern the Internet tomorrow. I applaud the decision by the U.S. delegation not to sign that final treaty, but efforts to bring the Internet under the control of international regulatory bodies continues. This week, member-states of the International Telecommunication Union will meet again in Geneva to debate issues surrounding global Internet governance. The passage of H.R. 1580 will be timely in, once again, demonstrating the unwavering support of our Congress of the multi-stakeholder Internet governance model.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON, and I want to thank Chairman WALDEN, and their staff, for working with us on the Democratic side to address the concerns. Ranking Member WAXMAN and Ranking Member ESHOO raised these concerns during the bill's markup in the Energy and Commerce Committee. We worked it out.

Mr. WALDEN, thank you.

I appreciate the modifications made to the bill, which make it clear that this policy statement will not implicate the legitimate activities of the U.S. Government online or the authorities of Federal agencies. Because of these changes, Democrats and Republicans in Congress once again stand united with the administration in its efforts to resist proposals that would undermine the existing multi-stakeholder approach.

I join my colleague Mr. WALDEN in urging my colleagues on the Democratic side to vote for this bill so we can once again demonstrate that there is support across the entire political spectrum for continuing the multi-stakeholder model that allows the Internet to thrive, which is for the benefit of every American and citizens around the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. In closing, Mr. Speaker, freedom of the Internet is as essential as America's long held constitutional belief in freedom of the press, and we don't need governments—ours or others—infringing on how the Internet is managed and governed, nor in terms of maintaining the freedom of the press.

So, with that, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1580, which reaffirms current policy to preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model that governs the Internet, which is so very critical to our economic and social well-being.

In June 2011, the thirty-four member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, business representatives, and technical experts agreed on principles that included a commitment to promote the open, distributed and interconnected nature of the Internet. The 34 OECD members range from the United States to France to South Korea to Mexico.

This landmark OECD communiqué recognized the importance of the multi-stakeholder approach, stating that ''The Internet's openness to new devices, applications and services has played an important role in its success in fostering innovation, creativity and economic growth.'' That's right.

Yet somehow the United Nations missed the memo. In December 2012, the U.N.'s International Telecommunications Union—a government-only membership body—took a vote on a binding global treaty that would establish the ITU as the forum for Internet standard setting. Despite U.S. opposition, 89 of 144 countries voted for the revised International Telecommunications Regulations. They included China, Cuba, Russia and other countries hostile to political freedom.

In a UN system where each country has one vote—no matter how undemocratic—this UN overreach could shift the idea of Internet governance from what is best for netizens to what is best for a group of governments. There is no need for a UN Internet treaty. The Internet is flourishing in the current multi-stakeholder framework just fine.

In addition, there are serious concerns around the lack of transparency and inclusivity of the UN's ITU process. The Internet has transformed our ability to access and share information—surely Internet policy should not be developed behind the closed doors of the UN.

The U.S. State Department, Commerce Department, business community and civil society leaders must step up their outreach. We must clearly explain the huge economic and social benefits that are derived from the Internet and the policy framework that is needed to maximize those benefits. Going forward, a concerted effort must be made to turn around as many as possible of the 89 votes for the International Telecommunications Regulations.

Congress is unified in our support of an open Internet—we recognize the importance of the Internet to our economy and society. We recognize the threat of proposed international control of the Internet. It is now time to rally the international community against this dangerous policy.

I want to thank Chairman WALDEN for his work on H.R. 1580 and want to recognize the excellent cooperation between the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Foreign Affairs committee on Internet governance. Our committees held a joint hearing in February entitled ''Fighting for Internet Freedom: Dubai and Beyond.'' We will continue to coordinate. And we will certainly continue to fight for Internet Freedom.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, as the World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (WTPF) begins in Geneva, Switzerland today, it's fitting that the House is considering legislation that affirms the support of the United States for the multi-stakeholder process of global Internet governance.

As we've debated before the Communications and Technology Subcommittee time and time again, H.R. 1580 is not about our views on domestic Internet policy. The legality of the FCC's 2010 Open Internet Order will be decided by the Courts. H.R. 1580 is about ensuring that this week and at future conferences, the International community knows that the U.S. Congress stands behind the multi-stakeholder process and the importance of a free and open Internet.

The Internet continues to advance rapidly and with this growth, billions around the world will experience the innovation, openness and transparency that have enabled the Internet to flourish. I thank Chairman WALDEN for bringing this legislation to the floor in a bipartisan manner and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1580.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to support H.R. 1580, a bill to affirm the policy of the United States to preserve and advance the successful multistakeholder model that governs the Internet.

Democrats and Republicans in Congress and the Administration have been united in our support for a global open Internet governed from the bottom up. We worked together last Congress on a bipartisan, bicameral basis to express our support for that successful approach to Internet governance.

On some domestic issues, I have strong differences with the majority over Internet policy. One example is my support for a domestic Internet policy that prevents Internet service providers from acting as ''gatekeepers'' that control what American citizens can do online. But those differences appropriately stop at the water's edge.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman WALDEN for listening to the concerns we had about the initial draft of this bill. They worked with me and other Committee Democrats to address those issues by removing certain language from the draft and assuring us that the legislation is in no way intended to direct domestic Internet policy. With these changes and the assurances of my colleagues, I am pleased that we stand together on a bipartisan basis in support of our diplomats and the multistakeholder model for global Internet governance.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure so we can send a strong, united signal to the global community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1580.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WALDEN. 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 motion will be postponed.

□ 1730

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 10

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on June 9, 2013, to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support, Mr. Speaker, of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall on June 9 to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha, a legendary figure in Hawaiian history and culture.

On June 11, the people of Hawaii will celebrate the 97th annual Kamehameha Day commemorating the life of Kamehameha the Great, who between 1795 and 1810 unified the islands into the Kingdom of Hawaii.

Known for being a fierce warrior who fought for unity and independence, King Kamehameha was highly regarded for ruling with fairness and compassion. He's remembered for his law

known as the ''law of the splintered paddle,'' which specifically protects civilians in wartime. It is a model for human rights throughout the world today.

The statue of King Kamehameha, prominently displayed in Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center, was added to the National Statuary Hall collection by Hawaii in 1969.

Every year, as part of the King Kamehameha celebration, the statue is draped in long beautiful strands of lei. In adopting the resolution, Mr. Speaker, we will authorize the use of this space for the celebration of his life and great accomplishments.

I certainly want to thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii, Ms. HIRONO, for introducing this concurrent resolution; and I certainly would urge my colleagues to support it, as well.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member BRADY for allowing this bill to be heard on the floor today.

As was stated, the Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 would permit use of Emancipation Hall to allow us to celebrate King Kamehameha and the lei-draping ceremony.

King Kamehameha has a unique history; and, as you know, Hawaii is the only kingdom that is part of the United States. This is going to be the 44th time such a celebration has taken place in the United States Capitol.

June 11 is a State holiday in Hawaii, a day of celebration honoring King Kamehameha. He was believed to have been born around 1758 and is credited with unifying the major islands by the year 1810. By uniting the Hawaiian Islands, King Kamehameha secured Hawaii's future as a viable and recognized political entity.

King Kamehameha was the first in a long line of Hawaiian—what we call ''ali'i,'' which is our royalty—who held the needs and well-being of their people as their foremost priority. Kamehameha's legacy and commitment to Hawaii's people is evident today through organizations created by his prodigy, like Kamehameha Schools, the Queen Lili'uokalani Children's Trust, Lunalilo Home, and the Queen's Hospital. These organizations are the bedrock foundations in Hawaii and provide crucial services to native Hawaiians while ensuring the maintenance of our State's uniquely Hawaiian identity.

The Hawaiian lei that we'll be draping is a special bond, or relationship, between two people that is figuratively represented by the stringing of flowers together in a circle. The Kamehameha lei-draping ceremony emphasizes the strong bond Hawaii's people have with each other and our State's rich history.

Honoring King Kamehameha in this lei-draping ceremony acknowledges our deep appreciation for his sacrifice and success in unifying our island home and reaffirms our connections with one another and the responsibility we all share to care for one another.

The significance of holding this ceremony in the Capitol of the United States cannot be overemphasized as it demonstrates to the Nation and the world that the rights and needs of the people should always be at the heart of the work that we do here. This is the legacy of King Kamehameha and his prodigy, and we should honor that by approving this event.

The celebration of King Kamehameha has been honored for over 140 years in Hawaii. It was first recognized in 1871, when Hawaii was still a kingdom, by Kamehameha V, his great-grandson. It was the first holiday proclaimed by the Governor and legislature when Hawaii became a State in 1959.

The statue of King Kamehameha and the traditional lei draping is over 100 years old itself. In Hawaii, the lei-draping ceremony is celebrated as a 2-day festivity in tribute to the great King. We celebrate it with parades, hula, music, chanting, storytelling, and arts. It is the way for Hawaiians to celebrate our history.

The American sculptor, Thomas Gould, was commissioned by the Kingdom of Hawaii to create the statue. It was sculpted in 1879 from his studio in Rome. It was completed in 1880, but the ship that was transporting the original from Germany sank. In 1883, the second statue made its way to Hawaii. The first statue was ultimately recovered and erected on North Kohala on the Big Island, and that is where King Kamehameha's birthplace is.

The statue stands 8½ feet tall with the King in his royal clothing. In it, King Kamehameha wears a mahiole, which is the helmet, and the 'ahu 'ula, which is the cloak. They are finished with gold leaf, reminiscent of the rare yellow feathers from the mamo bird the King wore. The spear in his left hand is the symbol of his kingdom and the fact that he is willing to defend it himself, and his right hand is extended towards the direction of the Hawaiian Islands.

The statue in Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is a mold of the second statue which stands in front of our Ali'iolani Hale, the home of the Hawaii Supreme Court. This was dedicated as a gift to the National Statuary Hall from Hawaii in the year 1969.

As everyone knows, President Obama was born in Hawaii. And on June 20, 2010, President Obama issued Proclamation 8534 in honor of the bicentennial of the unification of Hawaii.

President Obama said:

> On this bicentennial King Kamehameha Day, we celebrate the history and the heritage of the Aloha State, which has immeasurably enriched our national life and culture. The Hawaiian narrative is one of both profound triumph and, sadly, deep injustice. It is the story of native Hawaiians oppressed by crippling disease, aborted treaties and the eventual conquest of their sovereign kingdom. These grim milestones remind us of an unjust time in our history, as well as the many pitfalls in our Nation's long and difficult journey to perfect itself. Yet through the peaks and valleys of our American story, Hawaii's steadfast sense of community and mutual support shows the progress that results when we are united in the spirit of limitless possibility.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this celebration means to us. It is a symbol of how the Hawaiian people have the spirit of limitless possibility.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

□ 1740

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Hawaii for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, which authorizes the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

On June 11 of every year, the State of Hawaii celebrates King Kamehameha Day. It's a beautiful State holiday, filled with parades and lei draping at the statues that exist in his honor. One of these statues stands proudly here in Washington, D.C., in the Capitol Visitor Center; and for the last 43 years, we have celebrated King Kamehameha's birthday in our Nation's capital.

Kamehameha I, sometimes called Kamehameha the Great, was a skilled and fierce warrior and an intelligent leader. He established his dynasty and reputation by uniting the eight major islands of the Hawaiian chain under his rule in 1910. By uniting the Hawaiian Islands into a viable and recognized political entity, Kamehameha helped protect his people during a time of great cultural change.

King Kamehameha I is known for his prowess in war, but he is also remembered for his humanity.

We honor King Kamehameha on his birthday, and we welcome visitors both to Hawaii and here to our Nation's Capitol, and appreciate the opportunity to tell a little bit about one of our great heroes.

His Kānawāi Māmalahoe, or Law of the on in the Hawaii State Constitution and is a model for human rights policies on civilians and other non-combatants today. When attacked by fishermen trying to protect their land and family, rather than punishing them, King Kamehameha declared, ''Let every elderly person, woman and child lie by the roadside in safety.'' This decree lives on in Hawaii and is a living symbol of this ruler's concern for public safety.

After uniting the islands, Kamehameha also focused on governing his kingdom. He appointed governors for each island, made laws for the protection of all, built houses and irrigation ditches, managed natural resources such as sandalwood, and traded shrewdly with foreigners. Otto Von Kotzebue, a Russian explorer, said, ''The king is a man of great wisdom and tries to give his people anything he considers useful. He wishes to increase the happiness and not the wants of his people.''

I ask my colleagues for their support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 so that we can honor one of Hawaii's great leaders.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly urge all of my colleagues to support this very bipartisan legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, a resolution that would authorize the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha in the annual Kamehameha Day Lei Draping Ceremony. I thank Senator MAZIE HIRONO for sponsoring this resolution, and I thank my fellow members of Congress who join me in support of this important resolution.

Kamehameha the Great was one of the greatest Polynesian warrior-kings who ever lived. As a young man, Kamehameha was trained by one of the greatest warrior chiefs of his time, Kekuhaupi'o. He was knowledgeable of military tactics and was fearless in armed combat, and he was determined to bring all of the Hawaiian Islands under his rule, a monumental task that took him about ten years to achieve.

Kamehameha, also seen as a great leader by his Pacific neighbors—including the Samoan islands—developed political alliances to maintain Hawaiian independence under his rule.

Along with being a bold leader and skilled warrior, Kamehameha was a humanitarian with a heart for the people of Hawai'i. He is also remembered for the Kanawai Mamalahoe, the "Law of Splintered Paddle", which ensured that during times of battle, every man, woman, and child would be able to travel freely and in peace, with the right "to lie down to sleep by the roadside without fear of harm. . ." This law, which was later preserved in Hawai'i's State Constitution, has become a model of human rights law.

Since 1872, every June 11th in Hawai'i is honored as Kamehameha Day. It is tradition that the three statues of King Kamehameha placed at Ali'iolani Hale in downtown Honolulu, at King Kamehameha's home island, the Big Island of Hawai'i, and lastly at the United States Capitol in the Capitol Visitor Center, are draped with long strands of flower garlands, or leis, every Kamehameha Day in his honor.

This year, the Capitol Visitor Center will welcome guests from across the nation as we gather once again to celebrate the life and accomplishments of a revered leader and today I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to honor Kamehameha the Great.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 10.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. 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 motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 180, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1580, by the yeas and nays;

S. Con. Res. 10, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NATIONAL BLUE ALERT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 180) to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—406

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
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
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock

Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—2

Amash
Massie

NOT VOTING—24

Barletta
Butterfield
Campbell
Clarke
Clyburn
Cooper
Culberson
Ellmers
Garcia
Gosar
Grijalva
Hinojosa
Jeffries
Kingston
Lynch
Markey
Moran
Perlmutter
Quigley
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sewell (AL)
Tonko
Waters

□ 1852

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 144. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, I was absent because of travel delays. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 144 for the National Blue Alert Act, I was unavoidably detained. I would have voted "aye."

POLICY REGARDING INTERNET GOVERNANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1580) to affirm the policy of the United States regarding Internet governance, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—413

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
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
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Bentivolio
Butterfield
Campbell
Clyburn
Cooper
Culberson
Ellmers
Gosar
Grijalva
Hinojosa
Jeffries
Kingston
Lynch
Markey
McHenry
Moran
Perlmutter
Quigley
Rohrabacher

□ 1900

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 145 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—411

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
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
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—21

Becerra
Butterfield
Campbell
Clyburn
Cooper
Culberson
Ellison
Ellmers
Gosar
Grijalva
Hinojosa
Kingston
Lynch
Markey
Moran
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Quigley
Rohrabacher
Scott, David
Welch

□ 1907

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 676

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 676.

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

There was no objection.

REPEALING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. JOYCE. I rise in support of repealing the Affordable Care Act and preventing Ohioans from having to deal with higher health costs, $1.1 trillion in tax hikes, and more government intrusion in their health care. As we near the full implementation of the health care law, it seems as though every day we receive more evidence that this law will increase health costs for ordinary Ohioans, place an enormous burden on Ohio small businesses owners—making it harder for those businesses to hire new workers—and insert more big government in between Ohioans and their doctors.

My district in northeastern Ohio is home to several medical device manufacturing companies which will be especially hurt by the health care law's onerous medical device tax. It's crucial we repeal this law and replace it with commonsense health care legislation. Jobs and affordable health care are at stake.

HONORING ''BREAKAWAY FOR CANCER'' CHAMPION VIRGINIA ''DEE'' WILLIAMS OF LIVERMORE

(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, I rise to honor the amazing Virginia ''Dee'' Williams of Livermore, California, a 12-year survivor of breast cancer who will be honored this Saturday as part of Amgen's ''Breakaway From Cancer'' initiative at the Amgen Tour of California.

Dee was chosen as a ''Breakaway From Cancer'' champion because of the profound difference that she has made in the lives of cancer patients within our community. Dee is a ''call back'' volunteer who talks to cancer patients to determine if their needs are being met while undergoing chemotherapy or radiation. She also spends time talking with recently diagnosed breast cancer patients to help relieve their concerns as they're going through this journey.

As one of the Walnut Creek American Cancer Society ''Look Good, Feel Better'' coordinators for Livermore and Pleasanton, Dee teaches women who are undergoing chemotherapy or radiation how to pick out, take care of, and wear wigs, as well as teaching make-up techniques.

Dee has survived cancer and is still dealing with fibromyalgia and arthritis and battling a neurological disorder, but she has not let any of that slow her down one bit. She is truly an inspiration, and Livermore is lucky to have her, and I am lucky to represent her in the United States Congress. I look forward to seeing her this weekend on the Amgen Tour.

IRS, DOJ, BENGHAZI—AMERICANS DESERVE ANSWERS

(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, at a 2009 college commencement address, President Obama joked he could use the Internal Revenue Service to target political enemies, but, of course, he never would.

Well, today, it appears that officials at the Internal Revenue Service had the last laugh. On Friday, the IRS admitted to the political profiling of conservative groups and that senior-level officials were aware of these actions as far back as 2011.

This, on top of new revelations in the ongoing Benghazi terrorist attack investigation, one could say it's been a bad week for the White House. But it doesn't stop there. Yesterday, it was reported the Justice Department used a secret subpoena to obtain 2 months of phone records for Associated Press reporters and editors without notifying the news organization.

It has been a bad week for the White House, Mr. Speaker, but an even worse week for the Constitution, which is no laughing matter. The American people deserve answers from the White House concerning these abuses. The constitutional protections of free Americans and a free press—the foundations of our democracy—are at stake.

BENGHAZI

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are trying to tar anyone in sight with Benghazi. Next they're going for the former Joint Chief of Staff and a former Ambassador who did the investigation. But their investigation mandate was not talking points. It was:

> Whether the attacks were security related; whether security systems and procedures were adequate and implemented properly.

They have found that they most definitely were not, resulting in four tragic deaths. Talking points say a lot about bureaucratic in-fighting. We have yet to get to the real investigation of the causes and most especially how to prevent another Benghazi. That is our mission. Let's get to it this week.

STATE SECRETS VS. FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

(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, when I went to the Soviet Union in the 1980s, the Communist leaders told me that they believed in and had a free press and they also had free speech. However, I also learned that Soviet law prohibited these freedoms when they jeopardized state secrets—or national security, as we call it in America. The state-secret provision was so broad the Soviet press and speech were gagged and shackled. They certainly were not free.

Now we learn that our Department of Justice improperly seized without notice phone records of over 100 Associated Press journalists—all in the name of national security concerns.

To me, this is a clear violation of the spirit and letter of the First Amendment. These actions border on the Soviet method of legalizing these freedoms but never allowing them. So it's time to revisit U.S. law and require in all cases judicial review where these types of records are seized.

We cannot allow our government to arbitrarily abolish the First Amendment in the name of ''state secrets.''

And that's just the way it is.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring further attention to the fact that unless Congress takes definitive action, student loan interest rates will double on July 1. With that in mind, I proudly support H.R. 1595, introduced by Congressman JOE COURTNEY, and other bills that would keep student interest rates frozen at their reasonable rates for the next 2 years.

Right now, college tuition is spiraling beyond what many students and their families can afford. In many instances, students are being forced to leave school because they are accruing so much debt. At UC-San Diego or the University of San Diego or Point Loma Nazarene, all of which are in my district, students are relying on us to keep loan rates low.

My own education was made possible by student loans and work-study, and we must ensure that today's generation of students has the same opportunity to attend college that I and so many of us had. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 1595.

THE BUCK STOPS HERE

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Well, we once had a political party known as the Know-Nothings. We now have a President who wants us to believe that he knows nothing. He wants us to believe that he knows nothing about who decided to blame the terrorist attacks in Benghazi on a video. He wants us to believe that he knew nothing about the IRS scandal until he read the same press reports that you and I have read. He wants us to believe that he knows nothing about the Department of Justice subpoenaing 2 months of the Associated Press' phone records.

What has happened to the days in America when Democratic President Harry Truman proudly placed a placard on his desk that said: ''The buck stops here''? Perhaps, sadly, we have returned to the days where the question to the President of the United States ought to be: What did you know and when did you know it?

□ 1920

LIMITING CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Today I joined JIM BRIDENSTINE in filing a bipartisan constitutional amendment that would allow Congress to decide whether and how to limit the terms of its Members. Our measure would not prescribe the number of terms a Member would serve; but by giving Congress the power to ultimately decide, I believe it will foster a productive conversation about how to make Congress more responsive to the needs of the American public.

Many in our country feel that Congress is focused on reelection to the exclusion of solving our country's problems. They are rightly concerned about the enormous powers of incumbency and the corrupting influence of money as well as the uncompetitive, gerrymandered districts where the Representative chooses his constituency and not the other way around.

We owe our constituents institutional reforms that address these concerns. Enacting comprehensive campaign finance reform, fixing the congressional redistricting process, and moving forward with sensible term limits can improve how Congress works.

I urge all my colleagues to join in this reform agenda.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to those men and women who have answered the call of duty to serve their community, to those who place their lives on the line each and every day for their neighbors. This week we celebrate National Police Week, and I want to thank the police officers in my community who exemplify what it means to ''serve and protect.''

Minnesota is proud to be home to some of the most dedicated and professional police departments in the country. I have the distinct honor to meet regularly with local police officers and leaders during my law enforcement roundtables, and I can tell you we are privileged to have such committed officers patrolling our streets.

I want to especially recognize the officers that are currently aiding in the search for Mandy Matula, an Eden Prairie woman who has been missing. I pray for her swift return. And thank you to the law enforcement, also, for whose perseverance recently brought closure to the families of Danielle Jelinek and Kira Steger Trevino, who were victims of domestic violence.

Mr. Speaker, as we go about our busy lives, let's take time this week to

thank the police officers in our communities and keep the memory of those who've lost their lives in our thoughts and prayers.

YOUNG PEOPLE IN MEMPHIS CHOOSING OCCUPATIONS THAT HELP OTHERS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, there was a recent survey of about 9,000 outstanding high school and college students and graduates asking them where they would like to work. They had 200 companies that were all in the Fortune magazine list of top companies. I'm proud of that group of students from ages 15 to 27. Their number one choice was St. Jude Children's Hospital in Memphis, Tennessee. It speaks well of that group of young people that they want to work to help others and to find a cure for cancer—and to work at St. Jude, which is such a wonderful institution in my home city of Memphis.

Eight of the 25 sites that were selected by these young people were in the health care field. I think it's admirable and commendable that so many young people want to help others and do it through efforts in the health care industry, not necessarily in ways to enrich themselves.

I'm proud that they chose St. Jude, and it wasn't just because of the Grizzlies.

IRS TALKERS

(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, it is humbling for me every single day to walk onto this House floor knowing that I represent the former district held by Abraham Lincoln in central Illinois. In 1863, during his Gettysburg Address, President Lincoln spoke of our democracy by saying that it is ''a government of the people, by the people, for the people.'' Yet what we have seen over the last 48 hours is nothing close to a government for the people.

Does a government of the people target specific groups of individuals, especially groups that oppose the President's viewpoints? Does a government by the people obtain the phone records of reporters in what appears to be a violation of First Amendment rights? And does a government for the people refuse to accept responsibility and instead place blame wherever they can? The answer, of course, is no.

Public trust in government is at an all-time low, and partisan actions by this administration will continue the deterioration of that trust. We have been called to Washington by our constituents to work together in a bipartisan fashion for the best interests of our country. So I ask that we put politics aside, Mr. Speaker, lead by example, and work together to keep the trust of the American public.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT FIXES

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about commonsense actions we must take to fix the health care law. I wasn't in Congress in March of 2010 and I didn't vote for the Affordable Care Act, but I'm here today to ensure that it meets the needs of small businesses and middle class families.

That's why I've spent a lot of time listening to small business owners and staff, to seniors, and to hospital employees and physicians in Arizona about their concerns. That is why I have cosponsored legislation to repeal the medical device tax, the annual tax on health insurance, and the Independent Payment Advisory Board. These actions will protect families and small businesses from premium hikes, and protect access to health care for seniors and all Americans. This is why I'm working with the citizens of Green Valley in my district to keep health care affordable by protecting the tax deduction for medical expenses.

These are but a few examples of how we can come together to fix this law. I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find additional ways to do so.

MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, sexual assault in the military has reached a crisis point. A recent report from the Department of Defense found that the number of servicemembers who have experienced unwanted sexual contact has increased by more than 30 percent over the past 2 years, from 19,000 to 26,000 people.

These numbers are staggering, but they're more than just statistics. Behind every number is the story of a member of our armed services who stepped forward to serve our country. They're people like my constituent, Judy Atwood-Bell, a Hudson, New Hampshire, resident who enlisted in the Army at age 17 to further her education and live the American Dream. At 19, Judy was raped by a fellow soldier and suffered sexual harassment in silence throughout her career. After 20 years of service, she sought help and was eventually diagnosed with PTSD related to military sexual trauma.

Our military leadership, the chain of command, and the Veterans Administration failed to protect Judy and thousands of victims like her who suffered from sexual assault. We owe it to Judy and every other survivor to come together in a bipartisan manner to confront this epidemic head on.

REPUBLICAN FRESHMAN CLASS ON THE NEED TO REPEAL OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for another in a series of Republican freshman class Special Orders, this time to focus on the need to repeal ObamaCare in a vote in this Chamber later this week.

The President and many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle proudly refer to this health care law as ''ObamaCare,'' but we should neither be proud of the process that led us to this point nor the resulting policy mess.

The 2,800-page bill was crafted behind closed doors and rushed through Congress in 2010 with limited debate and without amendments. The predictable result is a flawed product that expands the Federal Government's role in health care, raises taxes on employers, and mandates benefits that will increase health care costs for most. Remarkably, there already have been more than 20,000 pages of regulations issued regarding this bill's implementation.

□ 1930

I would like to start by recognizing my distinguished colleague, the gentlelady from Missouri, for her remarks on this important issue.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding and for organizing these Special Orders this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 45, a bill that will repeal the President's devastating health care reform law, commonly referred to as ObamaCare. When promoting the health care reform legislation to the American public, the President and members of his party told people that if you liked your health insurance then you could keep it, that the penalty Americans have to pay under the individual mandate was not a tax, and that those with preexisting conditions would have access to health care. Well, as many of us suspected then, these claims were nothing more than blatant lies.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office recently said that 7 million people will lose their job-based health insurance due to ObamaCare. The Supreme Court has affirmed what we already

knew: that ObamaCare penalties are, indeed, taxes, and on February 15 the Obama administration announced they would not cover over 40,000 patients suffering from preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, friends, this should not happen in America. We need to repeal this law, and we need to do it now. Today, though not fully implemented, ObamaCare has already had many destructive effects on the American people—real people with bills to pay, mouths to feed, and jobs to do.

Since ObamaCare was signed into law, many of the new taxes in the President's $1 trillion tax hike have gone into effect, most of which target the middle class, increase the cost of health care, and stifle job creation.

The law continues to take its toll on small business. I hear from mom and pop operations throughout the St. Louis region that are not hiring needed workers or reducing full-time employees to part-time workers, for the sole purpose of being able to keep their doors open as a consequence of the new ObamaCare regulations.

The impact on jobs already is unmistakable. ObamaCare promised 4 million jobs, including 400,000 almost immediately. Yet we know the truth: that ObamaCare is destroying jobs and costing the American Dream for millions of Americans.

Just today, a Missouri hospital announced that it was eliminating 129 good-paying jobs. The reason? ObamaCare.

These are facts, these are real jobs, and this law is hurting real people.

It continues.

Premium costs continue to rise on hardworking families across the country. Premiums for the average family have already grown by $3,000 since 2008, despite promises by the Obama administration that ObamaCare would decrease premiums $2,500.

Premium costs are expected to double, triple, and even quadruple for millions of Americans when many of the provisions of the law go into effect next year. The greatest effect will be on young people in this country, who are already struggling to find jobs, pay off student loans, and grow healthy, prosperous families. These young people will be stuck between paying for insurance they cannot afford and being subject to a burdensome tax.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by addressing the shameful raiding of Medicare by this irresponsible law called ObamaCare. Despite promises to the contrary, ObamaCare has gutted Medicare to the tune of $716 billion—nearly three-quarters of a trillion dollars—stolen from our Greatest Generation to pay for this devastating law.

Every day, more and more doctors are refusing to see Medicare patients because they simply cannot afford to do so. Is this how we pay back our seniors—with reduced benefits, reduced access to health care, and reduced respect for their quality of life? We owe them more. We owe the American people more.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are clear: this law is wrong for America and needs to be repealed immediately before any more of its harmful provisions are implemented.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for her remarks.

Many of the promises that were made to justify ObamaCare's enactment have been broken. The results of these broken promises are hurting hardworking American families, workers, and businesses today, and will hurt them even more in the future, which is why House Republicans will be voting to repeal this government takeover of health care later this week. Through the course of the Special Order, we will look at some of those broken promises.

I would next like to recognize my good friend, my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join a chorus of individuals who are calling for the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, it's not even affordable. The CBO says it will cost $1.8 trillion just to employ. Blue Cross/Blue Shield in North Carolina says the premiums are going to go up 284 percent. We can't afford this. Seven million people won't be able to keep their own policies. There's no risk pool now, no funding for it, no provision. Even Democrat Senator MAX BAUCUS, Finance Committee chairman, says this is a train wreck getting ready to happen.

Mr. Speaker, last January, I sponsored a seminar in my district that brought together 400 business leaders. The purpose of this seminar was to explain ObamaCare. We had the Cato Institute and the AARP there. Mr. Speaker, what they heard was a resounding, What in the world have we done? They were so concerned about what ObamaCare was going to do to their own businesses, they were afraid to hire people, and they thought they would let people go.

Do you know what they saw, Mr. Speaker? This chart right here. This chart—what a quagmire to process through to try to get real health care. It can't be done. We can do better.

That's why with Congressman HUDSON I've introduced a bill called Auto Enroll. This is a little provision put in the health care law, one of those provisions that I believe Speaker PELOSI said we are going to read it after we vote on it, we are going to learn about it then.

Well, we've learned about it. What did we learn? That the companies have to automatically put people on their health care plan. And this bill says, no, you can opt out, you don't have to comply.

Students who are already on their parents' health care, they shouldn't have to do this. You have temporary people who are working during seasonal work time in major retail or in restaurants. They shouldn't have to be on this, yet they're required to. This bill will allow some flexibility for employers.

The American people were told, We are going to provide you a champion thoroughbred horse who is going to go win the Kentucky Derby. Do you know what they got, Mr. Speaker? They got a maimed, blind, deaf, crippled horse that can't even make its way around the track. That's what we have with ObamaCare.

We are going to do better. We are going to provide for the American people at the right time, and we can do this in competitive markets. They can cross State lines, hundreds of companies competing, drawing down the cost of health care. This needs to be done now.

We can get rid of the frivolous lawsuits that are driving the cost of health care up. The American workers, responsible people, hardworking taxpayer Americans, they deserve better, and we are going to do it.

Thank you, and God bless you.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I would next like to recognize my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. MESSER.

I've been blessed to do a lot of fun things in my life, to do a lot of interesting jobs. I was an Air Force pilot for 14 years. That was maybe the funnest thing I've ever done. I was a writer. I've written 15 books. That was very satisfying. But the hardest job, without question the hardest job I've ever done was to be a small business owner.

As a small business owner, you fight every day to make ends meet. You care about your employees. Your employees become your family.

One of the funnest things to do is to hire new people, but one of the hardest things to do, and one of the most, frankly, discouraging things you have to do is when you have to lay people off. But that is exactly what has happened in the business that I owned, that is exactly what is happening now, and that is what is going to continue to happen.

Jobs are being killed by the implementation of ObamaCare. And that's not a statistic. That isn't some government projection. It isn't some estimation from CBO. That is a fact. It is a reality. ObamaCare is killing economic activity. ObamaCare is killing jobs. And it's only going to get worse.

□ 1940

There is a reason that the Democrats—and I'm not talking about the Republicans; I'm talking about Democratic leaders—are calling ObamaCare a train wreck. There is a reason why NANCY PELOSI said, We have to pass this bill before we can find out what's in it.

This is like taking the lid off a garbage can that has been sitting out in the sun too long. The longer it's out there and the more we know about this legislation, the worse it is. 400 percent—that's how much some people's

premiums are going to go up because of the implementation of ObamaCare. The President promised and, in fact, the entire purpose of the Affordable Care Act was to drive premiums down. Instead, we see exactly the opposite—30 percent, 80 percent, 400 percent increases in health care premiums.

All of us Americans have become familiar with new words over the last year or two. We've learned about sequester, and we've heard a lot about the fiscal cliff. The new government phrase of the year is going to be ''rate shock.'' You're going to hear about that all the time beginning this fall because people will be shocked and businesses will be shocked and jobs will be lost and people will be hurt because of the implementation of ObamaCare.

Please, let's take the opportunity to repeal it now. We can do better. We can write something and design something that is better. Let's take the opportunity to do that.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I would quote for you broken promise No. 1 of ObamaCare: ''If you like your current health care plan, you will be able to keep it.''

Not true. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that nearly 7 million people will lose their employer-sponsored health care coverage under ObamaCare.

I would next like to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, Representative COLLINS.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. I want to thank the gentleman for holding this special session tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the American public is often concerned there is not enough agreement in the Halls of Congress. Well, I am pleased to report there is growing agreement among both parties and in both Houses of this Congress that ObamaCare is truly a train wreck, as recently described by Democrat Senator MAX BAUCUS. As this massive piece of legislation is being implemented, the negative impact it is and will have on our economy is becoming clear:

ObamaCare guts the funding for Medicare Advantage to help cover its growing price tag. So, for all those seniors out there, like my 86-year-old mom, who are happy with the coverage they receive through Medicare Advantage, I have news for you: you can't keep your existing plan, as promised, because ObamaCare effectively ends it.

What the administration could not raid from other sources to pay for ObamaCare it makes up in new taxes. Just last week, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Health and Technology, I heard from small business owners and advocates about the impact the health insurance tax will have on the bottom line of America's small businesses. The amount of that tax will be $8 billion in 2014, increasing to $14.3 billion in 2018, and will increase based on premium trends thereafter.

Supporters of ObamaCare will say these fees are supposed to be paid by the health insurance companies; but common sense, substantiated by independent studies, tells you the insurance companies are passing these costs directly on to consumers in the form of higher premiums. To avoid the taxes and fees, companies are cutting jobs, not hiring, and are reducing employee hours to stay under ObamaCare thresholds, all this at a time when national unemployment remains embarrassingly high.

ObamaCare is built on the premise that the young and the healthy will pay to insure the old and the sick. Well, guess what? The young and the healthy are too smart to have their pockets picked. Knowing they can't be denied coverage down the road, the young and the healthy are going to drop out of the insurance market and instead pay the $95 penalty and their out-of-pocket medical expenses. They know this approach will be far, far cheaper in the end than paying thousands of dollars for an individual or a family plan under ObamaCare. It's like not buying collision insurance on your new car because you know you can get it after you've been in a wreck.

When attempting to defend ObamaCare, its supporters like to tout all those ''free'' things that ObamaCare offers the American people. That sales pitch crystallizes what is wrong with ObamaCare and the tax-and-spend policies this town is famous for. Nothing is free in this world. For every free service ObamaCare offers, someone out there in America is paying for it with his hard-earned money; or, worse yet, we'll just add a few more bucks onto our staggering debt to cover this so-called ''free'' service.

This country can't afford ObamaCare figuratively or literally. ObamaCare must be repealed. It needs to be replaced with commonsense, cost-effective ways to improve health care in this country.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I would next like to yield to my good friend, the gentlelady from my home State of Indiana, for her insights as to this important Special Order.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Thank you to the gentleman from Indiana for organizing this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 45, the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

ObamaCare is bad for the young and for the elderly.

I recently received a letter from a high school senior in my district. She noted that her family's out-of-pocket premium costs have risen $7,000 in recent years while their deductible has increased tenfold. She said she is worried about how she is going to pay for health care on her own in the future.

She is right to worry. According to a study published by the American Academy of Actuaries' magazine, 80 percent of Americans under the age of 30 will face premium increases because of ObamaCare.

The costs of ObamaCare are more than monetary. Americans will also have fewer health care choices because of it. Specifically, the Independent Payment Advisory Board will threaten the options available today to Medicare recipients. This board of 15 officials will get to choose which treatments and which procedures Medicare will reimburse and which it will not. What a doctor prescribes or what a patient needs will come second, if at all. The IPAB is unelected and won't report to Members of Congress or to any elected official. The budget for this board is given directly by the executive branch. IPAB doesn't even have to justify its finances to the public.

My friends on the other side of the aisle like to say Republicans want to change Medicare as we know it; but, in fact, it is ObamaCare that is changing Medicare, putting bureaucrats in charge of decisions that should be between senior citizens and their doctors.

Repealing ObamaCare will right this wrong for the young and for our seniors. I urge the adoption of this important bill.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentlelady for her remarks.

I would next like to yield to my good friend from the State of Florida, Representative YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. I would like to thank my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in support of H.R. 45, the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

It's not just the House Republicans who want this or House freshmen who want to repeal this law; it's the American people. The American people don't like this. The people of my district overwhelmingly desire the repeal of this legislative debacle.

Let's face it: in March of 2009, with a Democratic Congress, this bill was passed through in the twilight hours. The Speaker said—and I think we all remember those infamous words—that we have to pass it to see what's in it, that we have to pass it to see how it's going to work.

America deserves better. Americans deserve better, and they demand better.

The Affordable Care Act is the number one job-killing bill in America. When the President speaks of job creation and of stimulating the economy, the 800-pound gorilla in the room that nobody talks about is the Affordable Care Act. It's the number one job-killing bill—bar none. Here are a couple of examples:

I had a person call in today. A young lady, one of my constituents, said that even though she doesn't have insurance, it's because she doesn't have a job; and the reason she doesn't have a job is due to this bill. It's getting in the way of job creation.

□ 1950

Another business owner I know, he's got 350 employees. I asked him how the

effects of this bill were going to affect his business. He said, Let me tell you about this bill. I could expand my business right now and I could add 100 new employees, but I'm not doing anything because of the estimated cost of this bill.

Think about that. That's one man's business in one town in America. How many businesses in America, throughout this country, are not expanding because of this bill and the uncertainty? It's got to stop.

There's a county in our district, Clay County. I was talking to one of the municipal people there that was in charge of the health care. He said that the estimated costs coming up because of the Affordable Care Act were going to cost $15 million. Then they figured out if they didn't comply with the Affordable Care Act what that cost would be. It would be $5 million. What choice do you think they're going to make? They're either going to lay off people or they're not going to cover people. They'll pay the fine.

In my own town in Alachua County, there's a contractor, and he's got 51 employees. He's bidding on a job against another contractor that has 49 employees. The estimated cost to him is $2,000 per employee. So this contractor with the 51 employees is starting at the same line with this guy who has 49 employees, and he's going to owe $102,000 more in his opening bid. I asked him what he was going to do. He said, The most commonsense thing to do is lay off some people so I don't have to pay for that. Again, I hear this story over and over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, it seems the President himself doesn't really like his plan that much either. In spite of all the glowing speeches he gives, the President himself has signed into law repeals of certain ObamaCare provisions on seven different occasions. When the President claimed that his plan would lower the cost of health care for Americans, he left out the fact that about 7 million Americans would just lose their health care altogether.

Estimated insurance costs for the younger generation: they can expect their insurance premiums to increase from what they are today 150 percent to 175 percent. When the President claimed that under his plan no family making less than $250,000 a year would see taxes increase, he completely left out the fact that there are 21 new taxes in this bill; and these are taxes that are on not just the wealthy, but all Americans at all income levels. It's a bad bill, and this is not what America wants.

The whole point of the Affordable Care Act was to create health reform, which implies not just health care, but health prevention. After 3½ years of this bill being out there, the Supreme Court said in reviewing it that it's not health care; it's a health tax. The bottom line is it's going to create people who have less insurance.

Then we have to think about who will collect these taxes: the IRS. That's the very same IRS we found out that's under a criminal investigation today. Americans don't want this.

Americans are a caring, generous, and a charitable people. We will always make sure that the least fortunate among us are cared for. The President's plan doesn't care for the less fortunate. In fact, it makes us all less fortunate. Our vote this week is not about politics; it's about being responsive to the people and adhering to the Constitution.

We represent the people who are being hurt the most by the ObamaCare bill, and we owe it to them to relieve them of this burden. If we truly want to create jobs, the full repeal of ObamaCare is the first step in jump-starting our economy, and I'm proud and thankful to be able to be a part of the process of repealing this legislative disaster and replacing it with a commonsense health care reform.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I thank my colleagues for their stamina and patience.

I would next like to recognize my good friend, the straight-talking Member from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I'd like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for allowing me to speak on this issue on behalf of my constituents. I can say very clearly that I support H.R. 45, ObamaCare repeal, and I can tell you why.

Under ObamaCare, we're looking at a minimum of about $500 billion in new taxes. We're talking about taxes on pharmaceuticals and taxes on medical devices. We're also talking about taxes on payroll, things that have nothing to do with medicine; taxes on the sale of real estate; taxes on other capital gains. There will be 21 new taxes, and $500 billion is the conservative estimate. Some people say it's going to be $1.1 trillion in new tax revenue.

Guess what? It's not enough. There's also going to be $500 billion in new borrowing over the first 10 years of ObamaCare. And it's still not enough. So we're going to rob $716 billion from Medicare at a time when seniors are finding it hard to find providers who are willing to accept Medicare as it is. This is hugely problematic for the people in my district.

Let's talk about the employers. Employers are seeking ways to reduce their staffs below 50 people. They're laying people off. No kidding. I talked to an employer just a few weeks ago in my district. He's got 57 employees. He's now trying to get down to 49. He's also trying to figure out ways to make his staff part-time. He's trying to get his staff under 29 hours so he has less than 50 full-time equivalents, as they refer to them now. This is going to be a disaster for the employment prospects of the people in my district.

Let's talk about how this is administered. It's going to be administered by the IRS. So everyone has to have the health insurance that perfectly conforms to what the President wants them to have. It used to be that there was a time when my wife and I had insurance, where we had a high deductible and a low premium. We had a little bit of savings. We wanted to save money on our premium, and so we were willing to accept the high deductible. We were willing to accept a little bit of risk upon ourselves to save money. That's not available anymore under ObamaCare. All that will be enforced by the IRS.

So if you have that high-deductible, low-premium policy, or if you have a policy that they call a ''Cadillac plan,'' you're going to be penalized. These penalties have been ruled by the Supreme Court to be taxes, but let's be clear that they are penalties for not conforming to what the President wants you to have in insurance.

That penalty, if you don't have the right health insurance, is going to be 2½ percent of your income, eventually. So if you make $50,000 a year, your penalty is $1,250, assessed by the IRS when you do your taxes. Or you could pay the premium. If you want the comprehensive health care that ObamaCare requires you to have, that premium is likely to be around $7,000, or you can pay the penalty of $1,250. What are most people going to pay? They're going to pay the penalty. Why? Because under ObamaCare, they can't exempt you for a preexisting condition. So you can pay the penalty, and then when you get sick you can go to the doctor and get the health insurance you need and then get healthy; and then when you're healthy, you can drop your health insurance again.

This creates an adverse selection. This is a big problem. If you want to see health insurance premiums skyrocket, let's only insure the people who are sick; and that's exactly what this bill does.

Let's talk for a second about the expansion of Medicaid under ObamaCare. I'm very proud of the State of Oklahoma for not expanding Medicaid under ObamaCare. This is a teaser rate. This is a time when the Federal Government comes in and they say, We're going to fully expand your Medicaid expansion up to 138 percent of the poverty line for the first 3 years, then we're going to pull the rug out from under you.

The State of Oklahoma is going to be faced with challenges. What are we going to cut? Maybe we'll cut education, maybe we'll cut the Department of Transportation in the State of Oklahoma, or maybe we'll raise taxes. This is just another way for the Federal Government to addict States to a program that ultimately they're going to pull the rug out from under the program and the State of Oklahoma is going to be forced to carry this load. I'm very proud of Governor Mary Fallin for not expanding Medicaid under ObamaCare.

I'd like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for allowing me to express my views. I fully support H.R. 45, the repeal of ObamaCare.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inquire as to the amount of time we have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has approximately 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. MESSER. Great. We're right on pace.

I would next like to recognize my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for organizing this important discussion with our freshman colleagues.

President Obama made big promises while pushing his health care law through the House and Senate. He promised the American people that it could create jobs, that it could increase access to health care, that it would promote economic growth, that it wouldn't add to the deficit, that it would not raise taxes on the middle class. He promised that if you like your health care plan, you could keep it. He said that it would lower the cost of premiums. He said that it would strengthen Medicare.

□ 2000

Three years later, President Obama's health care law has proven to be a string of empty and broken promises. We are seeing premiums rise. One business in my district that employs 13 workers expects a 26 percent increase in its premiums, totaling more than $30,000. That's $30,000 that cannot go to increasing wages for workers. Another company in my district with 17 employees expects a 19 percent premium increase with an annual cost of more than $20,000. Companies are being forced to change their health plans and pay more for them. Some companies may even drop their plans and put their employees in the ObamaCare exchanges. That means they're not keeping their plans. That's a broken promise.

ObamaCare is also raising taxes on the middle class. The Supreme Court made that clear.

One little known tax in ObamaCare is a medical device tax. This is a tax on the middle class because it is going to be passed directly to the consumers. Pennsylvania has the fourth largest medical device industry in the Nation. The medical device tax threatens health care businesses and innovators, like ZOLL Medical Corporation in my district, that supports 600 good-paying jobs.

ObamaCare does not strengthen Medicare. It cuts $716 billion from the program and creates the Independent Payment Advisory Board, also known as IPAB, which puts unelected bureaucrats in between seniors and their doctors.

President Obama's health care law is causing folks to lose their health plans; it's raising taxes; it's hurting Medicare; it's increasing the deficit; and it won't bring universal coverage. More than 30 million people will still be uninsured in 10 years. The fact remains that 3 years later, President Obama's health care law is a trillion-dollar string of broken promises. It's damaging our families, seniors, hardworking Americans and their health care. It's killing jobs, and it's violating the First Amendment rights of people of faith.

It's a small wonder that even some of the authors of this misguided health care law are now calling it a train wreck. The American people deserve better. This law should be repealed. Then all Members of Congress should sit down and do their jobs to craft commonsense, patient-centered reforms that reduce costs, preserve Medicare, and increase access to all Americans.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would like to talk right now about ObamaCare broken promise number two. The President promised:

> I will not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficits, either now or in the future.

The truth: ObamaCare will end up adding, according to a GAO report, more than $6.2 trillion to the debt over the long run.

I would next like to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentleman from Indiana very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the unaffordable health care act. I'll admit it: I'm standing here because of it. The unaffordable health care act is what made me realize that Washington was out of control and run amuck. It made me realize that the people of this great country needed a voice. Whenever I think of the proceedings that gave us this massive health care law, the words ''we must pass the bill to find out what's in the bill'' ring in my ear. It makes me cringe.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are good people. They passed the bill because their leadership assured them that it was good law. I don't think they purposely wanted to harm the country. We now know what's in the bill, and it's not good. I'm confident that my friends wouldn't have voted in favor of ObamaCare had they known that the bill empowered the IRS to bully people about their health insurance or that the new law created a rationing board to decide who gets treatment and who doesn't. Had the bill been read, I don't think it would have passed.

On top of repealing this law, we must reform how business gets done in the Capitol. That's why I've introduced the Read the Bills Act. The law is easy to understand: before we pass laws which will impact millions of hardworking Americans, Congress must read the bill. This is the kind of bill that will help restore the faith in Congress of those who send us here to represent them. Let's get rid of the notion that we have to pass bills to find out what's in them. Please join me in repealing ObamaCare and supporting the Read the Bills Act.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the good gentleman for his comments.

Next I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

This has been a great time tonight. It is a great time in the sense that we get to stand here and explain to the American people what they were not explained to a few years ago. It's a good time to explain to them what they were sold as being something good and something that was going to help in health care, and remember this bill says ''health care'' in its title. But the truth of the matter is it's not about health care, Mr. Speaker; it's about control. It's about who's going to control health care, who's going to control what our government is getting into and what our government should stay out of.

I fully support voting this week to repeal ObamaCare and moving forward with an agenda that promotes jobs, that creates better opportunities, because you see what is happening tonight, as my good colleagues have stood here: they've talked about the problems with business; they've talked about the problems with taxes; they've talked about the broken promises. My colleague has spoken of the broken promise of keeping your own health care, of it not adding to the debt, all of which are lies, things that are not true that were not talked about on this House floor just a few years ago.

So my problem is let's be honest. Let's talk about what it does do. It begins to make a regulatory framework that is amazing. It wasn't a matter if you read the bill. It didn't matter if you read the bill in 2009 because you wouldn't have known what's in it because at the end of almost every paragraph it would say, oh, by the way, we're going to let this agency promulgate the rules and regulations. You could have read every page and you'd have just known that more bureaucrats were going to tell you what health care was going to be like. Twenty thousand pages of regulations are already on the books, 828 pages in one day. We're paying a lot of folks to do a lot of regulation writing. We're paying a lot of folks to take away the basic rights that we're looking at.

You see, you can make an argument this is not about health care, this is about broadening regulatory authority at HHS and at IRS. Oh, wait, IRS. Any thoughts this week about letting them be the regulators of who's paying and who's not paying in our health care system? Excuse me, we're having trouble dealing with what their job is. We don't need them in health care. We've got bigger problems here.

But when broken promises come about, we have to remember—what has disturbed me the most about this

whole debate tonight is we've heard about businesses; we've heard about taxes; we've heard about some broken promises; but what we've not heard about is health care. We've not really heard about health care in a doctor and patient. As a doctor told me the other day, he said, Just let me practice medicine, which is all I want to do.

You see, it's time we talked about health care because this law, instead of helping those who need help, it kicks them off insurance and makes people pay more and does all of the things that it was promised not to do.

Doctors are getting out, and new doctors are not going in. And you know who's lost? I can see it right now. The picture I have in my mind is those waiting in the waiting room waiting to see a doctor who need health care, and this law simply leaves them waiting.

Let's don't do that. Let's repeal this law. Let's get on with the real business of this House.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. MESSER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

I yield to my good friend from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. I thank my good friend from Indiana, Congressman LUKE MESSER, for organizing this Special Order in preparation for Thursday's vote to repeal the President's health care law.

Earlier today I emailed my constituents a quick survey back home in Montana with one simple question: Do you support efforts to repeal President Obama's health care law?

We've seen already overwhelming response to our office here tonight from Montanans across our State, combined with letters, emails, the phone calls we've received, by three to one, Montanans want to repeal ObamaCare.

□ 2010

Last week I had a tele-townhall meeting so I could hear from the people of Montana about the issues that matter most to them. The last question I was asked at the very end of this hour-long tele-townhall was from a woman from Florence, Montana, a small town on the western side of our State.

She shared her heartfelt concerns about the health care law and how it was going to affect her small business. Between the costly new rules and regulations and rising health insurance premiums, she didn't know how she would be able to follow the law and keep her business afloat.

And these challenges aren't unique to this one small business owner from Montana. Families and small businesses across America are struggling under President Obama's health care overhaul.

Rather than providing real solutions to increase access to affordable care, ObamaCare is driving costs up, it's hurting small businesses, it's raising taxes on Americans by more than $1 trillion over the next decade and, ultimately, puts the government directly between patients and their doctors.

This law also hurts our seniors and their access to health care. The President's health care law took more than $700 billion out of Medicare to pay for new ObamaCare spending, and establishes IPAB, this unaccountable, unelected board of bureaucrats empowered to further undermine seniors' access to medical care.

And following this week's troubling news from the IRS, it makes it very clear that the IRS should not be in charge of enforcing ObamaCare's core provisions. We need to repeal ObamaCare to strip them of this authority.

Furthermore, the President's health care overhaul sets in motion serious violations of America's religious freedoms. Under ObamaCare, the Department of Health and Human Services has mandated health care coverage of products and services to which some Americans are morally opposed. Under this mandate, religious institutions and employers, as well as health care providers who hold religious and moral convictions, are stripped of their religious freedoms.

This is a clear violation of Americans' First Amendment rights, and it is of critical importance that the religious and moral convictions held by many Americans are protected.

That's why I recently joined more than 90 of my colleagues here in the House in calling for the upcoming House appropriations proposals to contain full protections for Americans' religious liberties and conscience rights by including provisions found in the Health Care Conscience Rights Act, which I helped introduce in March.

But we must continue fighting to repeal this failed law in its entirety. We know that our health care system is complex; it has major problems that need to be addressed. But ObamaCare only makes the matters worse.

The President's health care law takes us in the wrong direction. At the end of the day, it will result in higher costs, higher premiums, and force millions of Americans to lose the coverage they currently have.

And let's just remember something from 3 years ago. Remember in March of 2010, when ObamaCare passed the House, there was nothing bipartisan about ObamaCare. There was bipartisan opposition. In fact, 34 Democrats joined 178 Republicans in opposing ObamaCare, but not one single Republican voted for this. There's nothing bipartisan about it, other than bipartisan opposition.

I will vote to repeal this law on Thursday. I will continue to work with my colleagues in support of better, more effective solutions that give Americans the quality, affordable care they deserve.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I'll talk to you briefly about broken promise number three. The President promised that ''coupled with comprehensive reform, our bill could save families $2,500 in the coming years.''

The truth? Just the opposite has happened. The average family premium has grown by more than $3,000 since 2008. In Indiana, residents are expected to face some of the highest health care insurance cost increases in the Nation, amounting to more than 60 percent for many and as high as 100 percent for some.

I next would like to recognize my good colleague, a man who's shown the patience of Job this evening as he's waited with great stamina, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. Thank you to my friend from Evansville, Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for the time.

Mr. Speaker, few things in life are more personal than health care, the care we receive as individuals, the treatment our children receive, the treatment our friends and our loved ones receive.

And beginning next year, Mr. Speaker, the government will dominate this personal arena. Dismantling this failed attempt at health care reform needs to be a priority of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, time and time again I hear from the medical professionals in my district, those who have dedicated their lives to serving others, about the uncertainty ObamaCare is causing them. What regulations and rules are going to come down from HHS and step in between the care that these medical professionals provide their patients?

What treatments will they be able to provide?

How many hoops are they going to have to jump through to get the procedures and tests that their patients need?

How many hoops will they have to go through to get approved?

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare has also harmed small business in all sorts of unimaginable ways. Small businesses are what drive this Nation's economy, through innovation and good old-fashioned sweat equity. They are a testament to what built this country and made it great.

But this law, Mr. Speaker, is causing many of them to make tough decisions, tough decisions about whether they can go out and hire that additional worker or employee; tough decisions on if they can invest in growth as they try to grow their company, and what other long-term impacts ObamaCare is going to have on their business.

Many small businesses are struggling, and this law will only make things worse. We have heard here tonight about employers considering dropping coverage altogether because of the uncertainty.

Providing health care benefits has served as a sense of pride for small business owners, and has always been a means by which small business owners have been able to recruit and retain the best talent. This talent is what

helps them be successful but, unfortunately, under ObamaCare, providing health care is not going to be something that many small businesses do.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Congress repealed the misguided 1099 reporting requirement that was included in ObamaCare. It was there to gin up revenue. In this Congress I'm hopeful we can repeal the medical device tax, and I've cosponsored a bill to do just that, one that enjoys overwhelming bipartisan support, bipartisan support that is similar to the support shared for many of the misguided provisions of ObamaCare and the wish to get in there and repeal them and rein them back in.

Anyone who reads or watches the news knows that the Affordable Care Act, which, Mr. Speaker, probably should have been named the Unaffordable Care Act, as Mr. BENTIVOLIO said earlier this evening, is costing more and more money just to get it up and running. Costs have ballooned, and the law hasn't even been fully implemented yet or nearly implemented yet.

State exchanges are requesting more and more Federal dollars, which has sent the administration scrambling to pull dollars out of the so-called Prevention Fund.

Mr. Speaker, the CBO estimates that ObamaCare may now cost twice as much as originally promised, at a pricetag of $1.88 trillion through 2022.

Mr. Speaker, we haven't even touched on what will, without a doubt, impact individuals and families the most: the cost of their premiums. This is what American families are the most concerned about. Since 2008, families have seen their premiums grow by over $3,000, and the new report by the House Energy and Commerce Committee, based upon actual industry numbers, suggests that rates may go up anywhere from 47 percent to 400 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this law needs to be repealed immediately so patient-oriented reforms can be enacted that protect American jobs and actually deliver on the promise of affordable health care to individuals and families.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I would like to speak briefly about broken ObamaCare promise number four. The President promised ''Under my plan, no family making less than $250,000 a year will see their taxes increase.'' The truth? Taxes have gone up for many, and not just the well-off.

The Joint Committee on Taxation has issued a report detailing 21 new or higher taxes that will cost taxpayers more than $1 trillion. Indiana, which has a medical device industry that employs 20,000 Hoosiers, with a payroll exceeding $1 billion, would be devastated by ObamaCare's $20 billion tax on medical devices.

I would next like to recognize my good friend from Indiana—I appreciate her leadership on this topic—Mrs. WALORSKI.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Thank you to my good friend and my colleague from Indiana, Representative MESSER, for organizing this Special Order tonight.

It has been, Representative MESSER, over 3 years since ObamaCare was signed into law. In a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing, Senator MAX BAUCUS told Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius that he now sees this bill as ''a huge train wreck.'' I couldn't agree more. ObamaCare is a huge train wreck.

A few weeks ago I held roundtable discussions in many of the Chambers of Commerce in my area, in each county in my district. I sat down with a wide spectrum of industries, ranging from agriculture to manufacturing.

□ 2020

The prominent topic of each discussion was ObamaCare and the uncertainty it creates for Hoosier businesses that cannot afford the overwhelming taxes and employer mandates. From longtime small businessowners to aspiring start-up companies, employers agree that ObamaCare is largely responsible for smothering economic development. If the President and Members of Congress were truly listening to the American people's opinion of this law, they would see the writing on the wall: we must repeal ObamaCare.

The State of Indiana is proud to be a global leader in the medical device industry that my colleague just spoke of. However, ObamaCare is forcing a 2.3 percent tax on medical device manufacturing. This tax affects the orthopedic industry, causing rises in costs for seniors, veterans, and patients in need.

On the 3-year anniversary of ObamaCare, I met with Complexus Medical in Mishawaka, an emerging leader in orthopedic instrument manufacturing in the Second District. I was told that this tax will stifle innovation and could force companies to consider overseas supply chains.

The medical device tax is of great concern also for our veterans. That's why I sent a letter, along with my colleagues from Indiana, to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs asking how this tax will impact veterans care. After the sacrifice and fearless bravery demonstrated by our troops and our veterans, it is unacceptable for them to worry about their access to quality care.

And it gets worse. Just this week, we learned more shocking news when the IRS admitted they're targeting certain groups of people, a practice that is completely unlawful, unethical, and downright shameful. Their willful actions to defy transparency have already qualified the IRS for a comprehensive congressional investigation, with at least two hearings scheduled in the House in the coming weeks.

But let's not forget, the IRS is set to play a major role in ObamaCare from enforcing the individual mandate to distributing tax credits. If the IRS cannot operate under the light of transparency today with their current duties, I am deeply concerned that further responsibilities with sensitive information and controversial policies are a recipe for disaster.

This bill, ladies and gentlemen, is spiraling out of control. It's time for Washington to heed the overwhelming evidence and wipe the slate clean to show the American people that we are listening. Now, more than ever, the President and the Congress must restore transparency at the Federal level. I support the full repeal of ObamaCare and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentlelady for her remarks. As many other speakers have said tonight, ObamaCare is Big Government at its worst.

Federal agencies have recently reported that it will take them almost 190 million additional man hours per year for employers, families, and health care providers to comply with its onerous implementation regulations. That's nearly 95,000 new, full-time employees just to do ObamaCare paperwork.

Now I'd like to recognize our final speaker of the night, one of the hardest working Members I know in this Chamber. I appreciate your stamina and persistence for being here, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Well, I want to thank the gentleman, my friend from Indiana, for his courtesy and for his leadership on this very important issue. I join my colleague in supporting H.R. 45, the full repeal of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, it is true, you've heard from the other Members here this evening, you've heard about the importance of repealing ObamaCare because it is legislation that is full of broken promises. We know that the signature promise of this legislation was that if you like your current health insurance, you can keep it. We know now that 7 million people will lose their employer-sponsored health insurance at least, which is nearly double the previous estimate of 4 million.

We heard about savings. Remember, this was titled the ''Affordable Care Act,'' but in 2013, the Congressional Budget Office projection tags the total cost at $1.88 trillion. Premiums—premiums are not decreasing; premiums are going up. The average family premium has grown over $3,000 since the passage of ObamaCare. Individuals earning as little as $25,000 will pay more for insurance because of ObamaCare. And 1.1 trillion in new taxes and jobs. This legislation was supposed to create 400,000 jobs immediately. Speaker PELOSI promised that ObamaCare would create 4 million jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, small employers in Kentucky and central Kentucky tell me that ObamaCare is the principal reason that they're not hiring.

According to a study by the National Federation of Independent Business, the employer mandate like the one included in ObamaCare could eliminate

an additional 1.6 million jobs by 2014. ObamaCare is creating an environment in which employers are incentivized to reduce hours for their employees to go to part-time work. The supporters of ObamaCare are supporting a part-time work economy. We need a full-time work economy, and that's why we need to repeal ObamaCare.

It increases the Federal deficit. According to a January GAO report, ObamaCare will add 6.2 trillion to the deficit over the next 75 years. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude with the story that illustrates why this really matters.

There's a lot of statistics about jobs and the economy and increased premiums and costs, but the real signature failure of this legislation is that it hurts patients, that it deprives the American people of the benefits of medical innovation. A hospital administrator told me in central Kentucky that we used to take care of patients, but we now take care of paper. Medical innovation is central to America's future economic growth and to delivering new lifesaving medical devices to patients. But the new medical device tax included in ObamaCare, which imposes a 2.3 percent tax on medical device manufacturers, punishes medical innovation and prevents quality health care.

Families around the country know this all too well. In my own family, we saw this up close. Christmas Day 2012 could have been one of the worst days of our lives. Fortunately, it was the best day of our lives.

It happened when my mother called me that morning on Christmas morning and said, Andy, your father has had a fainting spell. I said, can I talk to him? So she got him on the phone. I said, Dad, how are you doing? He said, I need to drink a glass of water. I said, Well, stop drinking any more coffee. Calm down and give me a call if anything happens.

I got another call an hour later. This time, it was from my mother again. She said they were in the emergency room. My father had passed out a second time. So I rushed to the emergency room. I was greeted by the ER doctor. I said, What's going on, Doctor? He said, Well, we did an EKG, and here are the results. He showed me a flat line. He said, your father's heart is slowing down. I said, Doctor, what are we going to do about that? He said, Well, fortunately, we can put a pacemaker in your father.

An electrophysiologist came down to the ER, and he reassured us. He said, We can put a pacemaker in your father, and we can make him better. So he went in to get that pacemaker surgery. When he came out, he was recovering, and his life was saved because of that pacemaker technology.

Mr. Speaker, the American people, American families depend on the innovative, unbelievable technology that American entrepreneurship has created. But ObamaCare punishes that. And if it wasn't for that kind of medical innovation and technology, my father wouldn't be here today.

So I stand opposed to ObamaCare for all the reasons we've talked about here tonight, but, most importantly, because I credit the American free enterprise system for saving lives, and ObamaCare rolls that back. I certainly appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana for discussing the importance of this issue and the future of high-quality, innovative health care in America in the future.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his moving remarks. I thank all my colleagues for their remarks today. We're going to vote this week on repealing ObamaCare. That vote is more than symbolism. ObamaCare is wrecking this economy. ObamaCare is terrible for patient outcomes, and it needs to be repealed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2030

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to talk about this subject, rebuilding the American manufacturing sector, and I will. But I just heard the most remarkable 1-hour debate in my life—not a debate, but a whole slew of accusations and incorrect facts. I guess a fact shouldn't be incorrect. But I've never heard such gobbledygook and misstatements in my entire life.

The last one—I'm absolutely delighted the gentleman's father is healthy, but to think that a 2 percent tax on medical devices is somehow going to stop medical technology when those devices are extraordinarily profitable to these companies is just lunacy. I know nobody likes to pay taxes, and certainly the manufacturers of those devices don't want to have to pay a 2 percent tax. But come on, you think that's going to stop medical technology from advancing when there's so much profit in it? I don't think so.

Okay. Thirty-seven times now, 37 times this week the Republican majority is going to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act—37 times—when Americans are already benefiting from the Affordable Care Act. Is it that my friends who spoke here for the last hour want to tell every 22-year-old or 21-year-old in the entire Nation that they can no longer stay on their parents' health insurance? Because that's exactly what the repeal would do. Those young men and women who are counting on being able to have health insurance—no, repeal ends that part of the Affordable Health Care Act.

Are they to go out and tell 40 million Americans that they're not going to have health insurance at all? That's what the repeal of the Affordable Health Care Act will do, 40 million Americans. Are they to say that somehow this is costing more money to have an insurance policy where you can stay healthy, where you can get care before it becomes a crisis and wind up in an emergency room, that that's going to be cheaper when you repeal the Affordable Health Care Act? Sending people to the emergency room is going to be cheaper? What planet are you from? That's not the way it is. The most expensive care in the world is the emergency room, where somebody does not have the continuity of care that an insurance policy provides for them.

Or maybe they want to discriminate against women as existed before the Affordable Health Care Act. Every woman in this Nation faced insurance discrimination, but the Affordable Health Care Act ends that discrimination.

And how many families out there, how many families out across America have a member of that family—or maybe many members of that family—that have some preexisting condition—high blood pressure, onset of diabetes, maybe some incident in their past? I will tell you, I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years, and I know exactly what the health insurance companies will do if the provisions that prevent insurance discriminations are eliminated with the bill that these gentlemen and ladies intend to take up later this week.

Insurance discrimination has harmed millions upon millions of Americans—many of whom came to me as insurance commissioner in California pleading for some justice in their insurance program. Justice was to be found at least in California because I knew that the insurance companies had an obligation and they had a contract. But you eliminate the Affordable Health Care Act and you'll see insurance discrimination reemerge in the United States in a way that will harm millions upon millions of Americans because they will not be able to get insurance. And if they did, they will have to pay far more simply because they are a woman.

Thirty-seven times. Thirty-seven times you've attempted to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act.

Seniors—every senior in this Nation that's on Medicare is able to get a free annual checkup. And ladies and gentlemen, you need to understand in your arguments that that free, affordable annual checkup has reduced the cost of medical care in Medicare programs. And the inflation rate in Medicare has come down since the Affordable Care Act has gone into effect.

The statistics you toss around about the extraordinary cost, you need to understand that we have been plagued by health care insurance inflation for decades. The Affordable Health Care Act has built into it the very first opportunity this Nation has had nationwide

to bend the cost curve on health care, and we're seeing it happen today. We're seeing it happen today in the Medicare program because seniors are able to get prevention. They're able to get that drug that brings down their blood pressure, or the advice on how to deal with diabetes and avoid the extraordinary cost. Oh, yeah, 37 times repealing the Affordable Health Care Act.

You talk about jobs in America. Okay, let's talk about jobs in America. Let's talk about the fact that there's not been one significant piece of legislation out of this House since the beginning of this session to create jobs. President Obama stood here on this dais and talked about creating jobs, but this House has not brought forward one significant piece of legislation.

The President called for an infrastructure program—$50 billion—to put people back to work, to create the infrastructure—the streets, the roads, the bridges, the water systems, the sanitation systems—not just to put people back to work, but to build the foundation for future economic growth.

So where is that legislation? Has it even been heard in one committee controlled by our friends in the opposition party? No. No. Well, we will take up a transportation act soon, but will there be adequate funding for infrastructure? Probably not. Probably not.

The President called for an American Jobs Act, not even heard in committee here. Americans want to go to work. They want jobs. They want to go to work, and we have a program on the Democratic side to do that.

We want to deal with the big problems facing this Nation. We want to deal with the fact that we have millions of people that want to work in America, and we have serious problems to solve.

We ought to put aside this business of repealing the Affordable Health Care Act. Change it? Yes. Make a reasonable change and let's talk about it. Make a proposal about how to make it better, and we'll talk about it; but we're not going to talk about repealing it. We're not going to go there.

Maybe we ought to go with some things that are really important. Maybe we ought to go with something that was in the news today.

It's been determined that for the first time in at least 3 million years the carbon dioxide in the Earth's atmosphere is over 400 parts per million. What does that mean? Climate change? Oh, yes. If you were in Los Angeles this last couple of days, you would have seen record-high temperatures in early May. Reports are coming out about firestorms this summer season. We've seen Superstorm Sandy, and around this world we've seen many super-environmental effects.

□ 2040

The scientists tell us that that climate change will bring more severe weather events and there will be disruptions in our food supply like the current drought in the Southwest. Four hundred parts per million; in the last 3 million years, the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has never been that high.

Now, the good news is that this Nation, the strongest economic nation in the world, despite the inability of this House to get things done, we can solve the climate change problem, or at least lead; and in doing so, we can put people back to work.

Here's how it can be done: clean energy. Clean energy is spurring business development across this country and its future is very, very bright. Not a month goes by without some entrepreneur, a scientist, an inventor, coming to me with another idea about how you can improve solar technologies, photovoltaic technologies. One just came up the other day, a very inspired way of doing it, perhaps two times more efficient, or one-and-a-half times more efficient than the current solar panels.

Companies are investing. U.S.-based venture capital investments in clean energy surged 30 percent from $5.1 billion in 2010 to $6.6 billion in 2011, and the trend continues. Jobs in the solar energy industry are in every State, and there are over 5,000 companies involved employing over 100,000 American workers. And wind energy, which is big in my district in Solano County, 75,000 people across this Nation, and many of them my own constituents.

There's great potential out there as we move from coal and oil, the energy of the previous two centuries, to the clean energies of the future. We'll see that in agriculture as we grow crops that can generate energy. We'll see it in geothermal. We'll see it in wave energy in our oceans. There's enormous potential. And the research that goes into this is also jobs.

Our colleagues on the majority side have attempted in the last year to reduce research for energy and agriculture. To what effect? Well, maybe they want to go to 500 parts per million carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. I don't think Americans want to go there. I don't think the people of the world want to go there. I don't think they want the calamity that will come.

There's many other ways this can be done. Yesterday, as part of our Make It in America agenda, I was in Sacramento, California, on the edge of my district and a remarkable event took place, an event that was actually caused by a piece of legislation that was passed here, the very first piece of legislation signed by President Obama in 2009. It was the stimulus bill, the much-maligned stimulus bill. They said it didn't work. Well, it did work, Mr. Speaker, and it is working today, and it's being made in America. Here's what the American Recovery Act is doing for Americans. Here's what the stimulus bill, in yet one more example of success, is doing for America.

This is the most advanced locomotive built in the world. It's built in Sacramento. The stimulus bill provided $466 million for Amtrak to buy 70 advanced electric locomotives. And written into that bill was a sentence that said these locomotives must be American-made.

So, Siemens, a German company with large manufacturing facilities around the world, certainly in Germany and other countries on every continent except Antarctica, looked at that and said, 466 million? Hmmm. Made in America? We can do that.

They put a bid in. They went to their manufacturing plant in Sacramento that was previously manufacturing light rail cars, set about building a new factory, and that new factory employs 200 people today. Yesterday, the first of 70 new locomotives rolled onto America's rail tracks and will soon be providing service on the Northeastern Corridor. Two hundred new direct jobs in Sacramento at the Siemens factory and hundreds around the Nation—it works.

The climate change issue here is very important. The advanced technology in this locomotive that has 9,000 horsepower has the ability to generate electricity when it slows down, when it brakes for curves or stations, putting back into the grid electricity that it consumed in its previous travel.

Make it in America. Use our Federal tax dollars to buy and to build American-made equipment and supplies and materials. That's precisely what Siemens is doing.

This is a success story. This is the kind of thing we should be talking about here on the floor of the House of Representatives. This is the kind of work we should be doing in our committees: putting Americans back to work, laying the infrastructure for the future growth of this country. But, oh, no, we are going to spend this week dealing with the 37th attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

There's so much more to do. There's so much more to do here in America. Why don't we put our shoulder to the wheel of progress and provide a transportation bill that actually builds the infrastructure for this Nation, that provides these kinds of locomotives and train sets.

In the early days of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln signed the Transcontinental Rail Act. Little known, but in that Rail Act was a provision, not just to build a rail line across America, but that all of the steel, all of the iron that was to be used in that line had to be American made. Made it in America, creating jobs, connecting the east to the west, 1862. And here we are all these decades later with the same idea: a new locomotive on American rails and American made.

I want to congratulate Siemens. I want to congratulate this German company that is here in America, is providing American jobs, and is providing the most advanced locomotive in the world, and they're building it in Sacramento, California.

So, what else can we do? What else can we do to provide jobs? There's so much. If we had listened to the President when he proposed to Congress the American JOBS Act, perhaps 2 million more Americans would be working today. Construction crews would be putting bridges and dams and levees and flood protection facilities, they would be building the infrastructure. And we would also be working on our energy systems.

□ 2050

The piece of legislation that I have introduced would require that tax subsidies for individuals and businesses that wanted to put up a wind turbine or a solar panel would only be available to them if they bought American-made equipment. Spend our tax money on American-made equipment made by Americans: a pretty simple thought. Abraham Lincoln must have had that thought, and the Congress in 1862 had that thought and passed a law that did it.

There is more that we can do.

When we passed the transportation bill, as we should this year or early next year, a new highway bill, we should put into it a proposal by Ranking Member RAHALL. That proposal said that the money in this bill will be spent on American-made concrete, steel, trucks, buses—putting Americans to work. The Democrats on that committee think that's a really good idea, and we hope our Republican colleagues agree and that we write into the transportation bill a very strong ''buy America'' provision so that Americans can have the jobs and so that we avoid the egregious and humiliating fact that the steel in much of the new Oakland-San Francisco Bay Bridge was not made by American steelworkers, not by American companies, but Chinese. It went out to bid. It was supposed to be 10 percent cheaper, so the Chinese company took the bid, built a new highly advanced steel mill, and sent faulty steel to San Francisco Bay, requiring even more expenditure.

So there are things we should learn from the history, and we will if we listen carefully, if we pay attention to what science is telling us about climate change, about the buildup of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere, and if we listen, then we must have the courage to act. I would pray for our children's future and their children's and their children's beyond that that this House of Representatives and the Senate have the courage to act decisively on the climate crisis, and that in the farm bill that we mark up tomorrow we take the opportunity to write into that farm bill serious conservation programs that conserve the Nation's forests and farmland and water and streams. I would hope that we would do that.

I would hope that this House would find the courage to take on the oil industry and the coal industry and move decisively to green energy systems and stop, slow down what is a terrible process underway of filling our atmosphere with ever-increasing levels of carbon dioxide. After all, it's about the next generations. My generation will soon be gone, and so will most of the Members of this House. It's the future generations that are going to face our apparent unwillingness and inability to attack the climate change problem. As I said a moment ago, we can do it in a way that builds efficient transportation systems, like this locomotive that Siemens built in Sacramento, California, that builds green energy systems, renewable energy, low carbon dioxide-producing energy.

I've noticed that my colleague from Texas has joined us.

SHEILA JACKSON LEE, thank you so very much for joining us this evening. We've gone on here about the Affordable Care Act and how we ought to turn our attention to jobs for America, and I'm sure you have some thoughts on those subjects and others. Please join us.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I want to thank my good friend from California for really framing the discussion tonight around, I think, the only theme that gives us the kind of positive agenda that puts Americans back to work. We know, as the economy collapsed, 12 million were out of work. We also know that we have steadily made an increase, but it's not where any of us would like to be.

I listened to the gentleman so eloquently and so effectively ask the simple question as to why are we again putting on the floor of the House a repeal of the Affordable Care Act, something that has not only been resoundingly embraced by many of our leaders and by the uninsured in our Nation who are looking forward to the opportunity to be insured, but in the last election, I think it was very clear that, in the affirmation of President Obama, 64 million-plus people voted for him, and an enormous, unequaled divide in the States supported him, and he made it clear that he wanted to ensure, on behalf of the American people, that there would be the coverage of working families.

Now, as he looks to implementation, we recognize that Members of Congress will be engaged in making it work right, but we also realize that the Affordable Care Act will provide more resources for health professionals, that it will establish more federally qualified health clinics, which will create more jobs, and that it will attack the dastardly number, my friend, Mr. GARAMENDI, of 28.4 percent uninsured, and of 6 percent uninsured in the State of Texas. Of course, our Governor sees fit to reject the expanded Medicaid.

I can't imagine why we have not embraced this agenda, which includes the idea of all of the above and of creating clean energy and manufacturing jobs, bringing solar energy back to the United States again, making solar panels. Certainly, I'm aware of the fact that any country will grab what it can grab, but the United States has the capacity to do solar energy. It has the capacity to build wind turbines. All we have to do is invest.

It has the opportunity, in actuality, to build submarines and to get back in the shipbuilding business. I'm sure there are Members listening and saying, We've long left that business. No, I don't think so, because there is always a more technologically efficient, more effective, more swift, if you will, ship or submarine. You can always make it bigger and better, smaller and better. With the technological revolution, we also have the opportunity to raise the specter of manufacturing.

Of course, in the energy sector, where I come from, there is a whole array of opportunities as we utilize clean natural gas. That is making the manufacturing opportunities grow grander and grander, and I truly believe that we will find a common balance between natural gas producers and the manufacturers who need to use clean energy. Let me also say that the housing market is booming, and I am delighted to stand here and say that that is creating jobs, and many of these homes are being built on the basis of clean energy. H.R. 1524 is a bill that speaks to this issue.

I don't know why we are spending our time, 3 days, on the floor. I know that they will be in the Rules Committee tomorrow, and I will have a number of amendments that I hope to be introducing that hopefully speak to the issue of the utilization of expanded Medicaid for States that have 20 percent-plus of uninsured, the idea of ensuring that we include the right kind of Medicare reimbursement. These are issues that can go in regular order, but yet we are spending the Nation's time, dollars, and resources to be on the floor when we could be putting forward tax reform.

Many of us want to work on tax incentives for small businesses, the backbone of the economic engine of this country. My friends—I call them all my friends; I want small businesses to be paying attention—you are our friends. You create jobs. You stay the course.

□ 2100

Just today, I was listening to an individual in the ravaged area of Hurricane Sandy, and she was saying she has six restaurants. She was complaining that we had not done what we were supposed to do. Obviously you remember they stalled the compensation for those souls in that eye of the storm. We waited and our friends, the Republicans, wouldn't let the money out. She is a victim of that. She said I have six restaurants and some of the ones I cook in. But just give her, in addition to the compensation from FEMA which is overdue, give her a tax structure that can help her grow her business and pass legislation that gives incentives for hiring the unemployed. That's what

should be on the floor of the House as we approach all of the excitement of graduation, when young people will be coming out of college doors, looking for the opportunity that America has always promised when they say we all are created equal.

I'll be going to a number of graduations. I know I will. You'll be speaking at graduations. What will you be saying to them? That America is a land of opportunity, yet we pound day after day after day after day, month after month, year after year on a bill that has been passed, signed into law and is being implemented, where physicians and researchers are saying thank you for the Affordable Care Act. For the items we have to fix, let's fix them together.

So I came to the floor to just say that I want to join the chorus of getting to work; I want to join the chorus of creating jobs. In fact, I want to join the chorus of putting our heads together and creating a summer youths' job program for the young people, high school students that are coming out in the middle of their high school years. We always used to be able to find work. No one cannot tell me that when we did it in 2009, the first year of President Obama's administration, it was a grand and exciting—it was not an experiment, but a grand and exciting response to all those young people who were in the high schools preparing to go to college.

Let me finish by saying this and just throw a little something on the table just to say that if we want to work, let's move toward immigration reform. That is another job creator and one that answers the questions of America's businesses. Let's do that. If we want to work—of course, I know I'll see a couple of my friend running out the door, but we can find sensible gun legislation. But I'll just say that if nothing else, can we get something that says store your guns?

Over the last weeks, we've been seeing people leave guns around and do this. So could you do that? Could you just have a simple—H.R. 65 says to hold people responsible for storing their guns.

I want to thank my friend for your leadership. It has been a persistent and pronounced leadership that I've been delighted to join you on. And I want to thank our leader, NANCY PELOSI, for her pointedness about can we get to work and her rising leadership, if you will, in the backdrop of the tenor that she had as Speaker to be able to get things done. And, of course, all the leadership, including the leading spokesperson for Make It in America, our friend, STENY HOYER, and I must mention all of our leaders, Mr. CLYBURN, Chairman BECERRA, and our vice chair in Mr. CROWLEY, along with our committee ranking members.

But our message has been that we can do all of the fussing; we can fix the IRS; we can talk about issues that are occurring with leaks. That's our job. We understand that. But it is not our job to come back over and over again and revive a bill that is the law of the land not only by the vote of the United States Congress, but by the United States Supreme Court. What more do we need to answer that question?

So I hope to accomplish this in partnership with the gentleman. We're writing legislation, as well. Let me throw one other point in there. We joined in on some legislation about doing human exploration again. That creates jobs, as well. It builds the Orion that's on the books right now that is getting ready to be built. There are so many things we can do together bipartisan. And I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. GARAMENDI. SHEILA JACKSON LEE, thank you so very much. You are a leader in all of these issues. You've often and almost always present these issues to the American people on the floor of the House, and you do it with passion and knowledge.

There was an hour spent earlier by our colleagues about the 37th time that they're going to attempt to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act. It reminded me that they also have a piece of legislation to end Medicare as we know it. If you go back to when Medicare was put in place in the sixties, 1964, 1965, the Republican Party opposed it then and have often, through those years, to this date, attempted in various ways to eviscerate or to end it as we know it. Apparently they're going to try to do the same thing with the Affordable Health Care Act. It is such a waste of time because these programs are so fundamental to our ability to survive. This is health care for Americans and spreading that opportunity out.

It's a long discussion. We've had that discussion on the floor for many days. What we really ought to be focusing on is putting Americans back to work. This piece of legislation is one of about 30 pieces of legislation that's put in by the Democratic Caucus. This is mine. It deals with your tax money. It simply says that it's going to be spent on American-made clean energy, solar panels, wind turbines and the like. It's not a bad idea to spend your tax money on American-made equipment, American jobs, American businesses.

There's another bill that I have dealing with the transportation system. It's the same thing. That bill is now finding its way into the rewrite of the highway transportation program, the transportation bill; and hopefully it will be there. It's a very strong buy-American provision for our buses, our trains, our light rail, locomotives and steel and concrete for bridges.

We've got a lot of work to do in America. We've got a lot of work and a lot of need; and this House ought to be spending its time on that.

We'll take another night and we'll go into the tax policy side of this, which there is a lot to be said about changing our taxes to encourage manufacturing. Some of that has been done. I'll leave the one example that 2 years ago when the Democrats controlled this House, we eliminated about $12 billion of tax breaks that American companies received for shipping American jobs overseas. We put a stop to that. There's about another $5 billion that needs to be done, but we no longer control this House. But we ought to bring those jobs back home. We ought to flip that over and give a tax break for reshoring, bringing the jobs back to America.

That's another night's discussion. We'll take that up in another evening. But for tonight, it's about putting Americans back to work. It's about focusing the attention of this Chamber, the 435 of us, on what we really need in this country, which is a very strong and growing economy.

We've seen progress every quarter since the beginning of 2010. Every quarter we've seen private sector employment grow. We're not where we ought to be. We have more work to do. And when we finally rebuild the American manufacturing sector, when once again we make it in America, Americans are going to make it.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

Mrs. ELLMERS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of family matters.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and for the balance of the week.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to sections 401 and 503 of House Concurrent Resolution 112 (112th Congress), the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2013, deemed to be in force by House Resolution 614 (112th Congress), House Resolution 643 (112th Congress), and House Resolution 5 (1136th Congress), I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the budget aggregates and allocations set forth pursuant to this concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, as deemed in force.

These revisions are provided for the consideration of H.R. 45, a bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. A corresponding table is attached. These adjustments are made for the purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and other budgetary enforcement provisions.

House Concurrent Resolution 112 included the budget impact of repealing the Patient

Protection and Affordable Care Act (P.L. 111–148) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (P.L. 111–152) in its aggregates and allocations.

For enforcement purposes, however, section 101 of this concurrent resolution set the revenue aggregate at the baseline level estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. Sections 401 and 503 of the concurrent resolution on the budget provided for downward adjustments for the consideration of certain specified policies, among these is the repeal of these public laws.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year	
	2013	2013–2022
Current Aggregates:	.....	.....
Budget Authority	2,799,329	(1)
Outlays	2,891,863	(1)
Revenues	2,089,540	28,957,333
A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (H.R. 45):		
Budget Authority	0	(1)
Outlays	0	(1)
Revenues	−34,000	−896,000
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,799,329	(1)
Outlays	2,891,863	(1)
Revenues	2,055,540	28,061,333

[1] Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2014 through 2022 have yet to be considered by Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 15, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1465. A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States Standards for Wheat (RIN: 0580-AB12) received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1466. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updates to the List of Plant Inspection Stations [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0099] received April 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1467. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Wisconsin [Doc. No.: APHIS-2012-0075] received April 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1468. A letter from the Administrator Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Community Programs Guaranteed Loans (RIN: 0575-AC92) received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1469. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Recordkeeping for Approved Livestock Facilities and Slaughtering and Rendering Establishments [Docket No.: APHIS-2007-0039] (RIN: 0579-AC61) received May 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1470. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Liquidity and Funding (RIN: 3052-AC54) received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1471. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting Annual Report on the Activities of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC) for 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1472. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2013 Report to Congress on Sustainable Ranges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1473. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Carol M. Pottenger, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1474. A letter from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2012 report on vulnerability assessments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1475. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the thirty-third annual report on the implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 by departments and agencies which administer programs of Federal financial assistance, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6106a(b); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1476. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) — College Savings Account Research Demonstration Project [CFDA Number: 84.334D.] received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1477. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 1, 2, 15, 74, 78, 87, 90, and 97 of the Commissions Rules Regarding Implementation of the Final Acts of the World Radiocommunication Conference (Geneva, 2007) (WRC-07), Other Allocation Issues, and Related Rule Updates [ET Docket No. 12-338] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1478. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Reassessment of Federal Communications Commission Radiofrequency Exposure Limits and Policies; Proposed Changes in the Commission's Rules Regarding Human Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields [ET Docket No.: 13-84] [ET Docket No.: 13-137] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1479. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — NRC Regulatory Issue Summary 2013-04 Content Specification and Shielding Evaluations for Type B Transportation Packages received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1480. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the nineteenth quarterly report on the Afghanistan Reconstruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1481. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's Semiannual Report to Congress for the six-month period ending March 31, 2013, as required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1482. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1483. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capitol Police, transmitting Statement Of Disbursements Of The U.S. Capitol Police For The Period October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013; (H. Doc. No. 113—24); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1484. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Thirty-Fifth Annual Report to Congress pursuant to section 201 of the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 18a(j); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1485. A letter from the Chair, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the Commission's amendments to the federal sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary, together with the reasons for the amendments, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(o); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1486. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the 2012 Annual Progress Report on the National Strategy for Transportation Security; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows;

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 180. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty (Rept. 113–54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 767. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project; with an amendment (Rept. 113–55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 573. A bill to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa (Rept. 113–56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 356. A bill to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled ''An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes'' (Rept. 113–57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JONES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. AMASH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LONG, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MARINO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. YODER):

H.R. 7. A bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1958. A bill to prohibit wholesalers from purchasing prescription drugs from pharmacies, and to enhance information and transparency regarding drug wholesalers engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HALL, Mr. COLE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BARTON, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. VELA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER):

H.R. 1959. A bill to amend the Renewable Fuel Program in section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act to allow domestic alternative fuel to be used to satisfy a portion of the required applicable volume of renewable fuel; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington) (both by request):

H.R. 1960. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 1961. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1962. A bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 1963. A bill to amend the Water Conservation and Utilization Act to authorize the development of non-Federal hydropower and issuance of leases of power privileges at projects constructed pursuant to the authority of the Water Conservation and Utilization Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1964. A bill to amend the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, including at least one lease sale in the Reserve each year in the period 2013 through 2023, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 1965. A bill to streamline and ensure onshore energy permitting, provide for onshore leasing certainty, and give certainty to oil shale development for American energy security, economic development, and job creation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 1966. A bill to establish a visa waiver program for the United States Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 1967. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to expand the cause of action relating to the pattern or practice of conduct by a governmental authority that deprives a person of rights protected by the Constitution to such conduct relating to adults as well as juveniles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1968. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a pilot program to award grants and loan guarantees to hospitals to carry out projects for the purpose of reducing energy costs and increasing resilience to improve security; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 1969. A bill to increase Federal Pell Grants for the children of fallen police officers, firefighters, and other public safety officers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 1970. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to ensure that social security benefits are paid, to prioritize payments when the United States is not able to issue new obligations due to the statutory debt limit, and to address a lapse in appropriations to fund the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. KLINE (for himself and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 1971. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide certain TRICARE beneficiaries with the opportunity to retain access to TRICARE Prime; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 1972. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State all right, title, and interest in and to a percentage of the amount of royalties and other amounts required to be paid to the State under that Act with respect to public land and deposits in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 1973. A bill to permit business development companies to increase investments in small-and middle-market financial services companies and investment advisors; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. MULVANEY, Ms. CHU, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 1974. A bill to clarify the collateral requirement for certain loans under section 7(d) of the Small Business Act, to address assistance to out-of-State small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. HAHN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ESTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FARR, Mr.

GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan):

H.R. 1975. A bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, 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 Ms. PINGREE of Maine (for herself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 1976. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide access to certified professional midwives for women enrolled in the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1977. A bill to establish an alternative accountability model; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1978. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the phasedown of the credit percentage for the dependent care tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 1979. 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 Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. JONES, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. BARBER, Ms. ESTY, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 1980. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from requesting additional medical examinations of veterans who have submitted sufficient medical evidence provided by non-Department medical professionals and to improve the efficiency of processing certain claims for disability compensation by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLAY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.J. Res. 44. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.J. Res. 45. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting Congress the authority to enact laws limiting the number of terms that Representatives and Senators may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. SINEMA):

H. Res. 213. A resolution establishing the Special Committee on Sexual Assault and Abuse in the Armed Forces to conduct oversight, ensure accountability, and report on the activities of the Department of Defense to prevent, reduce, prosecute, and provide victims' services for cases of sexual assault and abuse in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Rules.

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. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 7.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress's power under the Spending Clause in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. (Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers)

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 1960.

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 provide for the common Defence'', ''to raise and support Armies'', ''to provide and maintain a Navy'' and ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces'' as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is enacted by Congressional Authority expressed in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1st Amendment to the US Constitution.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 1963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 1965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 1966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.''

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 1967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 1969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 1970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution sets forth the power of appropriations and states that ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .''

In addition, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states that ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .''

Also, Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12 and 13 states that Congress shall have power ''to raise and support Armies. . .'' and ''to provide and maintain a Navy.''

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds and pay U.S. debt in order to ensure that U.S. servicemembers will not lose pay.

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 1971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation ensures that the Secretary of Defense provides retired military veteran beneficiaries who live beyond 100 miles of a Military Treatment Facility, an opportunity to retain access to TRICARE Prime. Specific authority is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 1972.

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. MULVANEY:

H.R. 1973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 1974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, which states that Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution and section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine:

H.R. 1976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 1978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 1979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 1980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power *** To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.J. Res. 44.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.J. Res. 45.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to propose Constitutional amendments.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 27: Mr. RAHALL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 38: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 45: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. HURT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. REED, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 104: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 124: Mr. LATTA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 164: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RADEL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 176: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 182: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 184: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 207: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 241: Mr. POSEY and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 271: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 301: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 322: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 324: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 351: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 358: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 400: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 419: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 447: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 451: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 471: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 494: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BISHOP of of New York, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HURT, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 495: Mr. RUSH, Mr. WATT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. NEAL, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 508: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 535: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. LOEBSACK, AND Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 565: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 620: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 627: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 664: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 671: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 685: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 693: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 702: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 713: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. BARBER, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 721: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 761: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 763: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. BARBER, AND Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 769: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 811: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 846: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, AND Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 847: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 850: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 851: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 855: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 877: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 888: Mr. DENT, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 901: Mr. TERRY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONAWAY, MR. LONG, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 903: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 904: Mr. KILMER and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 914: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 920: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 924: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 940: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BARTON, MR. CALVERT, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 946: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 957: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 958: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 961: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 981: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 983: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1009: Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1015: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1020: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1024: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1070: Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1074: Mr. VELA and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1078: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1093: Ms. WATERS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1129: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1138: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1141: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1148: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1155: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1176: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1199: Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1201: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1209: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1213: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1249: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1250: Mr. COSTA, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1277: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1281: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1285: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1286: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1292: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1313: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1317: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1331: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1344: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1354: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1362: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1413: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1414: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. VARGAS, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1417: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1418: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1427: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1428: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. HURT.

H.R. 1449: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1481: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1485: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 1491: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1492: Mr. COBLE and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1493: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1498: Mr. ENYART, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. LEE

of California, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1502: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1506: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1507: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1518: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUNYAN, Ms. CHU, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MENG, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESTY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1528: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1537: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1552: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1565: Mr. BERA of California, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1579: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1588: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1595: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BASS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1598: Mr. FORBES and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1610: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1613: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1620: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1621: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1637: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1638: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 1645: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1663: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1674: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1676: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1692: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1693: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1699: Ms. CHU and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1701: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1708: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 1726: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1729: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CICILLINEr, and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 1733: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1759: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1763: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WALZ, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1773: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1775: Mr. NADLER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COHEN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1780: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1797: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1814: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LONG, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. COLE, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1818: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1825: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1828: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1829: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 1830: Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MEADOWS, OLSON, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1831: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 1833: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1847: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GRIMM, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1848: Mr. PETRI, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1863: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 1864: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1867: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RIGELL, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1869: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 1882: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1888: Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1897: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1900: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1902: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1904: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 1908: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 1910: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1918: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 1921: Mr. POLIS and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 1928: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1946: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1950: Mr. HANNA, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. YODER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 1951: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.J. Res. 34: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Con. Res. 21: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. HOLT.

H. Res. 24: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H. Res. 87: Mr. FINCHER.

H. Res. 106: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BARTON, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H. Res. 109: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 112: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 131: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. MEADOWS.

H. Res. 135: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. BERA of California.

H. Res. 174: Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Res. 177: Mr. CRAMER.

H. Res. 182: Ms. CHU.

H. Res. 187: Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 190: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Res. 206: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Res. 209: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 676: Mr. GRAYSON.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 14, 2013 No. 67

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ELIZABETH WARREN, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord God Almighty, we sing praises to You, for You bless all those who depend on You for strength. You are the shield that protects our Nation. You treat us with kindness and honor.

Lord, pour Your spirit upon our Senators so that they will feel Your transforming presence. May they use the abilities You have given them to make the world a better place. Help them to take seriously their opportunity to be instruments of Your grace.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable ELIZABETH WARREN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ELIZABETH WARREN, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. WARREN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BASEBALL FANS

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Republican leader and I follow very closely the Washington Nationals, and we talk often about how they fare on any given day. We just spent a minute commiserating about a young man from Las Vegas, Bryce Harper. We talk about him often because he is a phenomenon in baseball. Yesterday, while playing in Los Angeles—a late game—he got two walks, a hit, and, as he does all the time—well, not like this—he was chasing a ball full speed and he ran into the wall full speed. I told the Republican leader I am going to talk to his family later. It is too early in the West, but I told him I will talk to his mom or dad and find out how he is doing. But he crashed into that wall, and he has 11 stitches in his chin, he was knocked out, and he hurt one of his shoulders. So we will see how he is.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will my friend the majority leader yield?

Mr. REID. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. MCCONNELL. As my friend indicated, we were talking about this before the session opened. This kid is one the most incredible competitors I have ever seen.

The game was on the west coast, and I don't know whether my friend stayed up that late, but I didn't stay up late enough to see the crash into the wall. So when my friend speaks to his mother, remind her that this is one thing on which leaders on both sides fully agree: We are hoping Harper has a speedy recovery and is back in the lineup.

Mr. REID. And the manager said, when asked afterwards about him, I don't want him to change anything because he is such a competitor.

But I think he will maybe have to watch those walls in the future.

Mrs. BOXER. Plus, both Senators are wearing the same suit today. It is a good day for it.

Mr. REID. Yes, we are wearing the same suit. We try to match wardrobes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following leader remarks the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m. this morning. The majority will control the first half, the Republicans the final half.

Following morning business the Senate will resume consideration of S. 601, the Water Resources Development Act.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I ask unanimous consent that the full time, the full 1 hour, be given to the Democrats, their half hour, and the Republicans, their half-hour, and if the vote has to come a little later, we just need to get that out of the way before our caucuses. And we could probably terminate that at noon. That will be fine. So I ask unanimous consent that the Democrats have their full half hour and the Republicans their full half hour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Following morning business, as I indicated, the Senate will resume consideration of the Water Resources Development Act.

Madam President, I was in a meeting a few minutes ago. This is an important bill, and it shows that one of the most liberal Members of the Senate and one of the most conservative Members of the Senate—BOXER and VITTER—can work extremely well together, as they have on this bill. I hope we can have a finite list of amendments and not have to invoke cloture because we would invoke cloture and I would rather not do that. The filing deadline for all second-degree amendments to the bill is 11:15 a.m. today. The managers continue to work to

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

complete action on the bill. If no agreement is reached, there will be a cloture vote at noon today.

THE BUDGET

Mr. REID. Madam President, on Thursday Speaker BOEHNER said a remarkable thing. He said: We can't cut our way to prosperity. It was good to hear him speaking candidly, for that is what Democrats have been saying for years—we cannot cut our way to prosperity. It is important that we have done some cutting. That is very important. And we are proud of the work we have done. To this point, we have cut more than $2½ trillion.

But it will take more than meat-ax budget cuts to keep our economy on the path to full recovery. To protect our economic growth, it will take a balanced approach, one that couples smart spending cuts with investments in our future and some new revenue from closing these wasteful loopholes I have spoken about to members of the Finance Committee in my caucus on many occasions. Nothing could be further from that balanced policy than the so-called sequester. As long as the sequester's harmful across-the-board cuts remain in effect, our economy is in jeopardy. And as long as Republicans refuse to go to conference on the budget and work out our differences, the sequester will remain in effect.

It has now been 52 days since the Senate passed its budget. Why are Republicans standing in the way? We have talked about that for weeks. We need to move forward and pass a budget that encourages economic expansion by investing in what makes America strong while cutting the deficit.

After years—years—of calling for regular order, after years of demanding the Senate pass a budget, I expected Republicans to embrace this process, but I couldn't have been more wrong. Republicans have objected to a conference half a dozen times and counting. It is obvious they are delaying for one nakedly partisan reason: They hope to delay compromise long enough to create another manufactured crisis, as the Nation once again approaches the debt limit.

The debt ceiling is something we used to just move past. The elephant never forgets, but Republicans obviously don't follow their mascot—the elephant—as they have a very short memory. Elephants don't, but the Republican Party does. They should remember the political pain they inflicted upon themselves—the Republicans—and our country over the last 2 years, in part by driving the country from one manufactured crisis to the next.

It is astonishing that Republicans would once again—as they did in the House last week—pass a bill to hold the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government hostage, if only because it is so bad for their political brand. But it is also bad for our country. The last time Republicans drove us to the brink of default, it cost the United States its pristine credit rating, and it cost the economy billions of dollars.

When I talk about Republicans, I am not speaking about Republicans generically—that is, Republicans around the country—because many Republicans, if not most, agree these manufactured crises are a waste of time and not good for our country. I am talking about and directing my attention to the Republicans in the Congress because they do not, obviously, agree with the Republicans around the country.

I hope my Republican colleagues will not take their partisan ploy as far as they did in the past. It is time to embrace regular order. It is time to get away from last-minute negotiations and short-term fixes. It is time to engage in a responsible budget process. The budget process is the only way to work through our differences without bringing the country to the verge of another artificial crisis.

Americans are tired of bitter battles over whether the Federal Government should pay the bills it has incurred. That is what we have done. We have incurred these bills, and we have to pay them. We have made purchases on credit. Americans know, as Democrats do, that Congress won't set sound fiscal policy during last-minute negotiations and Congress won't set sound fiscal policy through extortion or hostage-taking.

The Secretary of Defense is going to announce later today that 800,000 civilian employees at the Defense Department are going to get furloughs. The decision is how long it is going to be. He hopes he can make it 11 days, but probably it will be 2 weeks. That may not sound like much, but for somebody who is on a budget, a personal budget, depending on their wages, to suddenly hear that during the time until September 1 they are going to be furloughed, that they are not going to get paid for 14 days, that is a significant amount of money and can wreak havoc with their personal budget.

What this sequestration is doing is setting bad fiscal policy. It can't happen. We have to compromise. We won't set sound fiscal policy without sitting down and finding common ground between the Republican priorities and the Democratic priorities in this Congress. Passing the budget would clarify each side's values. We did that. We had a vote-athon here determining what Republicans wanted to do and what Democrats wanted to do. We finished at 5 o'clock in the morning. We thought that was a good step toward compromise, but we were wrong.

Republicans will not move forward. We have waited 52 days. The next step is to name conferees, and that will only be a first step. After conferees are named, we have to make sure they meet and work things out. Right now, Republicans are the only party standing in the way of progress in getting rid of this sequestration. If my Republican colleagues are serious about reducing the deficit and charting a course for economic growth, they should stop waiting around for another crisis and start working with Democrats today.

Finally, again, it has been 52 days since the Senate passed this bill. We need Republicans to follow regular order and move to a conference.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

IRS ACTIVITIES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, over the past few days we have heard many in the media talk about how this has been a ''rough week'' for the administration. That is because it has been a worse week for the First Amendment.

On Friday we learned that—just as we had been told by our constituents—the IRS deliberately targeted conservative groups across the country in the midst of a heated national election. Over the weekend we learned that the extent of it was even broader—even broader—than we originally thought. Then this morning we all learned the targeting wasn't limited to an IRS office out of Cincinnati, as the administration suggested last week, but that it reached all the way to the IRS headquarters right here in Washington.

What we don't know at this point is whether it jumped the fence from the IRS to the White House. But we do know this: We can't count on the administration to be forthcoming about the details of this scandal because so far they have been anything but. So this morning I am calling on the President to make available completely and without restriction everyone—everyone—who can answer the questions we have as to what has been going on at the IRS, who knew about it, and how high it went—no stonewalling, no more incomplete answers, no more misleading responses, no holding back witnesses no matter how senior their current or former positions. We need full transparency and we need full cooperation.

The American people deserve answers. The answers the IRS has now owned up to and that were uncovered by their own inspector general are an outrage—an absolute outrage. We now know the IRS targeted groups for using such terminology as—get this—''we the people'' and for educating folks about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I mean, you can't make this stuff up.

What is also clear is that government officials repeatedly failed to own up to what they knew was going on—when it turns out they'd known about it since at least the middle of 2011.

So the IRS knew what was happening—yet they continued to give us

assurances that they were applying the tax rules in a fair and impartial way.

Despite repeated assurances from the Obama administration that it was not targeting its political enemies through the IRS during the last election cycle, we have now learned that the IRS was in fact singling out conservative groups—groups who dared to speak up and express their First Amendment rights.

Let's recap what happened.

Last March, after receiving multiple claims of unusual harassment by the IRS from constituents who wanted to form tax-exempt political organizations, I and several of my colleagues sent a letter to then-IRS Commissioner Shulman questioning selective enforcement on tax exempt organizations.

Now, we learn, according to the IRS' own Inspector General, that the IRS was well aware that this selective treatment was happening at the time our letter was sent, and in fact had already acted to correct what they later called ''inappropriate'' behavior.

But there was no mention of that in the IRS initial response.

Nor was there any mention of this behavior, which was by that time well-known within the agency, in a second letter sent back to us in September 2012.

We had to wait several more months—to wait for a special investigator's report that Republicans demanded—in order to find out the truth of what was actually happening at the IRS.

In the coming days we'll learn more, and we'll start getting answers to questions like: Was the IRS deliberately misleading Republican Senators, or was it betraying profound incompetence? But, as I said, the fact is, none of this would have come out if we'd relied on the administration's own word and Republicans had not demanded the truth.

Clearly, we've only started to scratch the surface of this scandal.

The American people are looking for answers, and I am determined to help them get to the bottom of this.

Last June, I gave a very public speech in which I called out the Obama administration for serial abuses of government power in going after its political enemies in the middle of a heated national election. The left scoffed at the suggestion. The Washington Post said my speech was full of ''red herrings.'' The New York Times called my argument ''bogus''. Robert Reich called it ''bonkers.''

Well, you know what we learned last week: these abuses were even more widespread than we knew.

So it is good to see even some of my Democrat colleagues now criticizing the IRS for such blatant and thuggish abuse of power. It is preferable to the silence—or, worse, encouragement—they have demonstrated in the past.

The Chairman of the Finance Committee was correct in referring to the IRS' actions as an ''outrageous abuse of power and a breach of the public's trust.'' He's vowed to ''get to the bottom'' of what happened, and he's promised that his committee will hold hearings on all this. Those hearings should be tough, and they should aim to bring the truth to light. But our Democrat friends should also acknowledge their role in inculcating this culture of intimidation, due to repeated calls for increased IRS scrutiny of groups like the very ones that were targeted.

We owe it to all Americans to get to the bottom of this scandal, hold those responsible accountable, and put the proper safeguards in place for moving forward. Because, as the President was correct in noting yesterday, one day a Republican will inhabit the Oval Office. And when he or she does, the left will want to know that they will not be harassed for having the audacity to disagree. That an agency like the IRS will return to its proper role as a completely non-partisan and apolitical institution—not a tool for an administration of one stripe to bully and intimidate those who adhere to another.

But in order for Congress to effectively perform the oversight it needs to do, the administration will have to make everyone who can answer these questions available expeditiously.

We have even more questions today than we did last year, and we are not going to accept more half-baked responses. We want the full truth this time. And we intend to get it. 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 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half.

The Senator from California is recognized.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, pretty soon we are going to go back to the Water Resources Development Act, otherwise known as the WRDA bill. I will comment on that soon. We are making terrific progress. I hope Senators who may hear my voice would understand we would prefer to deal with a number of amendments rather than vote cloture. We have been working with almost—I can't tell you—20 different Senators to try to accommodate them, to either take their amendments, if they are noncontroversial, by voice or to make sure we can vote on their amendments or have side-by-sides.

The bottom line is it is time now—it is past time—that Senators decide if they want to move this bill forward in an open way with regular order or if they want to avoid these very important amendments that we could vote on and go straight to cloture. I hope we can continue to work through the morning.

THE IRS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, there is no room for politics at the IRS. Senator MCCONNELL is right. Senator REID is right. They have both addressed it. The issue is the IRS has to be completely neutral in politics, but they do have to go after organizations and individuals who are not abiding by the rules, whether they are right, left, center or no ideology at all.

I remember during the Bush years we saw the IRS targeting liberal churches. It was awful. They were harassing them and forcing them to show that they were nonprofits. Now we see the IRS has been targeting tea party groups. Whether they are targeting right or left, that is wrong, and anyone doing it, frankly, needs to get another job because that is against the law. We cannot have politically motivated audits or harassing people, whatever their politics may be.

Here is what we do need. We do need a fair IRS that definitely looks at whether organizations, be they left or right, are truly deserving of tax-exempt status—that is important—but not targeting one group or another. We also know the targeting of the tea party groups took place while a Bush appointee was the head of the IRS, probably—perhaps was quite unaware.

The bottom line is people at the top have to be held accountable. I agree with that. He should have known what was going on. But there is no room for this. I do believe there has to be serious action taken at the personnel level; otherwise, people will just go ho-hum.

No, not ho-hum; you cannot use a position to harass people because of their politics, regardless of where their politics may lie.

BENGHAZI

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I wish to be heard on the issue of Benghazi. I wrote an op-ed piece on this because I absolutely cannot believe what is happening with our Republican friends on this issue.

As a senior member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I can say I sat through the entire testimony of then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Not only did she sit for hours, not only was she straight from the heart and straight from the shoulder, she took full responsibility for what went on, and she ordered an independent investigation which was launched by Admiral Mullen and Ambassador Pickering.

They did an exhaustive study. What they found is that, unfortunately, we did not have enough security at that outpost. It was not an embassy, but it was definitely an outpost.

There is a lot of talk going on about how could this happen—e-mails and all the rest. Let me focus on something very important. It takes funding to protect an embassy. It takes funding to protect a consulate. It takes funding to protect an outpost. Yes, it takes funding. Who cut the funds from embassy security? The Republicans in the House, that is who—hundreds of millions of dollars. If it were not for the Democrats, it would have been cut more, because when it came here, we stood our ground. We had to accommodate their cuts. That is how the process works. So I think the Benghazi ''scandal'' starts with the Republicans looking in the mirror. Mirror mirror, who is the fairest of them all? They ought to ask: Mirror, mirror, who cut the funding for diplomatic security across this world for America? The answer: Republicans.

They cannot stand the heat so they turn it on Secretary Clinton, and that is completely wrong. I believe if we want to know what happened in Benghazi, it starts with the fact that there was not enough security. There was not enough security because the budget was cut. Secretary Clinton said that she, in hindsight, should have definitely fought against it even harder than she did. But let the record show she predicted problems. When she saw the cuts—I don't have the exact quote in front of me but to paraphrase—she said there are going to be problems here. This budget is cut too much. And she was right.

What about these talking points? I do not know if the Presiding Officer sits down with her staff to discuss how she is going to phrase something. I don't know whether the Presiding Officer does that or whether she just does it by herself. What I do or what most people do is they have a collaborative process. When we are trying to put out a press release with a whole number of agencies having to sign off on it, it is a collaborative process. At the end of the day, one statement was approved. The statement that was made by Susan Rice, her paraphrasing of the statement was: It looks like this started because of this protest, but we don't know for sure. We don't know and as soon as we know we will say.

The day of or the day after what happened in Benghazi, the President of these United States, President Obama, stood and said this was a terror attack.

Why are the Republicans playing politics with this? It is pretty clear. Their attack coincides with the Karl Rove ad against Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. They are going after her. Why? Because they are looking to the 2016 Presidential election.

I have to say, keep politics out of the IRS, keep politics out of Benghazi. Don't take four beautiful Americans who died in a tragic fashion and play politics, 2016 politics, with it. It is an outrage.

So I say they should start off by looking in the mirror, stepping to the plate, admitting that they cut too much from embassy security. If they want to hold a hearing on it, fine. If they want a hearing, they need to call the people to the table who can help us make sure this never happens again.

I will continue to speak out on Benghazi, and I will continue to speak out on whatever issues my Republican friends are pounding on. At the end of the day, the bottom line is, Who cut the money for embassy security?

If they want to divert attention from that, be my guest, but I will bring it home. Everyone knows if we had adequate security there, it could have well been a different outcome.

WRDA

If there are any Senators who have amendments, please come down to the Senate floor. Let's get this done. We hope to get this agreed to in a timely manner. Let's get to the amendments. There is a whole list of bipartisan amendments we believe have been cleared. Let's get this bill done.

The rating we have been given from the engineers is a D-plus for our infrastructure. We need to deepen our ports and there needs to be more flex control. We need to invest in water infrastructure as well as restore our wetlands. We have a lot of work to do.

We are entering into a period of time now where there is more and more extreme weather—weather we have never seen before. We need to make those investments to prevent the worst from happening. We saw what Superstorm Sandy, that one event cost: $60 billion. How does it make sense to pay after the fact? We need to invest.

This bill has a lot of important reforms. People know we need to fix our infrastructure. We need to fix our roads, bridges, and water infrastructure. It has to be done. This bill will support 550,000 jobs, and Lord knows, people need that as well.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ABUSES OF POWER

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise to speak out against the alarming reports that have recently surfaced by the IRS and the Department of Justice.

As the Federal agency tasked with administering the U.S. Tax Code, the IRS has an extraordinary influence on the lives of all Americans, from all walks of life and all points of view. As citizens we have the absolute right to expect the IRS to be free from political influence, with taxpayers treated fairly and enforcement carried out in an unbiased manner. Unfortunately, in recent days we have learned our expectations are far adrift from reality.

Last week the Internal Revenue Service acknowledged a history of targeting conservative politically active groups during their process of seeking tax-exempt status. This practice first involved flagging groups concerned about government spending and debt. Ironically, such targeting comes at a time when poll after poll indicates the Federal Government's out-of-control spending and our $17 trillion debt are top concerns for all Americans. I can tell my colleagues from my experience it is the top concern for Nebraskans.

Despite these legitimate concerns and the patriotic desire of Americans to effect change in government, the IRS worked to impede these organizations with one of the bluntest instruments of government: regulatory abuse. The IRS demanded inordinate amounts of documents from these groups, including donor lists, which served to unfairly delay the tax-exempt certification of these well-intentioned groups.

This news is alarming on multiple fronts. First and foremost, it is unacceptable that the IRS would blatantly target any of our fellow citizens, let alone groups of Americans whose views are at odds with their own. As the Washington Post noted in today's lead editorial: ''Any unequal application of the law based on ideological viewpoint is unpardonable—toxic to the legitimacy of the government's vast law enforcement authority.'' I couldn't agree more.

These activist groups were simply trying to exercise their First Amendment rights of peaceable assembly and free speech—the cornerstone of our democracy. Yet their reward for expressing concern about the direction our country is going was to be singled out in an attempt to prevent them from fully engaging in the democratic process.

It has been reported that the targeting of these Americans—and muffling of their voices on the pressing issues facing our country—began in 2010. What has happened since then? The passage of very consequential pieces of legislation, including ObamaCare and the Dodd-Frank Financial Reform Act, multiple debates on how to address our Nation's dire fiscal situation, two national elections, including last fall's Presidential election.

As alarming as the actions of the IRS are, I am even more troubled by the IRS trying to hide these actions. When an IRS official last week finally acknowledged and apologized for the targeting of conservative groups, it was more than 3 years after the practice is said to have begun. It was more than 1 year after the current Acting IRS Commissioner, Steven Miller, is reported to

have become aware of the targeting, but it doesn't stop with Mr. Miller.

As the Washington Post noted: ''Lois Lerner, the head of the IRS's tax-exempt organization office, knew about the targeting in 2011; she seemed to say Friday that she learned about it from news reports last year.''

These were not the malicious actions of a rogue agent or simply another example of government incompetence; instead, this was a clear, methodical abuse of government power to discriminate against whole groups of Americans simply because of their political beliefs.

Despite their awareness of abuse, officials from the IRS failed time after time to disclose this targeting and little effort was made to end the practice. Even as recently as their admissions on Friday, the IRS continued to engage in coverups and half-truths. In fact, IRS officials seem to go out of their way to deny wrongdoing.

In testimony last year before the House of Representatives, then-IRS Commissioner Douglas Shulman said there was ''absolutely no targeting.''

After years of neglecting to inform Congress of this practice, the long overdue admission was the result of diligent lawmakers exercising oversight along with a soon-to-be released report from the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.

The time for muted outrage and limp apologies has passed. The American people deserve nothing less than absolute assurance that this practice will not happen again. Those who are responsible must be held accountable and removed from their positions. The policies that enabled this gross abuse of power must be changed immediately.

It is also worth noting the IRS is one of the lead Federal agencies in charge of implementing ObamaCare. It does not appear the IRS is in any condition to implement this highly controversial law, particularly as public trust in this agency continues to plummet.

Just yesterday we learned of another breach of public trust and another potential violation of our First Amendment freedom—the freedom of the press. Press reports indicate the Department of Justice secretly obtained extensive telephone records of reporters and editors for the Associated Press in what the head of the news organization called a ''massive and unprecedented intrusion'' into how news organizations gather the news. According to the Associated Press's legal counsel, the records obtained included those from reporters working out of the House of Representatives press gallery.

While it is unclear at this point how many reporters were targeted and why, the effect of this data gathering is clear: intimidation of the press and suppression of free speech.

This is unacceptable. A free and unfettered press is vital to any democracy. Moreover, the scope of this information gathering is simply beyond the pale—and likely beyond precedent.

The Attorney General and the President owe the American people answers, and they owe them now. These recent abuses of power by both the IRS and the Department of Justice are just the latest episodes of this executive branch's disturbing pattern of overstepping its lawful powers.

We have seen this in the President's unconstitutional recess appointments. We have seen this in the EPA's disclosure of classified information of cattlemen to activist environmental groups. We have seen this in a lack of forthrightness with our government's response to the attacks on the U.S. consulate in Benghazi.

The result of this methodical government overreach has a powerful chilling effect on citizens. There is no place for that in a democracy. There is no place for that in the United States. The American people deserve a government that jealously guards the liberties of its citizens, not a government that tramples on our basic constitutional rights.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, in the interest of all Senators, and frankly in the interest of the people of this country, we are moving forward on the Water Resources Development Act. The question is, will we be able to clear a list of amendments, some by voice vote, and a further list of more controversial amendments by recorded vote. I am hoping that is the case. Senator VITTER and I hope that is the case, that we can get clearance on these packages of amendments. If we do not, we have to decide whether to invoke cloture, which will bring debate to a close. If we have to go that way, we have to go that way. But I am very optimistic that we can get these amendments cleared because, frankly, almost every Senator here has a stake in this very important legislation.

We have ports that are sometimes on the coast, sometimes they are inland. We have waterways. We have floods in our States. Not all of us but most of us. We have environmental restorations in our States with wetland conservation. We have work to do on our water infrastructure. Our infrastructure in this country has been rated a D-plus. That is not very heartening for the greatest country in the world. We have a weak infrastructure. Frankly, that is not good enough.

I want to read a list of supporters for our legislation. I think what people will notice is how broad-based the list is. They are either representing workers or businesses, or they are businesses themselves. They are businesses that need to ship products. So let me read this. There are environmental organizations.

The AFL–CIO supports us; 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; the American Society of Civil Engineers; the American Soybean Association; Associated Equipment Distributors; Associated General Contractors; Association of Equipment Manufacturers; the Clean Water Construction Coalition; the Concrete Reinforced Steel Institute.

I can't even go through it all, it is such a very long list. There is the National Association of Flood and Storm Management Agencies, the National Governors Association, the National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, the National Waterways Conference, Inc, the American Institute of Architects, the National Association of Manufacturers, The Nature Conservancy, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. There are more. It is such a long list.

I ask unanimous consent to place this list into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING S.601

AFL–CIO, American Association of Port Authorities, American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Foundry Society, American Public Works Association, American Road and Transportation Builders Association, American Society of Civil Engineers, American Soybean Association, Associated Equipment Distributors, Associated General Contractors of America, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Clean Water Construction Coalition, Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute.

Construction Management Association of America, International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, International Liquid Terminals Association, International Propeller Club of the United States, International Union of Operating Engineers, Laborers International Union of North America, Management Association for Private Photogrammetric Surveyors (MAPPS), NAIOP, The Commercial Real Estate Development Association, National Association of Flood and Storm Management Agencies, National Governors Association, National Grain and Feed Association, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, National Retail Federation, National Society of Professional Surveyors (NSPS), National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, National Waterways Conference, Inc.

Plumbing Manufacturers International, Portland Cement Association, The American Institute of Architects, The Fertilizer Institute, The Nature Conservancy, Transportation Construction Coalition, U.S. Chamber

of Commerce, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America Waterways Council, Inc., National Association of Manufacturers; AASHTO.

Letter signed by 160 organizations to Members of the United States Senate (April 29, 2013)

Mrs. BOXER. The point is this legislation represents jobs. This legislation represents moving products. This legislation represents flood control. This legislation represents fixing our ports, making sure we have some reforms that work well. This makes sure that when the Army Corps sets a project timeline, the resources agencies are in the room. It is very important. I have to say, as this country sees, there is a lot of partisanship going on; this is a bipartisan bill.

The bill made it through the Environment Committee without a single ''no'' vote. Since then, Senator VITTER and I have been working with all Senators, whether they are on the committee or off the committee, to meet the needs of their States to work with them. I think we have done everything in our power to help every State.

We know the last WRDA bill was 2007. We used to have a WRDA bill every couple years, but everything has gotten so controversial. What happened between then and now is a ban on earmarks. This bill used to be a bill that listed projects. We can't do that anymore. What we have to do is figure out a way to fund the needed projects while averting earmarks.

We did it by saying if there is a completed Corps report then, in fact, the project can go forward. We set up a way for future projects to be handled with the local communities coming forward.

I think we handled that issue well. We focused on flood control, ports, and environmental restoration. We have a piece that deals with the Everglades. If you have never been to the Everglades, it is a national treasure, River of Grass. That is what it is called. It is a magnificent, amazing, fabulous, environment, but it needs to be preserved and protected.

When my spouse and I went there with Senator NELSON, we went down through the Everglades. All of a sudden we see a deer jump up. The deer is actually living on the water on these little berms. It is the most remarkable thing I have ever seen.

We put WIFIA in here based on a program we call TIFIA, which will allow us to help local areas leverage their funds and build these projects more quickly. It goes on and on. We have terrible threats from flooding in places such as Sacramento, for example. We are looking at tens of thousands of Californians at risk and $7 billion in property. We say, OK, it is time to get that done.

We look at flood protection for the 200,000 residents of Fargo, ND, and Moorhead, MN. They have been fighting rising floodwaters in recent weeks. We will restore the reliability of levees that protect places such as Topeka, KS. It goes on to Texas. I could name literally every State in the Union that has something at stake.

Mr. SANDERS. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mrs. BOXER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Senator from California and the chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee for her work on this important project. I do wish to mention we have in Vermont one small concern that I hope will be addressed in this bill. In Vermont we have suffered through Irene, and it was a devastating experience for many communities in the State and for businesses.

The problem we are having now is that we have State regulations which correctly require that culverts be built which can, in fact, deal with the real problems of flooding. Unfortunately, what FEMA is prepared to pay for is inadequate infrastructure—culverts, among other things, that will not address the problem if we have to deal with another problem such as Irene.

This is a very modest proposal. Senator LEAHY and I feel strongly about this issue. I know the chairperson is sympathetic. There appears to be some problems on the other side, and I very much hope we can resolve this.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes. There is an amendment, I would say to my friend through the Chair, on our list that we have agreed to, Senator VITTER and I. There will probably be a vote on this proposal. I will ask my staff is that correct, on the Leahy-Sanders amendment on the culverts if it is on the list.

Mr. SANDERS. I had heard there was some objection on the other side.

Mrs. BOXER. We are trying to work out the objections, but we will have a vote on it if we cannot. We are working on it.

Mr. SANDERS. It is very important to Senator LEAHY and me that be addressed.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator. We are doing everything in our power. This shows the American people right on the floor of the Senate the way Senators have been working with us. I wish to say to my friend I am so proud he is on the Environment and Public Works Committee and how he has looked after his State. He has some very important things in this bill.

As a matter of fact, his work on the extreme weather title is very important and would allow us to prevent these terrible floods before they start. Yes, we are looking at things such as this in every State. We are trying to do everything in our power to meet every Senator's needs.

Sometimes what happens is it is kind of like that pop-up game. Something pops up over here, and it is OK, but then something else pops up over here. It is the legislative fix we are trying to meet and get to here, the legislative fix so every State feels comfortable.

This is an important bill. There is no other bill that deals with the Everglades. There is no other bill that will deal with the Chesapeake Bay. There is no other bill that is possible that would allow us to move forward with these important flood control issues, because when we ended earmarks, we had no way to authorize any programs.

This Boxer-Vitter bill is not just an important bill, it is an essential bill. We need to move forward.

The extreme weather title I talked about that Senator SANDERS helped us write will require the corps and the National Academy of Science to jointly evaluate options for reducing risks related to future extreme weather events. Let me say that again. Right now the corps is not authorized to look ahead and say, given the extreme weather we are having, what is it we can do across this country to prepare. This study will give us a roadmap to that.

Without this bill, we don't have it. Without this bill, we have no reforms in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. People are paying good money into the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for dredging our ports. Yet the full amount of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is not going for those uses.

We make moves toward capturing more of those funds. The smaller ports have a good title, the Great Lakes, the seaports that are large donors such as Los Angeles and Long Beach make progress. I think it is a win-win. Our bill is certainly not perfect. Every one of us could write it in ways that benefit our States even more, I think there is no question, starting with the chairman of the committee. But we have to deal with everybody's issues, everybody's concerns, everybody's problems.

We support 500,000 jobs in this bill. There are very few bills that come before us that could make that claim.

I think we can show the American people we can work together. We have this one last stage, and we are working so hard.

I wish to say to my staff—who are still working. My staff and Senator VITTER's staff have worked nonstop. I am talking about Saturday, Sunday, last night. They were still in the office at 11 o'clock. I just want to praise them. People don't see that. People don't understand these bills don't magically appear.

Dealing with every Senator, I think everyone knows every one of us has a very strong personality. They truly care about their States and fight for their States. It is tough to try to preserve everyone's rights and everybody's wishes. We have to work with Senator MIKULSKI in a very good way and Senator SHELBY. Senator LANDRIEU has worked hard on this bill, and now she has an amendment we are trying to dispose of. I hope we will get the approval to do that.

Once we finish our work, Congressman SHUSTER, Chairman SHUSTER over in the House, needs to pass a bill or could take up our bill and pass it.

When I read this list to you, I didn't even get to all of the names. This is

one of the broadest coalitions I have ever seen behind any piece of legislation. It is a huge and important coalition. It represents America. It is people who work every day at building the infrastructure, utilizing the infrastructure, and making sure our homes are safe from flooding. The list includes the National Governors Association. It is a rarity to have that kind of a list.

At this point, we are supposed to vote at noon, and we will be back to you with some further comments.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be divided and controlled in the usual form.

Mrs. BOXER. While we discuss how we are going to proceed, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. 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. I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls be divided equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the sexual assault crisis that is facing our military and the need to act immediately to address this problem.

Last week, the Department of Defense released a report estimating that over 26,000 servicemembers—and this includes men and women—were sexually assaulted in 2012, and this is up from approximately 19,000 in 2010. This is astounding and totally unacceptable.

Even more alarming is the fact the number of cases actually reported remains just a fraction of the total. Only 13 percent of these cases are actually reported. Let me repeat that: Only 13 percent of assaults were actually reported in 2012.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and a Senator from North Carolina, home to the third largest military population in the country, I find these statistics appalling. The brave servicemembers who put their lives on the line should not have to worry about their personal safety on bases in the United States and around the world. The men and women who are already tasked with so much, who have vowed to serve and protect our country, should feel they are afforded the same protection in return, but they are not.

The stories I hear from our female servicemembers are astounding. One woman marine was raped by an acquaintance, her fellow marine, in her barracks one night. No one heard her cries for help. The next day she did report the assault to her chain of command. An investigation was launched from there. While that investigation was underway, from June to January, she was heavily alienated by her peers. She was called derogatory names, and her sergeant major even told her the assault was her fault because she must have given her rapist a reason to think it was OK. In the end the official investigation found her claim was ''unfounded'' because there were no witnesses, and she did not know at the time she should have gone to the hospital and had a rape kit analysis done.

Other servicemembers—women who have served on forward operating bases in Afghanistan—have told me they limit their water intake throughout the day so they do not have to use the latrines in the middle of the night and by doing so put themselves at further risk of being assaulted. No one should ever have to deal with those kinds of concerns, especially when they are already putting their lives on the line to protect our Nation.

The Department of Defense has reported that half of all servicemembers who were victims of sexual assault say they are actually afraid to report out of fear of retaliation or that their confidentiality will not be maintained. Others believe reporting the crime will jeopardize their military career. They fear they would not receive opportunities for advancement—opportunities they have earned through service to our country.

This is just totally unacceptable. The men and women of our Armed Forces deserve far more. We have to deal with this problem once and for all, and I am encouraged the National Defense Authorization Act of 2013 includes specific directives to reduce the alarming number of assaults that take place and often go unreported.

Specifically, these provisions include independent review boards to examine how sexual assault cases are handled, the creation of a special victims unit, ensuring convicted offenders are permanently barred from the military, improving how the military collects data on this topic, and several other needed provisions.

During his confirmation process, Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel said he was committed to fully implementing these directives, and I urge Secretary Hagel to report to Congress on the progress made as swiftly as possible. I still believe Congress should and must do more. The steps I believe we should consider are, first, the creation of a special victims counsel that would include advocates who can support victims and help them report incidents of sexual assault.

As I mentioned, too many victims do not come forward because they are either afraid of retaliation, they do not believe their confidentiality will be maintained, or they do not have faith in the military justice system. As in the case of the woman I described who had been raped, she did not know she should have had an analysis of rape actually done. These victims advocates would have given her that advice.

Second, we are fortunate in the Senate to have a number of former prosecutors engaged on this issue. Over the last 20 years, they and their colleagues have made great strides in handling sexual assault cases in the civilian world, and I believe we should take the lessons learned from that process to improve the military's response—lessons including proper training for tackling evidentiary issues and addressing victims' needs.

Third, commanding officers can overturn verdicts of jury trials, as happened in the Air Force earlier this year. These are commanding officers, they are not appellate judges; they are not legally trained. They should not have the authority to overturn a verdict. I believe we should review that authority as it applies to sexual assault cases, something Defense Secretary Hagel has indicated should be a priority.

Finally, we need to explore whether the present Uniform Code of Military Justice is up to the task of addressing the problem of sexual assault. I believe both the Armed Forces and the cause of justice would be well served by a vigorous debate in Congress on whether sexual assault cases can be effectively handled within the chain of command or whether this process needs to occur independently. Significant overhauls of the Uniform Code of Military Justice should not be approached lightly, but we owe it to our servicemembers to think outside the box and consider all possibilities.

These men and women of our military cannot wait another day, and they should not have to wait another day for this problem to be addressed. I urge my colleagues to join me in taking concrete steps to address this issue and to

protect the men and women who sacrifice so much for us each and every day.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senators BOXER and VITTER have worked hard for days now to come up with a finite list of amendments to complete work on this very important bill, the Water Resources Development Act. In just a minute I am going to ask consent that we postpone the vote scheduled for 12 today until 2:30. We will come back in session, I hope, at 2:15 today. When we come back in session I want Chairman BOXER to report to the Senate if they have been able to work out an agreement between the two of them. If they have, I want her to ask the consent and when she asks that consent, if there is an agreement, we will work through a number of amendments they have come up with to complete work on this bill.

If there is no agreement at 2:15 when she comes in, then we will vote at 2:30 on cloture. I hope that is not necessary. But I am not going to have any ''I'm objecting on behalf of somebody else.'' If it is not done, I don't care who objects, we are going to move to cloture. That is what I believe should be done.

It is a lot of work to get this agreement. I think tentatively it has been done. We know how things work; one Senator can block all this. I hope that is not the case. I know the block will not come from our side. Senator BOXER has the complete confidence of all members of our conference. They recognize that she has worked hard on this and has done the right thing—as she always does.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 601 be moved to 2:30 p.m.

I will ask, while she is on the floor, the Senator from California, the chairman of the committee, is there anything I have missed in my statement?

Mrs. BOXER. If my friend will yield, through the Chair, I think he has covered it. Basically what I want to make sure people know as they go to their various conference meetings this afternoon is that we have a very fair list. I think it probably has more Republican amendments than Democratic amendments. We have done everything to reach an agreement.

But I also want to support my leader. If there is objection to this important list of amendments, we will go straight to cloture. I want everyone to understand, without this bill there will be no more water infrastructure projects because there is no path forward. Since we ended earmarks, this is the one bill that will make sure there is a path forward. Without water infrastructure earmarks you cannot keep commerce moving at the ports, you can't do flood control, you can't restore the Everglades or the Chesapeake. I strongly support what my leader is doing but I also hope colleagues will please allow us to move forward, make the cloture vote unnecessary. But we are going to have that cloture vote, if necessary, at 2:30.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 601 be moved to 2:30 p.m. this afternoon; that if cloture is invoked, it will be considered as having been invoked at 12 noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

THE BUDGET

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the continuing efforts by a minority of this body to block a Federal budget by blocking a conference with the House to find compromise. I spoke about this one week ago, but the stalemate continues.

Today there was an announcement that in my Commonwealth, 90,000 civilian Department of Defense employees and hundreds of thousands of DOD civilians nationally will be furloughed for 11 days between now and the end of the year. This furlough announcement—along with ample other evidence we have discussed in this body in the last few weeks—demonstrates that budgetary gridlock, budgetary indecision, and budgetary stalling has real-life consequences.

I rise to implore my Senate colleagues to do what is right and to do the job the American public has sent us here to do. This is not only about budgets, it is also about something even bigger than budgets. It is about something fundamental to the entire system of government we have; that is, the willingness to work together to find common ground and find solutions.

I truly view this budgetary stalemate as an attack on compromise. We cannot survive as a Senate or as a Congress or as a nation without finding common ground.

I know the Presiding Officer, like me, was out on the campaign trail a lot in 2012. I heard a repeated critique of this body during the campaign. I heard that this body was unable to produce a budget since 2009. There were some arguments back and forth about whether that was technically accurate. As I looked at it as a candidate, it was at least clear that a normal budgetary order in accordance with the Budget Act of 1974 had not been followed for a number of years.

As a candidate and citizen of the Commonwealth and country, I said: If I have the opportunity to serve in this body, I am going to work with my colleagues to make sure we do the public's business in the way that was contemplated in that statute.

Although I didn't ask, I was assigned to be on the Senate Budget Committee as soon as I got to this body. I immediately made clear—along with many other Members, both newcomers and Members who had been on the committee for a while, including the new committee chair, Senator MURRAY—that this body needed to return to normal budgetary procedures.

It seemed as though over the past few years, Congress tried a lot of other things—supercommittees, sequesters, and continuing resolutions—none of which were working to do the Nation's fiscal business. Along with many Senators of both parties, I said the right strategy for us is to return to normal budgetary procedure. We can make it work just as Congresses in the past have made it work.

I entered the body on January 3—more than 4 months ago—with the profound belief that we needed to embrace the normal procedures about doing a budget. Those normal procedures are known to all. People read in textbooks about how bills become laws. Essentially, in the spring the Senate and House, under normal procedure, would each pass a budget. Those budget bills would likely be significantly different.

Even when the parties controlling the two Houses are the same, the two House budgets are different. There is then some effort to find a compromise between the two differing versions often through use of a conference committee. Once that compromise is found, then that compromise is sent back to each House for a vote, and it then becomes the guidance that is used by the Appropriations Committee to write the bill's appropriating dollars for the next fiscal year. That is the normal process, and it is the way Congress has operated under both parties, under split Houses for many years.

Here is the good news: The Senate Budget Committee embraced this challenge. Chairman MURRAY worked with staff and members of the committee to create a draft budget, and then early in mid-March we had robust committee hearings, a full debate, and a full amendment process about a Senate budget.

In March the committee ultimately considered the chairman's mark for 13 hours, and we had a full amendment process. We voted on over 30 amendments, the majority of which were made by Republican members of the committee. We debated and voted on those amendments. I sat there and voted for a number of the Republican amendments to the budget that then became part of the ultimate committee product.

Republican members offered numerous amendments. In response to an amendment offered by a Republican member, I remember my colleague from Maine, Senator KING, asking: If I vote for your amendment, are you going to vote for this committee budget? The answer was given in public.

The answer was: No. I want you to vote for my amendment, but I am still

going to vote against the budget. I am going to vote against it because the House will produce a Republican budget, the Senate will produce a Democratic budget, and then we can get those two budgets together and find compromise going forward.

That was what was said when we met as a Budget Committee. At the end of the day, the Senate Budget Committee passed that budget in mid-March, and passed it without a single Republican vote. The budget was passed and forwarded to the Senate floor.

I know the Presiding Officer remembers this, as it is emblazoned upon all of our memories. We took the budget to the Senate floor in late March. The budget was the subject of floor activity in this body for 39½ hours. We don't do a lot around here for 39½ hours, but the budget was subject to floor activity and numerous speeches by Senators, just like me, over the course of that week.

The entire body then considered, debated, and voted on nearly 110 amendments to the budget. We passed 77 of the amendments. The amendments that were passed were offered by both Democrats and Republicans. I remember voting for many of the Republican amendments that then became part of the ultimate budget bill. This amendment activity—110 amendments, 77 passing—is significantly greater than has been the norm in earlier Senate deliberations.

At 5 a.m. on the morning of Saturday, March 23, the Senate passed its first budget in 4 years. Not a single Republican voted to support that budget even though many of their amendments had been included either in the committee or in the floor amendment process we had during those hours in late March.

I have done a lot of budgets as a mayor and as a Governor. Along with my colleagues on the Budget Committee, I worked hard in the committee and on the floor. My staff—as well as the Senate Budget Committee staff and the staffers of all the members on that committee—also worked hard on this bill. I am proud we passed a budget on March 23, and I believe firmly if that budget were implemented today, without changing one apostrophe, comma, or punctuation mark, it would do a number of things: It would help create jobs, it would help the economy, and it would deal with our debt and deficit in a fiscally responsible way.

I also understood this: that the Senate budget we passed was not the final product. It was the Senate's best effort to find a budget that would move our economy and our country forward. We knew that budget would be placed in a conference with the House budget. The House passed their budget the same week. We knew there would have to be discussion and compromise in an effort to find common ground, but we did our best version and the House, I assume, feels as though they did their very best version.

The two budgets are very different. I deeply believe the Senate budget is superior and the American people, watching the discussions between the two Houses and comparing them, would reach the same conclusion. But at the very least I know this: The American public are entitled to see that debate and discussion. They are entitled to look at the House budget and look at the Senate budget and compare them, just as the conferees would be comparing. They are entitled to watch that process of dialog and debate and, hopefully, compromise. That is, in fact, what they have sent us here to do, and that is what Congresses have done for many years and decades.

The process of a budget conference would not be an easy one because the two budgets are quite different, but there is no substitute for dialog and compromise. In fact, I think all of us in this body know dialog and compromise at its core are what we are about here.

When the Framers of our Constitution, in article I, set up a legislative branch with two Houses—a bicameral branch—and required that most items to pass through Congress would have to go through both branches, they understood very well what they were doing. They were creating a system of checks and balances that required dialog and listening and compromise in order to do good for the benefit of the Nation. At our very root, a bicameral legislature, existing in a system of checks and balances, with a judiciary and an executive branch, depends upon public servants who are willing to find common ground.

Well, since March 23—nearly 7 weeks—a small minority of Senators, often one at a time, has done all it can to block a budget conference from even beginning and, therefore, to block compromise. As we have taken steps to begin a budget conference with the House leadership to put these two budgets together and find compromise, again and again individual Senators have stood on the floor of this body and, in my view, abused the UC rules to block a conference from even beginning. Even as budgetary indecision and sequester are leading to furloughs, they have blocked a conference from even beginning. Even as we are seeing reductions in the number of people who are able to receive Meals On Wheels or children in Head Start, they have abused Senate rules to block a budget conference from even beginning.

I serve on the Armed Services Committee. We are working on the Defense authorization bill now, and we have the service chiefs come in and talk to us every day about the challenges they are facing, about the degraded readiness. One-third of our air combat command units are standing down because of these budgetary challenges. We hear the steady drumbeat, day in and day out, about degradation in readiness and challenges to our modernization programs. We had a hearing about the Marine Corps this morning. Yet even as we are hearing this testimony in hearings in the morning and in the afternoon, Members come to this floor and stand and try to block a budget conference from even beginning.

This is very serious. When we are talking about the readiness of our military who are facing challenges—just pick up today's paper and read headlines about Syria or North Korea or Iran—as we are facing continuing challenges in Afghanistan, to have Members in this body block efforts to find compromise is very chilling.

Let's be clear about what this is. This is not just an attack on the budget itself, because those who want to attack the budget voted against it in committee. Those who didn't like the budget had a chance and voted against it on the floor. Even in the event a conference committee would produce a budget compromise, that compromise would come back and those who didn't like that budget would have a chance to vote against it again. That is how we attack a budget. That is how we express disagreement with a budget. A Member stands on the floor of this body and votes against it. The Members have had a chance to do that in committee and on the floor and they will have a chance to do it again at the end of the conference process.

The effort that has been underway in this body since March 23 is not fundamentally an attack on budgets, it is an attack on the whole notion of compromise. To block a conference committee from beginning so House and Senate conferees can sit down and listen to each other and try to iron out their differences is fundamentally an attack on compromise. We have seen that too much in this body. Anyone in this room knows that, if a person is not a hermit, if a person is a member of a family or a member of a parish council or a member of the PTA or part of an organizing group of a Little League, if a person has a business or if a person is elected to a school board or to the Senate—everybody knows if we participate in life, it has to be about compromise. Our Founders knew it and they created a system that relies upon compromise.

What we have seen in this body since March 23, after people had a full opportunity to amend and vote on a budget, is not about a budget, it is an attack on compromise.

I conclude by saying that just as no family can succeed without compromise, just as no community, just as no business, just as no school board, just as no group of people can succeed without compromise, Congress, the Senate, and our Nation cannot succeed without a spirit of compromise.

So I implore and I ask my colleagues to rethink the path they are on, to stand down in this attack upon compromise, to allow the budget to go to conference so we can do the tough work of listening to each other and finding common ground for the good of the American people.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. What is the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering S. 601.

Mrs. BOXER. We are working on our finite list, and we expect to make our unanimous consent shortly.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. While we have some down time on the floor to wait for the 2:30 hour—I believe we are going to have some action on the WRDA bill, which is very important—I thought I would take this time to talk about an amendment I have pending on the WRDA bill. It is an amendment that I offered for myself, Senator VITTER, Senator SCHUMER, and Senator MENENDEZ. Several other Senators have expressed their strong support over the weekend on both sides, Republicans and Democrats.

There are many States in the Union, and Louisiana is only one—the State of Florida, the State of California, the State of Mississippi, the State of Alabama, other coastal States and, yes, some inland States—that are going to be terribly disadvantaged if the Landrieu-Vitter amendment does not pass on the WRDA bill. What is going to happen because of a reform bill—parts of it were necessary, but there were some parts that, in my view and in the view of many Senators, should never have passed as part of the flood insurance reform bill.

The reason some of us are fairly exercised about this is the bill itself, the reform bill to reform the Flood Insurance Program of the United States, never came to this floor for debate. It came out of the Banking Committee, and then it was basically tucked into a larger omnibus bill, which happens sometimes. This is not the only or the first time it has happened. It is very unfortunate that it happened with this bill.

In our haste and in our good intentions to try to put national flood insurance on a more even financial keel, we have put the ability, unfortunately, in this bill for flood insurance rates to go up 20 percent a year on hundreds of thousands of first homes in this country—not second homes, not vacation homes, but first homes. The Landrieu-Vitter amendment doesn't try to solve this whole problem on the WRDA bill. It is going to take a little bit of work, which we can do, working together in good faith on behalf of our constituents.

This is big government at its worst—passing a reform bill and making the cure worse than the disease. In this case, for my constituents and for constituents in Florida, Mississippi, California, and New Jersey, we would have taken the disease as opposed to the cure. The cure is going to kill us. We weren't sure about the disease, but the cure is going to kill us.

Our papers have been editorializing for days since this issue has come to the surface on the WRDA bill. Our largest newspaper or second largest newspaper editorialized this morning and spoke about a quite senior woman—in her eighties—who lives with her daughter, who is in her sixties, in Plaquemines Parish. It is very typical to have families of different generations living together. They were in Plaquemines Parish before the flood insurance measure was ever passed.

We were living in Louisiana before this Nation was a nation. Our people have been down there a long time living on this water. They built their houses centuries—not this couple, but we had houses built centuries before this bill was ever passed. Now, what the law—the cure that is going to kill us—says is that this is their choice: They can elevate their home 18 feet, which probably would cost $50,000, which they don't have, or their flood insurance will go up to something on the order of $15,000 or $20,000 a year, which they can't pay.

One may say: That is too bad. Let them sell the house.

Their house has no value.

This is a dilemma not just for the people of Louisiana but for people from Mississippi, Alabama, California, and New York. We have a solution. The solution I have offered is temporary until we can be smart and think about how to fix this, and it doesn't cost anything.

I am begging Members to allow us this short period of time to get this cure corrected. We can find a way to make this program balance. We don't have to do that today, at this moment. Give us a little breathing room to figure this out. I believe this program could be self-sustaining. I am not an expert on insurance, but I am very fortunate to serve with colleagues who are. I am sure we can put our heads together and come up with something better than what is coming down like a firehose out there on lots of people in communities in Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama.

My understanding is—the managers are not on the floor—that there are about eight or nine amendments that have been worked out, hopefully, on both sides of the aisle. One of them is the Landrieu-Vitter fix, the flood insurance amendment that has zero cost to the taxpayer—zero. It is a temporary reprieve of rates going up for grandfathered homes, which affects many people in Florida, Louisiana, and in other States as well. It has a zero score. The CBO has testified. We have letters from CBO.

Please give our people this breathing room. I promise that I will work in good faith.

There are probably a few other things that need to be fixed in this flood insurance bill as we find a better way to lower costs to the taxpayer and to provide opportunities for people to live on a mountaintop if they choose, in a valley or on the coast, but to be safely sustainable. We all need to work together as a country. We can find an affordable way for our people—and not just millionaires—to be able to live on the coast. We have to make room for our fishermen, our agriculture, our farmers, and our aquaculture folks who have invested a good amount of money in helping to build more sustainable fisheries for our Nation. We have people who have to live near the water for commerce and trade. Not everybody lives by the water to vacation. Some people live by the water to work, which is an essential part of the work to keep this country moving forward. We have to figure out a way to allow them to do that in an affordable manner without completely undermining the coastal counties of our country.

Senator SCHUMER is on the floor now with some others who also have been working. I thank them for working over the weekend. Let's help them get this list of amendments cleared. One of those amendments will be the Landrieu-Vitter amendment on fixing temporarily—giving some reprieve to thousands of homeowners who are desperate for a signal from us that we get it, we understand. We didn't correct this appropriately. We are going to respond, as a democracy should, and give them a little signal today that as the WRDA bill moves forward, we can fine-tune and modify this flood insurance reform.

I understand we are ready for action on WRDA.

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.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 847, 899 AS MODIFIED, 895, 894, 867, 872, 912, 880, 904, 884, 870 AS MODIFIED, 911 AS MODIFIED, 882, 903 AS MODIFIED, 906 AS MODIFIED, 893, 898, 861 AS MODIFIED, 907, AND 896 EN BLOC

Mrs. BOXER. For the interest of Senators, we are going to very shortly propound a consent agreement that has been cleared by Senator VITTER and myself and we will see where that takes us. If it needs to be modified, we may well do that, but I want Senators to know it is our hope we can avert a cloture vote at this time.

I ask unanimous consent the following amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc: Baucus No. 847, Boxer-Vitter No. 899 as modified, Inhofe No. 895, Wicker No. 894, Inhofe No. 867, Boozman No. 872, Thune No. 912, Cornyn No. 880, Murkowski No. 904, Klobuchar No. 884, Wyden No. 870 as modified, Cochran No. 911 as modified, Carper No. 882, Murkowski No. 903 as modified, Durbin No. 906 as modified, Levin No. 893, Collins No. 898, Cardin No. 861 as modified, Brown-Graham No. 907, and Wyden No. 896; further, that the only remaining amendments in order to the bill be the following: Inhofe No. 797, Barrasso No. 868, Sanders No. 889, Johnson and Landrieu—Johnson No. 891, Landrieu No. 888, Coburn No. 815, Coburn No. 816, Boozman No. 822, Merkley No. 866, Udall of New Mexico No. 853, and Hoeven No. 909; further, that no second-degree amendments be in order to any of the amendments prior to votes in relation to the amendment; that the time until 5 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees for debate on all of the amendments; that at 5 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the amendments in the order I have listed; that all after the first vote be 10-minute votes; that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote; that the following amendments be subjected to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold: Sanders No. 899, Johnson No. 891, Landrieu No. 888, and Barrasso No. 868; finally, that upon disposition of the Hoeven amendment No. 909, the cloture motion be withdrawn, the Senate proceed to vote on the passage of S. 601, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I want to point out there is one amendment in this package that is very troubling to me. Under the current flood insurance law we passed just 10 months ago, we put in place a mechanism to diminish the subsidization that occurs now where homeowners in low-risk areas are made to subsidize homeowners in high-risk areas by the nature of the way premiums are set. The existing law is designed to diminish significantly that unfair subsidy that occurs, and I think that is why the chairman and the ranking member of the Banking Committee and many others of our colleagues oppose this amendment.

If this amendment goes through, the Landrieu amendment No. 888, then for 5 years this reform cannot take place and that means not only do people in low-risk areas continue subsidizing people in high-risk areas, but because people in high-risk areas are paying lower premiums than what they ought to pay to reflect the risk they are taking, it creates the moral hazard of a risk to continue building in high-risk areas with the expectation this will continue and therefore jeopardizes taxpayer funds.

This is already a program that is $24 billion in debt and that is the reason I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, it is my understanding, listening to my friend from Pennsylvania, that he objects to the Landrieu amendment. It is also my understanding that Senator LANDRIEU would like to be heard on this matter. Then I will propound a new consent request. I ask she get the floor and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I wish to clarify through the Chair that the Senator from Pennsylvania is not objecting to the long list of amendments as described by the chairman of the committee, he is only objecting to amendment No. 888 and objecting to a vote on amendment No. 888 by myself, Senator VITTER, Senator SCHUMER, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator LAUTENBERG, and others; is that correct? Is the Senator objecting to a vote or to the amendment?

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, my understanding is there is a unanimous consent request for a series of amendments on this bill, and I am objecting to that consent request because it contains the Landrieu amendment No. 888.

Ms. LANDRIEU. So it is my understanding, Madam President, through the Chair, that the Senator is objecting to a vote on the amendment. He is certainly entitled, in my view, to vote against the amendment. That is what debate on the floor is all about. But he is not expressing his objection to that. He is objecting to having a vote on the amendment; is that correct?

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, as I said earlier, this is a matter that has been litigated and adjudicated in this body. We have had a vote on this. This has not come back through committee. This would cause considerable risk to taxpayers. If the Senator from Louisiana believes this is something that needs to be addressed yet again, despite the fact that 10 months ago we had a vote on this—and we did vote, then I would be happy to work with the Senator on how we might address that. But my objection still remains.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I am just trying to get clarification through the Chair from the Senator from Pennsylvania. I understand he objects to my amendment. That is not what I am asking him. I would just like a yes or no answer; is he objecting to a vote on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. I think I answered the question.

Ms. LANDRIEU. He did not answer the question clearly, but since he will not answer the question, which is unfortunate, I wish to make it clear for the record that the Senator from Pennsylvania is objecting to a vote on the Landrieu-Vitter amendment. He most certainly is entitled to vote no on our amendment. Other Senators may vote no. But I want the record to show he is saying, no, we cannot even have a vote.

If I could have 5 more minutes. I will take 3 more minutes. I want to say how disappointing it is to me because the Senator is unfortunately wrong on several counts.

No. 1, this floor never voted on the Biggert-Waters bill. As I said a dozen times, the bill came out of the Banking Committee with broad bipartisan support. A different bill was passed by the House. Then these two bills that were very different and tried to ''reform the flood insurance program'' were tucked into a conference committee report. I want the record to show this floor never voted on the reform, and the cure that came out of the conference committee is worse than the disease.

Second, I want to tell the Senator from Pennsylvania I think this is going to come back to haunt him because the people of his own State are going to be negatively affected by his actions today.

There are 74,000 people in Pennsylvania—4,000 in Philadelphia alone but 74,000 people in Pennsylvania who pay flood insurance rates. Under the proposal that never came to this Senate floor, those rates in some cases can go up 20 or 30 percent in 1 year.

For the record, I want to put in: In Florida, 2 million people are affected; Texas, 645,000; Louisiana, 486,000; California, 256,000; New Jersey, 240,000; South Carolina, 205,000; New York, 178,000; North Carolina, 138,000—I am not going to read all of this—Virginia, 116,000; and in Pennsylvania, 74,000. I could go on. I ask unanimous consent this list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NFIP POLICIES BY STATE

[County/City Examples]

State/County/City	Policies in Force
1 Florida	2,060,245
City of Fort Lauderdale	42,126
2 Texas	645,615
City of Houston	132,529
3 Louisiana	486,580
Jefferson Parish	121,501
4 California	256,095
City of Sacramento	46,758
5 New Jersey	240,857

NFIP POLICIES BY STATE—Continued

[County/City Examples]

State/County/City	Policies in Force
Ocean City	17,370
6 South Carolina	205,146
Beaufort County	54,201
7 New York	178,863
New York City	44,415
8 North Carolina	138,605
Dare County	22,157
9 Virginia	116,275
City of Virginia Beach	25,530
10 Georgia	96,906
Chatam County	31,870
11 Mississippi	75,186
Harrison County	20,271
12 Pennsylvania	74,006
Philadelphia	4,330
13 Maryland	73,696
Ocean City	27,232
14 Massachusetts	59,420
Plymouth County	10,748
15 Hawaii	59,290
Honolulu	37,398
16 Alabama	58,048
Baldwin County	26,985
17 Puerto Rico	55,964
Puerto Rico	50,935
18 Illinois	48,498
Cook County	17,777
19 Washington	45,200
Skagit County	5,728
20 Ohio	41,920
Ottawa County	1,962
21 Connecticut	41,710
Fairfield County	17,140
22 Arizona	35,000
Scottsdale	8,672
23 Oregon	34,764
Portland	2,148
24 Tennessee	33,745
Davidson County	7,377
25 Indiana	30,933
Indianapolis	5,852
26 Missouri	26,640
St. Louis County	1,229
27 Michigan	26,247
City of Dearborn Heights	1,232
28 Delaware	26,011
Sussex County	21,250
29 Kentucky	25,179
Louisville-Jefferson County	5,503
30 Arkansas	21,459
Little Rock	1,487

Ms. LANDRIEU. Second, I have a letter from the National Association of Home Builders—not a liberal-leaning organization and most certainly not a group that just works in Louisiana. People build homes all over America including in Pennsylvania. They sent a strong letter urging us to adopt the Landrieu-Vitter amendment which will just temporarily put a hold on raising rates 20 to 40 to 60 to 80 percent on grandfathered homes that were around before the flood insurance program was ever invented by Members of this body, well before I was even a Senator.

What this says is the program should be widely available, it should be affordable, so people can live in many different places of America. This is one big great country with lots of different kinds of neighborhoods. That is what the National Association of Home Builders said, and I am going to submit their letter.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2013.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: On behalf of the more than 140,000 members of the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB), I am writing to express strong support for amendment #888 (sponsored by Senators Mary Landrieu and David Vitter) to S. 601, the Water Resources and Development Act of 2013. This amendment would delay flood insurance premium increases on certain properties for 5 years. NAHB believes a financially-stable National Flood Insurance Program is in all of our interests, yet we must ensure that overall affordability is not adversely affected.

The Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (BW12) reauthorized the NFIP for five years and included a phase-in to actuarial rates to help return the program to sound financial footing. Also included in the law was the requirement for a study and a report on the affordability of NFIP premiums and the effects of increased premiums on low-income homeowners.

The BW12 phase-in to actuarial rates is separated into two different segments of policy-holders. Some homeowners will start to see premium increases in October, while the others will start in 2014, once the new scientific rate maps have been drawn and approved. Over the next year and a half, many hard working homeowners in flood-prone areas (and newly-drawn flood prone areas) could see large flood insurance premium increases. The Landrieu-Vitter amendment ensures that the later changes are delayed to help Congress re-examine consumer affordability and answer other questions about implementing BW12. NAHB believes this amendment is a first step in balancing consumer affordability and re-establishing the solvency of the program.

The homebuilding industry depends on the NFIP to be annually predictable, universally available, affordable and fiscally viable. This program enables the home building industry to deliver safe, decent, affordable housing to consumers in all areas of the country. We urge you to support this important amendment that balances the fiscal solvency of the NFIP and consumer affordability.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. TOBIN III,
Senior Vice President & Chief Lobbyist.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Evidently, the Senator from Pennsylvania doesn't understand this. That is fine. We have disagreements and I respect him. He should vote no. But to stop a vote?

The third and final argument I am going to make in my 30 seconds left, we worked so hard on this amendment that it doesn't even cost anything.

We have a zero score—zero. It does not cost one dime, not one dollar, and still the Senator from Pennsylvania, with 74,000 people in his State who could be affected, is objecting to even voting on giving people a chance. We are going to be on this issue again; it is going to come back.

I praise Senators BOXER and VITTER for their work on WRDA. It is a shame that we cannot even get a vote to postpone this issue to try to see if we could make it more affordable. It doesn't cost anything.

I say to the Senator from California that I am sorry for holding this up. I thought this was important. We worked on it all week. Everybody is cleared except for one Senator from Pennsylvania.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise to very briefly agree with two key points made by my colleague from Louisiana. First of all, as far as the substance of this amendment goes, I wholeheartedly agree with her, and that is why I am a sponsor of this amendment as well.

We will visit this issue again because it is vitally important that we get it right—not just for the tens of thousands of folks from Louisiana but for millions of Americans across the country. We need to get this right, and we don't yet have it right.

Secondly and also very importantly, I absolutely agree that we should have debate and votes on the Senate floor. I don't think any Member should object to just having a vote on a matter.

My colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, has been a leading advocate to have an open amendment process on the Senate floor, to allow votes, and I agreed with that. I fought with the chair of the committee to have an open amendment process in the context of this bill, and we got it. Now, at the end of the day, he objects to even having a vote on a particular amendment he doesn't like. The Senator cannot have it both ways. If the Senator wants an open amendment process on the floor, as I do, then he will have to accept that he may have to take votes on amendments he doesn't agree with. I accept that; I wish he would accept that. I hope it will continue and grow from here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I think everybody who is listening to this understands that there has been a disagreement here—a pretty tough one.

I have to praise Senator LANDRIEU for saying: Look, I am going to bring this fight back another day. She has told me she would be willing to support a new, modified request—the same one I made about 10 minutes ago—and take out Johnson amendment No. 891 and Landrieu amendment No. 888. I believe the new request will be acceptable to all in the Senate.

I renew my request with that change—the deletion of Johnson amendment No. 891 and Landrieu amendment No. 888. I ask unanimous consent that we move forward with this agreement at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we realized over the last 72 hours that we were all scandalized when we learned that the Internal Revenue Service of the United States and employees within the Internal Revenue Service were targeting fellow Americans and political organizations because of their political views. The feelings we have are bipartisan—I hope they are. I don't think any of us want to see an agency of government being used to target our fellow Americans because of their points of view on a political issue. This is a very serious issue.

Yesterday I called for the President to ask for the resignation of the acting chief of the IRS. I asked that there be a criminal investigation launched in this matter, which Attorney General Holder has announced today.

I have prepared an amendment that I think is timely and that I hope we will consider in this body that makes it a crime for an employee of the IRS to target individual taxpayers or organizations because of their political views. I stand today to ask if the chairwoman would consider consenting to allow my Rubio amendment No. 892 to be included in the unanimous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. If I might respond to my friend's request, the American people need to know that we are dealing on this Senate floor with a bill that is the Water Resources Development Act. This bill is about improvements in flood control so we don't have anymore Hurricane Sandys. This is also about port-deepening and about 500,000 jobs. This is about restoring the Chesapeake Bay and the Everglades in my friend's home State. What a beautiful spot that is, I say to my friend. It is not about the IRS scandal, although I could not agree more with my friend. Anyone who would play politics at the IRS is doing a disservice to this Nation. I am happy to look at this law. They ought to be canned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an inquiry which took place by the IRS into a church in my State—the All Saints Church—in the district of ADAM SCHIFF be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 9, 2005]

INQUIRY INTO IRS INVESTIGATIONS OF CHURCHES IS SOUGHT

(By Patricia Ward Biederman)

Expressing concern about the 1st Amendment rights of clergy, Rep. Adam B. Schiff (D–Burbank) and two Republican colleagues called Thursday for an investigation by the U.S. Government Accountability Office into the IRS' recent probes of alleged ''campaign intervention'' by churches, including Pasadena's liberal All Saints Church.

Schiff, whose district includes Pasadena, said he asked for information from the IRS on its church inquiries soon after learning in November that the local Episcopal church could lose its tax-exempt status because of an antiwar sermon preached by former Rector George Regas just before the 2004 presidential election.

Because the IRS has yet to respond to his request, Schiff said, ''I've gone to the next level.''

On Thursday, Reps. Walter B. Jones (R–N.C.) and Joe Pitts (R–Pa.) joined with Schiff in sending a letter to GAO Comptroller General David M. Walker. They asked the office to look into reports that the IRS is investigating places of worship ''based on the content of sermons or other discourse delivered as part of a religious service or gathering.''

Although the tax code prohibits tax-exempt organizations from ''intervening in political campaigns and elections,'' the congressmen said, ''We believe that the faith community has every right to express itself in the political process.''

Spokesman Eric Smith said IRS policy precludes commenting on requests such as the congressmen's. But Smith cited a report released by the Treasury Department in February that found the IRS had ''not . . .

All Saints Rector Edwin Bacon announced Nov. 6 that the church's tax-exempt status was threatened.

The congregation has received wide support, from evangelicals as well as liberal groups. All Saints expects an IRS decision soon, a church spokesman said.

Mrs. BOXER. Republicans and Democrats at that time asked for investigations into this, and this is from 2005.

I ask unanimous consent that an article that talks about the investigation of the NAACP that involved the IRS in 2006 be printed in the RECORD.

This is a continuing scandal. It is outrageous, and I think anyone who goes after a liberal group should be canned. Anyone who goes after a conservative group should be canned unless there is reason to do so. But it appears they are not following the rules of nonprofits, which is they cannot be political.

I ask that those items be placed in the RECORD only to remind people that this is a bad and terrible thing that has happened, and it has been a while.

I object to the request that we place such an urgently important matter on this long-term bill. It is going to take a while for us to get it through the House. We don't know when the conference will come back.

I object to the unanimous consent request to turn a bill like this into a bill about the IRS scandal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First of all, on the second request of the Senator from California, is there any objection?

The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, September 1, 2006]

IRS ENDS 2-YEAR PROBE OF NAACP'S TAX STATUS; LEADER'S CRITICISM OF BUSH IN 2004 DID NOT VIOLATE LAW, AGENCY DECIDES

(By Darryl Fears)

Nearly two years after a controversial decision to investigate the NAACP for criticizing President Bush during the 2004 presidential campaign, the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that the remarks did not violate the group's tax-exempt status.

In a letter released yesterday by the NAACP, the IRS said the group, the nation's oldest and largest civil rights organization, ''continued to qualify'' as tax-exempt.

If the NAACP were stripped of the status, donors would not be allowed to claim contributions to the group on income tax returns.

Federal law requires tax-exempt nonprofit organizations to be politically nonpartisan.

''It was an enormous threat,'' NAACP Chairman Julian Bond said of the investigation. The opposite outcome, he said, ''would have reduced our income remarkably.''

Bond reiterated his belief that the investigation was politically motivated. He said the decision, received by the NAACP on Aug. 9, ''meant that they thought they had harassed us enough and they could stop.''

In a response to lawmakers who expressed outrage over the investigation in 2004, IRS Commissioner Mark W. Everson said the agency's examinations are based on tax law, not partisanship.

The commissioner said the investigation of the NAACP was undertaken because two congressional leaders, whom he declined to name, requested it. They were unhappy because Bond criticized Bush in a speech in July 2004, saying his administration preached racial neutrality and practiced racial division.

''They write a new constitution of Iraq and they ignore the Constitution at home,'' Bond said.

After filing four freedom-of-information requests, NAACP lawyers discovered that far more than two members of Congress called for an investigation and that all were Republicans.

Republican Sens. Lamar Alexander (Tenn.) and Susan Collins (Maine) called for the investigation.

Others included Rep. Jo Ann S. Davis (R–Va.) and then-Rep. Larry Combest (R–Tex.). Former GOP representatives Joe Scarborough of Florida, who now hosts a talk show, and Robert L. Ehrlich Jr., currently governor of Maryland, also requested a probe.

The investigation started Oct. 8, 2004, a month before the election. As the investigation dragged on into the following February, the NAACP announced that it would not continue to cooperate.

Angela Ciccolo, an NAACP lawyer, noted that although Bond's remarks were made in July 2004, the investigation did not begin until October, just when the NAACP was attempting to register voters. ''The timing of the investigation is critical,'' she said.

When the investigation started, Bush and the NAACP were locked in a long-running feud that started shortly before the president's first election victory in 2000.

During that campaign, the NAACP ran television spots featuring the daughter of James Byrd Jr., a black man who was dragged to death behind a pickup truck in Texas in 1998. She criticized Bush, then governor of Texas, for not signing hate-crime legislation.

The rift grew when the NAACP charged that Republicans in Florida stole the 2000 election by turning black voters away from the polls.

Recently, however, the relationship between the group and Bush has begun to warm. Bush addressed the NAACP convention in July for the first time in his six years in office, avoiding becoming the first president since Warren G. Harding to snub the group for an entire presidency.

''It's disappointing that the IRS took nearly two years to conclude what we knew from the beginning: The NAACP did not violate tax laws and continues to be politically nonpartisan,'' said its president, Bruce S. Gordon.

CORRECTION-DATE: September 12, 2006; September 21, 2006

CORRECTION:

A Sept. 1 article incorrectly said that the Internal Revenue Service had named the NAACP as a group whose tax-exempt status was being investigated in response to questions from congressmen. Though the NAACP's status was investigated, the IRS did not name the group.

A Sept. 1 article incorrectly listed several Republicans as having called for an Internal Revenue Service investigation into the tax-exempt status of the NAACP. Named were Sens. Lamar Alexander (Tenn.) and Susan Collins (Maine); Rep. Jo Ann S. Davis (Va.);

and former representatives Larry Combest (Tex.), Joe Scarborough (Fla.) and Robert L. Ehrlich Jr. (Md.). The lawmakers forwarded complaints and requests for an investigation from constituents to the IRS.

LOAD-DATE: September 1, 2006.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object to the unanimous consent request because of the importance of this issue to many States in the country, let me close by saying that we need to understand what happened here over the last 72 hours and what we found out. Employees of the Internal Revenue Service made a decision that they were going to specifically target groups who had things like ''tea party'' and the word ''patriot'' in their organization, groups who looked to do things like protect the Constitution of the United States. This is outrageous.

There is growing evidence that higher-ups—significant people in the IRS—knew about this and were not disclosing that to Members of Congress. Members of this body were asking the IRS directly: Are you involved in this? Is this happening? They were not giving us information we now know they had.

I will not object to the unanimous consent request because of the importance of this issue, but this issue will not and cannot go away because of the importance of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 847

(Purpose: To modify a provision relating to Northern Rockies headwaters extreme weather mitigation)

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

AMENDMENT NO. 899, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 214, strike lines 15 through 20 and insert the following:

''(d) INTERIM ADOPTION OF COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN.—Prior to completion of the comprehensive plan described under subsection (a), the Secretary shall adopt the plan of the State of Louisiana entitled 'Louisiana's Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast' in effect on the

On page 216, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(c) EFFECT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section or an amendment made by this section authorizes the construction of a project or program associated with a storm surge barrier across the Lake Pontchartrain land bridge (including Chef Menteur Pass and the Rigolets) that would result in unmitigated induced flooding in coastal communities within the State of Mississippi.

(2) REQUIRED CONSULTATION.—Any study to advance a project described in paragraph (1) that is conducted using funds from the General Investigations Account of the Corps of Engineers shall include consultation and approval of the Governors of the States of Louisiana and Mississippi.

On page 222, line 14, strike ''2018'' and insert ''2023''.

On page 239, strike lines 14 through 19 and insert the following:

for the period beginning with fiscal year 2001 $450,000,000, which shall—

''(1) be made available to the States and locales described in subsection (b) consistent with program priorities determined by the Secretary in accordance with criteria developed by the Secretary to establish the program priorities; and

''(2) remain available until expended.''.

On page 293, line 2, strike ''amount'' and insert ''amounts remaining after the date of enactment of this Act''.

On page 347, line 12, strike ''or ecosystem restoration'' and insert ''ecosystem restoration, or navigation''.

Beginning on page 47, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 53, line 13, and insert the following:

SEC. 2014. DAM OPTIMIZATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF OTHER RELATED PROJECT BENEFITS.—In this section, the term ''other related project benefits'' includes—

(1) environmental protection and restoration, including restoration of water quality and water flows, improving movement of fish and other aquatic species, and restoration of floodplains, wetlands, and estuaries;

(2) increased water supply storage (except for any project in the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River system and the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa River system);

(3) increased hydropower generation;

(4) reduced flood risk;

(5) additional navigation; and

(6) improved recreation.

(b) PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out activities—

(A) to improve the efficiency of the operations and maintenance of dams and related infrastructure operated by the Corps of Engineers; and

(B) to maximize, to the extent practicable—

(i) authorized project purposes; and

(ii) other related project benefits.

(2) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—An eligible activity under this section is any activity that the Secretary would otherwise be authorized to carry out that is designed to provide other related project benefits in a manner that does not adversely impact the authorized purposes of the project.

(3) IMPACT ON AUTHORIZED PURPOSES.—An activity carried out under this section shall not adversely impact any of the authorized purposes of the project.

(4) EFFECT.—

(A) EXISTING AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this section—

(i) supersedes or modifies any written agreement between the Federal Government and a non-Federal interest that is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) supersedes or authorizes any amendment to a multistate water-control plan, including the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(B) WATER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this section—

(i) affects any water right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(ii) preempts or affects any State water law or interstate compact governing water; or

(iii) affects any authority of a State, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, to manage water resources within that State.

(5) OTHER LAWS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An activity carried out under this section shall comply with all other applicable laws (including regulations).

(B) WATER SUPPLY.—Any activity carried out under this section that results in any modification to water supply storage allocations at a reservoir operated by the Secretary shall comply with section 301 of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b).

(c) POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall carry out a review of, and as necessary modify, the policies, regulations, and guidance of the Secretary to carry out the activities described in subsection (b).

(d) COORDINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) coordinate all planning and activities carried out under this section with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and those public and private entities that the Secretary determines may be affected by those plans or activities; and

(B) give priority to planning and activities under this section if the Secretary determines that—

(i) the greatest opportunities exist for achieving the objectives of the program, as specified in subsection (b)(1), and

(ii) the coordination activities under this subsection indicate that there is support for carrying out those planning and activities.

(2) NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—Prior to carrying out an activity under this section, the Secretary shall consult with any applicable non-Federal interest of the affected dam or related infrastructure.

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the actions carried out under this section.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a schedule for reviewing the operations of individual projects; and

(B) any recommendations of the Secretary on changes that the Secretary determines to be necessary—

(i) to carry out existing project authorizations, including the deauthorization of any water resource project that the Secretary determines could more effectively be achieved through other means;

(ii) to improve the efficiency of water resource project operations; and

(iii) to maximize authorized project purposes and other related project benefits.

(3) UPDATED REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall update the report entitled ''Authorized and Operating Purposes of Corps of Engineers Reservoirs'' and dated July 1992, which was produced pursuant to section 311 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4639).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The updated report described in subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) the date on which the most recent review of project operations was conducted and any recommendations of the Secretary relating to that review the Secretary determines to be significant; and

(ii) the dates on which the recommendations described in clause (i) were carried out.

(f) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may use to carry out this section amounts made available to the Secretary from—

(A) the general purposes and expenses account;

(B) the operations and maintenance account; and

(C) any other amounts that are appropriated to carry out this section.

(2) FUNDING FROM OTHER SOURCES.—The Secretary may accept and expend amounts from non-Federal entities and other Federal agencies to carry out this section.

(g) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies and non-Federal entities to carry out this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 895

(Purpose: To clarify the role of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma regarding the maintenance of the W.D. Mayo Lock and Dam in the State of Oklahoma)

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 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.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 894

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that, in recognition of the contributions of Donald G. Waldon to the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, a lock and dam on that waterway should be designated as the ''Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam'')

At the end of title II, insert the following:

SEC. 2_____. 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''.

AMENDMENT NO. 867

(Purpose: To allow the Secretary to accept and expend non-Federal amounts for repair, restoration, or replacement of certain water resources projects)

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 11004. AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT AND EXPEND NON-FEDERAL AMOUNTS.

The Secretary is authorized to accept and expend amounts provided by non-Federal interests for the purpose of repairing, restoring, or replacing water resources projects that have been damaged or destroyed as a result of a major disaster or other emergency if the Secretary determines that the acceptance and expenditure of those amounts is in the public interest.

AMENDMENT NO. 872

(Purpose: To improve planning and administration relating to water supply storage activities)

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 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—

(1) 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—

(A) a detailed description of the activities carried out relating to the water supply aspects of the project;

(B) a clear explanation of why and how those activities relate to the water supply aspects of the project; and

(C) a detailed accounting of the cost of carrying out those activities; and

(2) 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 consistency in the calculation of the appropriate share of joint project costs allocable to the water supply purpose.

(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 subsection (a)(2) 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 with non-Federal interests at Corps of Engineers projects 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 912

(Purpose: To authorize the Secretary to assist Indian tribes in addressing shoreline erosion in the Upper Missouri River Basin)

On page 234, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 5009. UPPER MISSOURI BASIN SHORELINE EROSION PREVENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide planning, design, and construction assistance to not more than 3 federally-recognized Indian tribes in the Upper Missouri River Basin to undertake measures to address shoreline erosion that is jeopardizing existing infrastructure resulting from operation of a reservoir constructed under the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program (authorized by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the ''Flood Control Act of 1944'') (58 Stat. 891, chapter 665)).

(2) LIMITATION.—The projects described in paragraph (1) shall be economically justified, technically feasible, and environmentally acceptable.

(b) FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL COST SHARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Federal share of the costs of carrying out this section shall be not less than 75 percent.

(2) ABILITY TO PAY.—The Secretary may adjust the Federal and non-Federal shares of the costs of carrying out this section in accordance with the terms and conditions of

section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)).

(c) CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may provide the assistance described in subsection (a) only after—

(1) consultation with the Department of the Interior; and

(2) execution by the Indian tribe of a memorandum of agreement with the Secretary that specifies that the tribe shall—

(A) be responsible for—

(i) all operation and maintenance activities required to ensure the integrity of the measures taken; and

(ii) providing any required real estate interests in and to the property on which such measures are to be taken; and

(B) hold and save the United States free from damages arising from planning, design, or construction assistance provided under this section, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or its contractors.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For each Indian tribe eligible under this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not more than $30,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 880

(Purpose: To deauthorize portions of the project for East Fork of Trinity River, Texas)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. EAST FORK OF TRINITY RIVER, TEXAS.

The portion of the project for flood protection on the East Fork of the Trinity River, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1185), that consists of the 2 levees identified as ''Kaufman County Levees K5E and K5W'' shall no longer be authorized as a part of the Federal project as of the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 904

(Purpose: To declare certain areas in Seward, Alaska, as nonnavigable waters of the United States for purposes of navigational servitude)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3010. SEWARD WATERFRONT, SEWARD, ALASKA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The parcel of land included in the Seward Harbor, Alaska navigation project identified as Tract H, Seward Original Townsite, Waterfront Park Replat, Plat No 2012-4, Seward Recording District, shall not be subject to the navigation servitude (as of the date of enactment of this Act).

(b) ENTRY BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—The Federal Government may enter upon any portion of the land referred to in subsection (a) to carry out any required operation and maintenance of the general navigation features of the project.

AMENDMENT NO. 884

(Purpose: To require the closure of the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam if certain conditions are met)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER PROTECTION.

(a) DEFINITION OF UPPER ST. ANTHONY FALLS LOCK AND DAM.—In this section, the term ''Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam'' means the lock and dam located on Mississippi River mile 853.9 in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

(b) ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report regarding the impact of closing the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam on the economic and environmental well-being of the State of Minnesota.

(c) MANDATORY CLOSURE.—Notwithstanding subsection (b) and not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall close the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam if the Secretary determines that the annual average tonnage moving through the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam for the preceding 5 years is not more than 1,500,000 tons.

(d) EMERGENCY OPERATIONS.—Nothing in this section prevents the Secretary from carrying out emergency lock operations necessary to mitigate flood damage.

AMENDMENT NO. 870, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To modify a provision relating to Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund prioritization)

Beginning on page 299, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 301, line 16, and insert the following:

''(D) LOW-USE PORT.—The term 'low-use port' means a port at which not more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

''(E) MODERATE-USE PORT.—The term 'moderate-use port' means a port at which more than 1,000,000, but fewer than 10,000,000, tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

''(2) PRIORITY.—Of the amounts made available under this section to carry out projects described in subsection (a)(2) that are in excess of the amounts made available to carry out those projects in fiscal year 2012, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall give priority to those projects in the following order:

''(A)(i) In any fiscal year in which all projects subject to the harbor maintenance fee under section 24.24 of title 19, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) are not maintained to their constructed width and depth, the Secretary shall prioritize amounts made available under this section for those projects that are high-use deep draft and are a priority for navigation in the Great Lakes Navigation System.

''(ii) Of the amounts made available under clause (i)—

''(I) 80 percent shall be used for projects that are high-use deep draft; and

''(II) 20 percent shall be used for projects that are a priority for navigation in the Great Lakes Navigation System.

''(B) In any fiscal year in which all projects identified as high-use deep draft are maintained to their constructed width and depth, the Secretary shall—

''(i) equally divide among each of the districts of the Corps of Engineers in which eligible projects are located 10 percent of remaining amounts made available under this section for moderate-use and low-use port projects—

''(I) that have been maintained at less than their constructed width and depth due to insufficient federal funding during the preceding 6 fiscal years; and

''(II) for which significant State and local investments in infrastructure have been made at those projects during the preceding 6 fiscal years; and

''(ii) prioritize any remaining amounts made available under this section for those projects that are not maintained to the minimum width and depth necessary to provide sufficient clearance for fully loaded commercial vessels using those projects to maneuver safely.

''(3) ADMINISTRATION.—For purposes of this subsection, State and local investments in infrastructure shall include infrastructure investments made using amounts made available for activities under section 105(a)(9) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(9)).

''(4) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary may prioritize a project not identified in paragraph (2) if the Secretary determines that funding for the project is necessary to address—

''(A) hazardous navigation conditions; or

''(B) impacts of natural disasters, including storms and droughts.

''(5) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than September 30, 2013, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes, with respect to the preceding fiscal year—

''(A) the amount of funds used to maintain high-use deep draft projects and projects at moderate-use ports and low-use ports to the constructed depth and width of the projects;

''(B) the respective percentage of total funds provided under this section used for high use deep draft projects and projects at moderate-use ports and low-use ports;

''(C) the remaining amount of funds made available to carry out this section, if any; and

''(D) any additional amounts needed to maintain the high-use deep draft projects and projects at moderate-use ports and low-use ports to the constructed depth and width of the projects.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 911, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide Crediting Authority for Federally Authorized Navigation Projects)

At the appropriate place, insert:

Crediting Authority for Federally Authorized Navigation Projects

SEC. ____. A non-Federal interest for a navigation project may carry out operation maintenance activities for that project subject to all applicable requirements that would apply to the Secretary carrying out such operations and maintenance, and may receive credit for the costs incurred by the non-Federal interest in carrying out such activities towards that non-Federal interest's share of construction costs for a federally authorized element of the same project or another federally authorized navigation project, except that in no instance may such credit exceed 20 percent of the costs associated with construction of the general navigation features of the project for which such credit may be received pursuant to this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 882

(Purpose: To modify the allocation of funds to the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin to fulfill equitable funding requirements of the respective interstate compacts of the Commissions)

On page 190, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 20____. RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS.

Section 5019 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1201) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) AUTHORIZATION TO ALLOCATE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall allocate funds from the General Expenses account of the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers to the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin to fulfill the equitable funding requirements of the respective interstate compacts on an annual basis and in amounts equal to the amount determined by Commission in accordance with the respective interstate compact.

''(2) LIMITATION.—Not more than 1.5 percent of funds from the General Expenses account of the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers may be allocated in carrying out paragraph (1) for any fiscal year.

''(3) REPORT.—For any fiscal year in which funds are not allocated in accordance with paragraph (1), 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—

''(A) the reasons why the Corps of Engineers chose not to allocate funds in accordance with that paragraph; and

''(B) the impact of the decision not to allocate funds on water supply allocation, water quality protection, regulatory review and permitting, water conservation, watershed planning, drought management, flood loss reduction, and recreation in each area of jurisdiction of the respective Commission.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 903, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To authorize the Secretary to enter into deep draft port development partnerships)

On page 243, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 5017. ARCTIC DEEP DRAFT PORT DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance, including planning, design, and construction assistance, to non-Federal public entities, including Indian tribes (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)), for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of channels, harbors, and related infrastructure associated with deep draft ports for purposes of dealing with Arctic development and security needs.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary is authorized to accept and expend funds provided by non-Federal public entities, including Indian tribes (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)), to carry out the activities described in subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION.—No assistance may be provided under this section until after the date on which the entity to which that assistance is to be provided enters into a written agreement with the Secretary that includes such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate and in the public interest.

(d) PRIORITIZATION.—The Secretary shall prioritize Arctic deep draft ports identified by the Army Corps, The Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 906, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide for a severe flooding and drought management study of the greater Mississippi River Basin)

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5_____. GREATER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN SEVERE FLOODING AND DROUGHT MANAGEMENT STUDY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GREATER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN.—The term ''greater Mississippi River Basin'' means the area covered by hydrologic units 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11, as identified by the United States Geological Survey as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER.—The term ''lower Mississippi River'' means the portion of the Mississippi River that begins at the confluence of the Ohio River and flows to the Gulf of Mexico.

(3) MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.—The term ''middle Mississippi River'' means the portion of the Mississippi River that begins at the confluence of the Missouri River and flows to the lower Mississippi River.

(4) SEVERE FLOODING AND DROUGHT.—The term ''severe flooding and drought'' means severe weather events that threaten personal safety, property, and navigation on the inland waterways of the United States.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a study of the greater Mississippi River Basin—

(1) to improve the coordinated and comprehensive management of water resource projects in the greater Mississippi River Basin relating to severe flooding and drought conditions; and

(2) to evaluate the feasibility of any modifications to those water resource projects, consistent with the authorized purposes of those projects, and develop new water resource projects to improve the reliability of navigation and more effectively reduce flood risk.

(c) CONTENTS.—The study shall—

(1) identify any Federal actions that are likely to prevent and mitigate the impacts of severe flooding and drought, including changes to authorized channel dimensions, operational procedures of locks and dams, and reservoir management within the greater Mississippi River Basin, consistent with the authorized purposes of the water resource projects;

(2) identify and make recommendations to remedy challenges to the Corps of Engineers presented by severe flooding and drought, including river access, in carrying out its mission to maintain safe, reliable navigation, consistent with the authorized purposes of the water resource projects in the greater Mississippi River Basin; and

(3) identify and locate natural or other physical impediments along the middle and lower Mississippi River to maintaining navigation on the middle and lower Mississippi River during periods of low water.

(d) CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with appropriate committees of Congress, Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies, environmental interests, agricultural interests, recreational interests, river navigation industry representatives, other shipping and business interests, organized labor, and nongovernmental organizations;

(2) to the maximum extent practicable, use data in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) incorporate lessons learned and best practices developed as a result of past severe flooding and drought events, including major floods and the successful effort to maintain navigation during the near historic low water levels on the Mississippi River during the winter of 2012–2013.

(e) COST-SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out the study under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study carried out under this section.

(g) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section impacts the operations and maintenance of the Missouri River Mainstem System, as authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 897, chapter 665).

AMENDMENT NO. 893

(Purpose: To provide for the policy relating to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund prioritization)

On page 297, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

(a) POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that the primary use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is for maintaining the constructed widths and depths of the commercial ports and harbors of the United States, and those functions should be given first consideration in the budgeting of Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund allocations.

AMENDMENT NO. 898

(Purpose: To provide for the reopening of the Cape Arundel Disposal Site as a dredged material disposal site)

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 50_____. CAPE ARUNDEL DISPOSAL SITE, MAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in concurrence with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, is authorized to reopen 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'').

(b) DEADLINE.—The Site may remain open under subsection (a) until the earlier of—

(1) the date on which the Site does not have any remaining disposal capacity;

(2) the date on which an environmental impact statement designating an alternative dredged material disposal site for southern Maine has been completed; or

(3) the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 861 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To improve a provision relating to project acceleration)

On page 121, strike lines 1 through 3, and insert the following:

''(II) conflict with the ability of a cooperating agency to carry out applicable Federal laws (including regulations).

On page 138, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

''(q) AUTHORIZATION.—The authority provided by this section expires on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 907

(Purpose: To provide for future project authorizations)

At the end of title I insert the following:

SEC. 2_____. FUTURE PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) POLICY.—The benefits of water resource projects designed and carried out in an economically justifiable, environmentally acceptable, and technically sound manner are important to the economy and environment of the United States and recommendations to Congress regarding those projects should be expedited for approval in a timely manner.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The procedures under this section apply to projects for water resources development, conservation, and other purposes, subject to the conditions that—

(1) each project is carried out—

(A) substantially in accordance with the plan identified in the report of the Chief of Engineers for the project; and

(B) subject to any conditions described in the report for the project; and

(2)(A) a report of the Chief of Engineers has been completed; and

(B) after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works has submitted to Congress a recommendation to authorize construction of the project.

(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A bill shall be eligible for expedited consideration in accordance with this subsection if the bill—

(A) authorizes a project that meets the requirements described in subsection (b); and

(B) is referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(2) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 31st of the second session of each Congress, the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate shall—

(i) report all bills that meet the requirements of paragraph (1); or

(ii) introduce and report a measure to authorize any project that meets the requirements described in subsection (b).

(B) FAILURE TO ACT.—Subject to subparagraph (C), if the Committee fails to act on a bill that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) by the date specified in subparagraph (A), the bill shall be discharged from the Committee and placed on the calendar of the Senate.

(C) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (B) shall not apply if—

(i) in the 180-day period immediately preceding the date specified in subparagraph (A), the full Committee holds a legislative hearing on a bill to authorize all projects that meet the requirements described in subsection (b);

(ii)(I) the Committee favorably reports a bill to authorize all projects that meet the requirements described in subsection (b); and

(II) the bill described in subclause (I) is placed on the calendar of the Senate; or

(iii) a bill that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) is referred to the Committee not earlier than 30 days before the date specified in subparagraph (A).

(d) TERMINATION.—The procedures for expedited consideration under this section terminate on December 31, 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 896

(Purpose: To require the Government Accountability Office to carry out a study evaluating the effectiveness of activities funded by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in maximizing economic growth and job creation in port communities)

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8_____. HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND STUDY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LOW-USE PORT.—The term ''low-use port'' means a port at which not more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

(2) MODERATE-USE PORT.—The term ''moderate-use port'' means a port at which more than 1,000,000, but fewer than 10,000,000, tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study and submit to Congress a report that—

(1) evaluates the effectiveness of activities funded by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in maximizing economic growth and job creation in the communities surrounding low- and moderate-use ports; and

(2) includes recommendations relating to the use of amounts in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to increase the competitiveness of United States ports relative to Canadian and Mexican ports.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it is my understanding—and I ask the floor staff to correct me—is it so that we just now passed the first number of amendments that don't require votes? Was that just done in the unanimous consent? Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. I am very pleased with that. We had about 15 of these amendments—quite bipartisan. Half of the amendments were Democratic and half Republican, so that is good.

Now what we are going to do is take up the amendments that require votes. It is my understanding that Senator VITTER wants to speak on the Barrasso amendment, which is fine.

I say to my colleagues through the Chair that they now have approximately 2 hours to come down and make the case on their votes. Senators INHOFE, BARRASSO, SANDERS, COBURN, BOOZMAN, MERKLEY, UDALL, and HOEVEN is where we are. If they wish to be heard, then it is time to come over and be heard.

At this time, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, first of all, let me thank my colleague from California, the chair, and all of my colleagues for allowing us to move forward with a very open amendment process. It is not quite as open a process as I would have wanted—namely on the Landrieu amendment because of the objection from my colleague from Pennsylvania. By any Senate standard, this has been a very open amendment process, and that is very healthy.

I join the chair in urging all of our colleagues who would like to debate upcoming votes to come to the floor now. The time is between now and 5 p.m. Please come to the floor. I am doing that right now. I want to talk about one of those amendments on which we will vote, the Barrasso amendment, which is about waters of the United States. This is an important issue.

JOHN BARRASSO and I and many others believe the EPA should not be able to define and expand its regulatory jurisdiction—in this case, we are talking about the Clean Water Act—without undertaking a formal rulemaking process that provides individuals, businesses, and other stakeholders the opportunity to give meaningful input.

The Clean Water Act authorizes the EPA to regulate the discharge of pollutants into ''navigable waters.'' Again, that is a very clear term—''navigable waters.'' The act defines ''navigable waters'' as ''the waters of the United States, including the territorial seas.'' The trouble is clearly understanding what constitutes the waters of the United States. For decades, courts have considered the meaning of ''the waters of the United States,'' and yet uncertainty still remains.

Recently, in 2006—about 7 years ago—in the Rapanos decision, the Supreme Court considered whether the Army Corps of Engineers properly determined the wetlands in Michigan as being waters of the United States. Although the Court determined that the corps viewed its regulatory authority under the Clean Water Act too broadly, a majority of the Justices still could not come to a precise agreement into exactly what ''waters of the United States'' means. So they agreed about what it didn't mean in the context of that case—that the corps had gone too far afield—but they didn't clearly agree on exactly what it meant.

More recently, Justice Alito, in the Sackett case, observed that the reach of the Clean Water Act remains ''notoriously unclear.'' Justice Alito and others have called on Congress to examine the Clean Water Act statutory language to make it precise and clear up the confusion. He also noted that EPA ''has not seen fit to promulgate a rule providing a clear and sufficiently limited definition of the phrase''—that phrase being ''the waters of the United States.''

Instead, the EPA has done something different. Unfortunately, this is a trend at the EPA. The EPA issued what it calls guidance on this issue. Now, according to the EPA, the guidance ''clarifies how the EPA and Corps understand existing requirements of the Clean Water Act and the agencies' implementing regulations'' in light of relevant decisions.

The problem is this: Guidance is short of what the EPA should do, which is to promulgate rules and regs. It is short of that for a very particular reason—because there is no clear-cut, nailed-down process for guidance. The EPA can just make up what it wants without having to take input from affected parties. Under the law, there are clear-cut guidelines and rules for promulgating rules and regulations, and that is what the EPA should do.

In this instance, there are two problems. First of all, the guidance is simply mistaken. It is way too expansive, in the view of many folks, including myself and the author of this amendment, Senator BARRASSO. Also, very importantly, guidance doesn't have to go through a process. Guidance doesn't illicit input from citizens, impacted parties, and stakeholders. That is another crucial issue involved.

This Barrasso amendment would clear up that point on two fronts. It would go to the substance of the guidance—and we think EPA is getting it wrong with regard to that substance—but it would also help underscore that there is a process for the EPA to issue rules and regulations, and that is what the EPA should be doing on important matters such as this—not shortcutting, circumventing that process by simply issuing guidance.

So if the EPA wishes to examine the meaning of ''waters of the United States'' in the Clean Water Act, it needs to do so in a fair and transparent manner, and in a way that provides all Americans the chance to offer meaningful regulatory input. Guidance doesn't do that. This guidance gets it wrong. But, just as importantly, guidance doesn't fulfill the need for transparency and openness and the ability to accept input. This Barrasso amendment would provide EPA with precisely that opportunity: Make them accept

input and make them get it right. That is why I strongly support the Barrasso amendment.

Again, I invite all of our colleagues to come down to the floor to debate any part of this bill, any aspect of pending amendments. We are open for business now until 5 p.m. I think that is going to be a lot of time. We will have a series of votes starting today and going into tomorrow, and I very much appreciate the chair of the committee and others who have allowed this very open amendment process on the floor of the Senate.

With that, Mr. President, 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. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 868

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I wish to call up amendment No. 868.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRASSO], for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. WICKER, proposes an amendment numbered 868.

Mr. BARRASSO. 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 preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States)

On page 452, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 2055. IDENTIFICATION OF WATERS PROTECTED BY THE CLEAN WATER ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Neither the Secretary of the Army nor the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

(1) finalize the proposed guidance described in the notice of availability and request for comments entitled ''EPA and Army Corps of Engineers Guidance Regarding Identification of Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act'' (EPA–HQ–OW–2011–0409) (76 Fed. Reg. 24479 (May 2, 2011)); or

(2) use the guidance described in paragraph (1), or any substantially similar guidance, as the basis for any decision regarding the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or any rulemaking.

(b) RULES.—The use of the guidance described in subsection (a)(1), or any substantially similar guidance, as the basis for any rule shall be grounds for vacation of the rule.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this amendment restricts expansion of Federal authority, and it is a Federal authority attempting to encompass all the wet areas of farms, ranches, and suburban homes all across America, so this amendment is designed to restrict that expansion of Federal authority.

Specifically, the amendment eliminates this administration's guidance to implement this expansion of Federal authority. Through proposed guidance—that is the key phrase here, ''guidance''—Federal agencies are preparing to expand the definition of ''waters of the United States.'' I think it would make sense that people would inherently understand what waters of the United States would be. But the Federal Government is preparing to expand the definition to include ditches, including dry areas—other dry areas where water happens to flow and when it only flows even for a short duration after a rainfall. The American people know that should not be considered waters of the United States. Federal regulations have never defined ditches and other upland drainage features as ''waters of the United States.'' But this draft guidance coming out of Washington does do that, and it will have a huge impact on farmers, ranchers, and small businesses that need to put a shovel in the ground to make a living. The EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers' guidance amounts to a Federal user fee for farmers and ranchers to farm the land they own.

Just as troubling as ignoring congressional intent, the guidance absolutely disregards the fundamental tenet embodied in two decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. One is the SWANCC decision and the other is the Rapanos decision. Those are decisions that say there are actual limits to Federal jurisdiction. It is particularly troubling to me and to others around the country—and certainly at home in Wyoming it is particularly troubling—that the guidance allows the Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA to regulate waters now considered entirely under State jurisdiction. As somebody who has served in the State legislature, talking to the Presiding Officer as someone who has served as a Governor of his State, we know the key importance of State jurisdiction in making local decisions.

This guidance would grant the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Corps of Engineers virtually unlimited—virtually unlimited—regulatory control over all wet areas within a State.

In addition, if this guidance is allowed to go forward—the guidance I am attempting to prevent to protect Americans from today—enormous resources are going to be needed to expand the Clean Water Act Federal regulatory program, which could lead to longer delays, and the delays today are significant. Increased delays in securing permits are going to impede a host of economic activities in Wyoming as well as in all of our other States. Commercial and residential real estate development, agriculture, electric transmission, transportation, and mining will all be affected. These are not sectors of our economy we ever want to deliberately hurt, but we certainly would not want to vote for guidance that would harm these sectors while we are in economic times such as these.

That is why I come to the floor with this amendment. I will be urging a ''yes'' vote on this amendment No. 868 at the appropriate time, to continue with the rights and responsibilities of the States and the private landowners impacting this significant water which is the lifeblood of our States.

Thank you very much. I yield the floor, and I note 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. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise now to speak in opposition to the Barrasso amendment No. 868 and to explain why.

Before I talk about why I hope the Senate will defeat this amendment, I wish to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working so closely with me and with Senator VITTER.

The underlying bill is a very good bill and it protects every State. We look at every State's needs. Whether it is flooding, whether it is preserving fishing, whether it is about ports, whether the ports are inland or coastal, medium, small, or large, we have gone out of our way on both sides of the aisle to accommodate Senators.

I wish to speak about Barrasso amendment No. 868, which will be the first amendment to come before us.

It is an anti-environmental rider. Now, here we go again, again and again and again. There is no reason to bring these anti-environmental riders onto every single piece of legislation that goes through here, but yet that is what we face. So I agreed that we would have a vote on this in the spirit of good faith because it certainly is not germane to this bill. It is not.

It has to do with the Clean Water Act. It does not have to do with the Water Resources Development Act. This Barrasso amendment says the guidance that has been developed by the Army Corps of Engineers and by the Environmental Protection Agency as they get ready for a rulemaking after a Court decision is null and void—without a hearing, without giving the corps a chance to explain their guidance, without giving the EPA a chance to explain their guidance. Without looking at the Court's decision his amendment would say the guidance is blocked because he does not like the guidance.

Well, trust me. I am sure I do not like everything in the guidance either. But let the process go forward. The guidance is necessary so there can be a rulemaking, which is essential. Right now there is nothing but chaos after the Court's ruling. People do not know what the Clean Water Act covers.

So the Army Corps, working with the EPA, has issued some guidance. It is

not the final rule, it is guidance. The Barrasso amendment throws the guidance out, throws it into the garbage can, says it cannot be used. If anything like it is ever used, there can be no rulemaking. The Barrasso amendment stops, therefore, the rulemaking. He may not say it explicitly, but if you cannot use any of the guidance, any of the work that has been done, then you cannot have a rule.

Let me tell you who opposes not having a rule: the business community. The business community opposes it. Everyone opposes it. Everybody wants a rule. The vague restriction will make it impossible to initiate a rulemaking, to define what waters are protected under the Clean Water Act. The Barrasso amendment locks into place the current confusion created in the wake of two Supreme Court decisions. He does it by prohibiting any future update of the Clean Water Act regulations or related guidance.

Industry associations and 30 Republican Senators who are opposed to the guidance developed by the Obama administration have called for a rulemaking. They have called for a rulemaking. The letters were just sent to the EPA last month. What we believe to be absolutely accurate is if you throw out the guidance, if you vote for this Barrasso amendment and you say no guidance that looks anything like this will ever be used, there can be no rulemaking.

For decades the Clean Water Act has provided broad protections for the Nation's waters. The Barrasso amendment stops the corps from restoring these longstanding protections, leaving many waters at risk. Let me tell you what that means. Streams that provide drinking water for up to 117 million Americans may not be covered by the Clean Water Act. That is dangerous for the people because there is all kinds of pollution that gets dumped into these streams. There are 20 million acres of wetlands that provide flood protection and serve as wildlife habitat. There will be no rules governing them because of the way the Barrasso amendment is written.

Any effort to clear up uncertainty that has resulted in delays and confusion and slowed efforts to hold polluters accountable will be null and void, can have no effect. You cannot use the guidance. You have to throw it away. If anything comes forward that remotely resembles it, you have to throw it away. Then you cannot make a rule. This is harmful.

In closing, I want to talk about from what harm we want to protect the people. We know some of the dangerous pollution that gets dumped into our Nation's waters sometimes on purpose, sometimes on accident. But we have chemical pollution and all kinds of industrial pollution. It includes such chemicals as arsenic—very dangerous for people. I will have more to say on the specifics, but we know there is waterborne disease. People get very ill if the drinking water is not good, if the swimming water is not good. The warmer our waters are getting, the more dangerous it is. Certain organisms that live in these warmer waters never existed before.

We had a case in Ohio where a child got deathly ill because the water was so warm it attracted these different kinds of bacteria and organisms. So when I stand here, I speak from the heart. All of us do. But I know we should not vote on something that precludes us from protecting the health and safety and the lives of our people who are the most vulnerable, the children—the children, the pregnant women, the elderly. My goodness, if we are here for any reason, it would certainly be to do no harm to them.

The Barrasso amendment does a lot of harm. It does not belong on the Water Resources Development Act, which is about building projects to protect people using flood control. It is about dredging our waters. It is making sure commerce can move. This is an anti-environmental rider. It does not belong on this bill. It is dangerous for the people.

I urge my colleagues to vote no when the vote comes before us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Vermont here. I will not be long. I did have a few comments to offer about the unusual developments of the last few days in Washington, DC. Back in 2011 and 2012 my office was contacted by some constituents who were active politically with organizers such as the King Street Patriots, True the Vote, the tea party, particularly in Waco and San Antonio. They were concerned that they were being targeted by the Federal Government, specifically the Internal Revenue Service, for their political activity. They were concerned that the activities of the Internal Revenue Service seemed excessive, unreasonable, and improper. They feared the government officials were targeting them for doing nothing more than exercising their constitutional rights under the First Amendment of the Constitution.

So I did what I think any Senator would do, any Member of Congress: I wrote a letter to the Internal Revenue Service and asked them, first of all, about any indication they had that this was the case. Douglas Shulman, the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, testified later before Congress and categorically denied any type of targeting was, in fact, taking place.

Well, last Friday we learned that my constituents were correct and the Internal Revenue Service was wrong. It turns out the Internal Revenue Service really was targeting American citizens for exercising their most fundamental rights. Even though the Internal Revenue Service did not acknowledge this until last Friday, the Associated Press has reported that senior agency officials learned about the abuses as early as June 2011, nearly 2 years ago.

Let me be clear. These abuses are not simply inappropriate, they are a breach of faith with the American people. They are potentially violations of our criminal law.

Now, as my friend from Vermont knows, if the IRS, if the government can target conservative groups such as the King Street Patriots and the tea party, they can target anybody anywhere across the political spectrum. That is why you are seeing such bipartisan outrage over this news. But not only was the IRS targeting tea party groups, they targeted other people based on their advocacy of restoring the Federal Government to its basic constitutional framework, people concerned about government spending. Meanwhile, there is evidence that the IRS also in some cases targeted Jewish organizations as well. I would hope we would all on a bipartisan basis rise and say this is unacceptable and it is immoral. It is the kind of behavior we associate not with the greatest democracy in the world but with corrupt tinpot dictators.

President Obama has said, to his credit, that all guilty parties will be held fully accountable. Well, I wish I could take some comfort from the President's comments. Unfortunately, the administration has repeatedly stonewalled and misled U.S. officials investigating programs like the Fast and Furious gunwalking scandal and the 2012 attacks in Benghazi, Libya.

The President of the United States got four Pinocchios today from the Fact Checker in the Washington Post. That has to be a first. So why should we expect the Internal Revenue Service investigation to be any different? Unfortunately, this administration has shown a tendency to put politics ahead of the rule of law too many times.

For example, during the government-run Chrysler bankruptcy process, the company-secured bondholders received much less for their loans than did the United Auto Workers Pension Fund, a favorite of the Obama administration. As Solyndra was going bankrupt, the administration violated the law by making taxpayers subordinate to private lenders. So the taxpayers got gored first before private lenders were at risk.

Last year the administration made unconstitutional recess appointments to the National Labor Relations Board and to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Last year the administration illegally waived key requirements of the 1996 welfare reform law.

Finally, to help implement ObamaCare, the IRS has announced that it will violate the text of the law and issue health insurance subsidies through Federal exchanges, something Congress did not authorize. The law clearly states that these subsidies are not available to the Federal exchange but to the State-based exchanges. Indeed, it is the case that the President's

health care law will dramatically expand the power of the Internal Revenue Service because the agency is responsible for implementing so much of ObamaCare's most important provisions.

Well, given what we have learned about IRS malfeasance, does it really sound like a good idea to give them more responsibility, to hire more agents? Before we get to the bottom of the present scandal, do we really want the IRS to administer a law that will affect one-sixth of our economy, as ObamaCare will?

Do we really want the Internal Revenue Service agents collecting so much personal information about millions of American citizens? Remember, even before ObamaCare became the law, the IRS had more than enough power to destroy the lives of individual Americans. Chief Justice John Marshall, at the very beginning of our country, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States said the power to tax involves the power to destroy, and those words are still true today. With trust in the Federal Government already at an all-time low, the IRS scandal will further diminish public confidence in public institutions and in Washington, DC.

As a result, this scandal will make it much harder for us to work together to adopt a fiscal policy and economic reforms that our country so desperately needs. When the IRS starts behaving as a rogue agent that considers itself above the law, we have entered truly dangerous territory. Today I am going to join others of my colleagues to call on the Acting IRS Commissioner Steven Miller to resign. If it is true what currently appears to be true, that Mr. Miller willfully misled Congress when inquiries were made earlier about this political activity, he should resign today.

Furthermore, I am encouraged actually by Chairman MAX BAUCUS of the Senate Finance Committee and Senator ORRIN HATCH who said they believe it is important for the Finance Committee as the appropriate standing committee of the Senate with jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Service to conduct an investigation.

I hope the first witness they will call is Treasury Secretary Jack Lew, who is the boss of the IRS, or overseer of the IRS, Mr. Miller's direct reporting boss. I look forward to a thorough bipartisan investigation that will deliver justice to these government officials who betrayed the American people in such a shameful and egregious manner.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 889

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 889.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 889.

Mr. SANDERS. 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 address restoration of certain properties impacted by natural disasters, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RESTORATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES IMPACTED BY NATURAL DISASTERS.

For all major disasters declared under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act on or after August 27, 2011, the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall consider eligible the costs necessary to comply with any State stream or river alteration permit required for the repair or replacement of otherwise eligible damaged infrastructure, such as culverts and bridges, including any design standards required to be met as a condition of permit issuance.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this amendment is cosponsored by my colleague from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY. What it does is it addresses a very serious problem facing the State of Vermont and I think potentially States all over the country.

Mr. President, as you well know, Tropical Storm Irene impacted some 225 Vermont communities with 90 bridges and 963 culverts damaged or destroyed statewide. In a small State, that is a lot of damage.

Long before Irene, the Vermont State legislature enacted stream alteration standards that prevented flood hazards, damage to fish and wildlife, and damage to adjacent property owners. These standards result in resilient infrastructure and are looked to as a model by other States. In other words, what the State legislature did appropriately is pass standards that would do the job, that would protect communities in times of floods and natural disasters.

As we all know, FEMA compensates communities for the rebuilding of bridges and culverts damaged during large storms such as Irene, but FEMA—and here is the main point—in many cases is insisting on overriding Vermont's stronger standards, requiring communities to build inferior projects that are unlikely to withstand the next major storm to hit the State. In other words, communities are standing there wanting to do the right thing. The State has promulgated regulations as to what these culverts and bridges should look like. What FEMA is saying is we are not going to compensate you for doing the right thing. In other words, FEMA is insisting that local communities, in order to get reimbursed for these expenses of replacing damaged infrastructure, must build culverts and bridges to standards that have already failed and are likely to fail again. This is Vermont's problem today. It could be your State's problem tomorrow. The point here is we should not be rebuilding culverts and bridges in a way that will result in them failing once again when another flood or extreme weather disturbance takes place. That makes no sense at all.

In Vermont, at least 39 bridge and culvert projects would benefit from this amendment, and half of these projects have not yet gone forward because of this dispute with FEMA. In other words, we have many communities in the State of Vermont that are not going forward rebuilding the damaged culverts and bridges but waiting because of this ongoing dispute with FEMA.

Again, today this is Vermont's problem. Tomorrow it could be West Virginia's or California's. It makes no sense to rebuild bridges and culverts in a way that has failed. We want to rebuild them in a way that will enable them to remain strong during the next flood or extreme weather disturbance. If another Hurricane Irene were to hit, those towns would be vulnerable to severe damage yet again. In other words, they are sitting in limbo. They don't have the money to do the job they want to see done, and they are not getting help from FEMA. In fact, communities in States across the country that adopt more resilient standards for infrastructure replacement would benefit from this amendment.

Today it impacts Vermont. Tomorrow it could impact any State in this country. Local communities and States have a better sense of the kinds of standards that are required for bridges and culverts than FEMA, and they should be allowed to go forward with those standards and be compensated by FEMA.

FEMA's current practice throws good money at bad by preventing States and local communities from rebuilding with more resilient, better-defined infrastructure after devastating storms. The amendment Senator LEAHY and I are offering will save taxpayers money, will save lives, and better protect communities from future natural disasters and extreme weather disturbances.

In short, the Sanders-Leahy flood resilience amendment requires FEMA to recognize State standards when providing Federal reimbursements for bridge and culvert replacements after natural disasters, supports communities that want to rebuild more resilient infrastructure after natural disasters, harmonizes the approaches of the Army Corps of Engineers and FEMA, and stops throwing good money after bad, saves taxpayers at the local, State, and Federal level by making smarter investments in more durable infrastructure.

With that, I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the time during all quorum calls be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. 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. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 868

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first let me thank Senator BOXER and Senator VITTER for the incredible work they have done in bringing forward the Water Resources Development Act, the WRDA legislation. This truly has been a bipartisan effort to bring forward an extremely important bill for our economy, for jobs, for infrastructure, and for competitiveness. I can speak for the citizens of Maryland as to how important this legislation is to the economic life of our State in maintaining the shipping channels that are critical to the ports in our State, the Port of Baltimore. This legislation will provide the wherewithal for Maryland and our Nation to remain competitive.

In this environment, it is not easy to get a major bill to the finish line. It looks as though as a result of the work done by the chairman and the ranking Republican member, we are on the verge of being able to move this bill forward.

I know we are going to have a few votes in a few moments, and I wanted to take this time to urge my colleagues to reject the Barrasso amendment that would deny the regulation of a lot of the waterways in our country. For 40 years the Clean Water Act dramatically improved the health of a generation of Americans. Without this law, which for decades had protected rivers, streams, wetlands, lakes, and coastal waterways from toxic pollution, all of our Nation's waters would be less safe to swim in, to fish in, and, especially, to drink.

Mr. President, we are talking about the health of the people of this country—the Clean Water Act. We are talking about the health of our streams which people live next to. We are talking about families depending upon clean safe water when they turn their taps on so they can have water to give their families. We are talking about our environment.

I am pretty aggressive on this because I have the honor of representing one of the States that is part of the Chesapeake Bay watershed. The Presiding Officer also represents a State—West Virginia—that is part of the Chesapeake Bay, as is Pennsylvania and Delaware and Virginia and the District of Columbia. My point is there are over 100,000 streams and rivers that feed into the Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay is the largest estuary in North America and has thousands of species. The life of the Chesapeake Bay depends upon the waters that flow into it, and the Barrasso amendment would deny the effectiveness of regulating the health of the waters leading into the bay. It would inject into the Clean Water Act a way in which we would be denying the protection of the Clean Water Act to the public.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. It is anti-environment. There is no question about that. But let me cite another reason. I hear my colleagues on both sides of the aisle talk about predictability and we need to know what the rules are. We thought we knew what the rules were on the Clean Water Act, but then the Supreme Court came through with some cases that are, quite frankly, baffling to us because they change the long-standing tradition of the regulations on the Clean Water Act. We thought we understood what it was all about. So there is a great deal of uncertainty today, and the Barrasso amendment takes us back to that uncertainty.

The Obama administration, through its regulatory process, has given us the predictability we need so everyone can plan their activities, knowing full well what the responsibilities are for clean water. I don't think we want to return to that time of uncertainty, and the Barrasso amendment would lead us back down that path.

There are many other reasons why this is wrong to do. When we take a look at how many wetlands and how many streams and brooks we have lost across this country, do we want to turn back the clock on the regulation of clean water on the streams, the brooks, and the wetlands that are involved in our water supply? It is literally because of the protections of the Clean Water Act that we know we are going to have a safe supply of drinking water. It is because of the Clean Water Act we know we can go to our beaches this summer and enjoy the recreational activities along the water. The Barrasso amendment would take us to a point where we could lose the effectiveness of the Clean Water Act in protecting the public health of the people of this Nation.

We have a good bill before us. It is well balanced. I do again applaud the chairman and ranking member. There are provisions in this bill, quite frankly, I would like to see written in a different way, but it was done with full bipartisan cooperation, and so the Barrasso amendment should be rejected by this body, and I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on legislation in regard to surplus water fees. I call it the States Water Rights Act, the States water rights legislation, and I introduced this legislation as an amendment to the Water Resources Development Act. Essentially what it does is it would prevent the Corps of Engineers from unlawfully and unfairly imposing water usage fees on the Missouri River States. Joining me in this bipartisan legislation is Senator JOHN THUNE of South Dakota, Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP of North Dakota, Senator MAX BAUCUS of Montana, and also Senator TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota. It is bipartisan legislation. In fact, I expect Senator THUNE will be joining me here on the floor very shortly, and also Senator HEITKAMP, so we can engage in a colloquy in regard to the legislation.

The Missouri River, of course, flows through the State of North Dakota and the other Missouri River States. We have seven States the Missouri River flows through. In 1944, through the Pick-Sloan Act, waters in those States were dammed to create large-scale reservoirs. There are six mainstream reservoirs. Of course the primary purpose for the dams and reservoirs was to provide flood protection downstream, which we have been doing now for more than 50 years—actually, over 60 years.

At the same time, just as we are providing that flood protection with these reservoirs, at the same time the upper basin States, States throughout the basin, have withdrawn water from those reservoirs for a whole variety of uses—municipalities, tribes, business and industrial—the whole gamut of uses. In all that time, more than 60 years, the Corps of Engineers has never charged the respective States—Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska—any of them—has not charged them for using the water. That makes sense because if they draw the water out of the river—I mean every one of the States has water rights. Tribes have water rights. If they draw the water out of the river, of course, there is no charge.

Likewise, because the States gave up the land for flood protection in order to create those reservoirs, the corps has never charged for drawing water out of the reservoirs either.

That has changed now. Now the corps is saying we are undertaking a study and in our study we are going to look and decide whether we are going to charge a fee if you take water out of the reservoir; even though we never have, now we think maybe we are going to charge a fee.

This amendment blocks that. It says you can't do that. The States have water rights. Just as if you take it out of the river you can't charge us for that water, you certainly can't flood our land and then charge us for it. It doesn't make any sense.

Furthermore, because States have water rights, they would never be able to do it. If in fact the corps were to proceed and impose those fees, we would sue them and we would win under the law because the respective States are entitled to those water rights. That makes this kind of an unusual situation.

We have put this legislation forward, frankly, to avoid the cost of litigation,

the cost to the respective States and the cost to the Federal Government. So the reality is without this legislation we are offering, it would actually cost the Federal Government money because they would have to undertake litigation against the States to impose fees on the States in violation of their water rights which are well established at law. This amendment, in fact, in actuality saves the Federal Government money.

But the CBO, under their scoring regime, says no, wait a minute. Somehow we are going to look beyond that. I guess they would pretend that wouldn't really happen. So we are going to assign a cost to this legislation because the corps might get some fees down the road somewhere; in spite of all these things, they might get a fee. So they have assigned a $5 million cost to the legislation over the 10-year scoring window; $5 million over the 10-year scoring window.

We have managed to address that by saying no, we have also added—in addition to the fact that under this legislation the corps can't impose the fees, we have also said you have to find $5 million in savings over the next 10 years out of your operating budget. Since just their operations alone are $2 billion a year, obviously that would be a very simple matter. The fact is it is, frankly, a technicality anyway because they are offsetting money they are never going to get so there is no cost to it. But from an accounting standpoint we do that so the CBO does not assign any score to this legislation.

That is kind of some of the nuts and bolts of the legislation. But the key is this: This is about States that have given up fertile farmland, hundreds of thousands of acres, in order to provide flood protection for other States farther downstream. They were able to not only use the land but they were able to draw water from the river as they wanted to without being charged. So here comes the corps and says now that we have flooded your land, now that you have provided that flood protection, oh, golly, we are going to charge you for flooding your land. We are going to charge small towns, we are going to charge tribes, we are going to charge business and industries, farmers—whomever.

It absolutely makes no sense. That is what this act does. It addresses that and makes sure they do not impose those fees in clear violation of States' water rights. In fact, the legislation, even though scored by CBO as having no cost, will save not only the Federal Government money but the respective States money as well.

I am very pleased to note that my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, Senator JOHN THUNE, is here. I wish to ask if he, as cosponsor of this legislation, would express some of his thoughts as well.

Mr. THUNE. I ask the Senator from North Dakota if he will yield for a question?

Mr. HOEVEN. Yes.

Mr. THUNE. This is an issue that is important to both his State and my State for many reasons, not the least of which is we have basically flooded 1.6 million acres of prime bottom land, some of the richest agricultural land in our States, in order to prevent flooding downstream. Then of course there were also stated other various uses of the water that would be allowed for the States that were impacted when this occurred.

But I wonder if my colleague from North Dakota—he has already touched upon many of the reasons why this should not happen, but he is a former Governor of his State. I know our Governor and our attorney general have made it abundantly clear that if the corps moves forward, they intend to file a lawsuit and they will litigate this. As a former Governor, if the now-Senator from North Dakota could respond to how his State of North Dakota might act in the event this actually were implemented by the corps?

It strikes me at least that this is without precedent. This is something that—the Flood Control Act was passed in 1944 and the dams were built subsequent to that. For the past 50 years our States have had access to this water and it is something that is a State right. There is no legal or statutory—there is no historical precedent for doing this. I am wondering how the former Governor of North Dakota might view this as a Governor, as to what his action might be in the event the Corps of Engineers were to move forward with this. Because it certainly would impact a lot of the industrial users, water users in the State, businesses, tribes—a lot of folks are going to be impacted if the corps moves forward with this proposal. If the Senator from North Dakota might tell me as former Governor how he might view this and what he would intend to do and what our Governor and attorney general would intend to do in the event the corps moves forward.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for joining me, and for his question. Of course, he is anticipating exactly what would happen. The States will initiate litigation against the corps if in fact the corps decides to impose a fee. They are undertaking a year-long study and at the end they are going to come back and say: Oh, they are not going to charge a fee. Or they are not going to impose a fee. If they do impose a fee, here is what it would be. At that point they would be sued by the States. In fact, in the case of North Dakota, the legislature has already set aside moneys to fund the lawsuit.

As when I was the Governor, the current Governor and the attorney general have already said very clearly they will commence litigation. It would be multistate litigation. As I said, they have already set aside funds.

That is the point I am making. We can talk about the CBO score—which we have now squared away so it doesn't score—the reality is we are saving both the Federal Government and the States money with this legislation because there will absolutely be litigation.

Mr. THUNE. Will the Senator yield for another question, if I might?

Mr. HOEVEN. I will.

Mr. THUNE. Our attorney general wrote a letter and said:

> This proposal, whether disguised as a reallocation or surplus water, exceeds the Corps' regulatory authority and violates basic principles of federalism.

It went on to lay out the reasons why they, our State, would obviously enter into litigation if it comes to that, if it is necessary in order to protect the rights of South Dakotans to the water that is rightfully theirs.

I would be interested in knowing as well from the Senator from North Dakota if in fact, during the course of the last many years, his amendment would change anything, if his amendment would change anything that is happening today? In other words, today what happens if the State wants to use water in one of the mainstream dams—and there are six mainstream dams, one in Montana, a big one in North Dakota, and then we have four in South Dakota, all of which were created by the Flood Control Act or authorized. These were dams built to protect from flooding downstream and then also authorized various uses of that water.

I might point out what some of those uses are. They were to be for enhanced navigation, cheap hydro power, irrigation, programs to increase public recreation facilities, municipal-industrial water supplies, and fish and wildlife populations. Those are some of the things that are stated that the water is to be used for.

The Senator's amendment, which would prevent the corps from charging for this water, as I understand it, doesn't change anything, the practice as it exists today, because a water user would request an easement from the corps, and then essentially the State would have to issue the water. That is my understanding of how it works today.

Does any of that change—if it is passed—as far as the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, in response to the Senator's question, absolutely not. It doesn't change any of the authorized purposes for the reservoirs and for the system. This does not impact in any way any of the authorized uses for the mainstem dams, the mainstem breviaries or the Missouri River system.

I want to emphasize that because we have the seven Missouri River States, and sometimes we get the upstream and downstream interests. This does not change any of those authorized purposes or how they are utilized or how the respective States interact with them—or even the amount of water usage.

So to try to bring in any of the other issues which have typically been concerns for the Missouri River does not

apply here. This is about whether the respective States—this is one where we can come together. This is upstream or downstream and whether any States will be charged for water that is rightfully theirs. That makes this very much a States rights issue about which all of the States should be concerned.

How can we allow Federal agencies to come in and simply impose a fee because they want to and then impose whatever fee they want? We will do a study and we will impose a fee of whatever size we determine we believe is appropriate.

It is a clear violation of States rights, and on a very important issue, water rights.

If I could, I want to also invite the good Senator from North Dakota, Ms. HEITKAMP, to join us as well in this colloquy. She also brings expertise as the former attorney general in North Dakota and can certainly comment on the legal issues as well.

Before I do that, I will turn it over, Mr. President, to the Senator from South Dakota, who I think had another question and/or comment.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I want to welcome our other colleague from North Dakota who also has experience as a litigator in protecting the interests of her State. Perhaps she could also comment on what actions the States might take if the corps moves forward.

I want to point out to my colleagues, and perhaps the Senator is already aware of this, but I am looking at some things that are proposed charges that the corps would make under this proposal, although I don't think they have stated explicitly what that might be. But it ends up being a significant amount.

In fact, over the Lewis and Clark leg, which is Gavins Point—or I should say, Lewis and Clark Dam—they are talking about $174 per acre foot of yield from Lewis and Clark Lake. We are talking about businesses, individuals, tribes, and industrial users having access to water they believe—and I think we all believe—is something that was promised to them when this legislation was passed way back in the 1940s.

We have essentially 70 years of precedent where it has been the case that the States have access and can rightfully use that water for those various purposes as authorized under the legislation. This would move away from that and start to impose these fees, which I think over time get to be quite excessive.

I appreciate the work that has been done by the Senator from North Dakota Mr. HOEVEN in terms of trying to get the CBO to evaluate this in the proper context. For a while they were talking about the scoring impact that was much larger than many of us believed it would be. Again, it is a hypothetical situation. It is not happening today.

All the Senator is simply doing is saying we want to keep in place the rules of the game as they have applied to the mainstem dams for the past 50 years—70 years since the authorization in the legislation that created it, but also since the dams were built.

I guess I would say to my colleagues from North Dakota, I appreciate their good work, and I would simply reiterate—as a South Dakotan, downstream from North Dakota—that our States, and all the States in the upper basin, would be dramatically impacted by this because it would be a precedent that would be entirely new.

Literally, this is something we have not dealt with since we had the dams and the lakes in our States. Again, this would be at a tremendous sacrifice in terms of the amount of prime bottom land that was given up when the dams were built and the land was taken.

I now defer to the former attorney general of North Dakota, Senator HEITKAMP, for some observations she might have with respect to that issue.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for joining, and he is absolutely right. The cost to the States is significant. In actuality, the scoring number is reduced because the probability of them getting it is so remote. As I mentioned earlier, they are flying in the face of well-established water rights the States have. So once they assign the probability they would lend to it, obviously that reduces the amount that gets scored.

Once again, it shows they are trying to impose a fee where they have no right to do it, so it did create some scoring issue that it really never should. The fact is the litigation would far outweigh the score that CBO has put on it, both to the Federal Government and to the respective States. In the end there would be no fees because there is no right to assess those fees.

I think we have someone who as a former attorney general dealt, in fact, with this very type of issue during her tenure as attorney general. I turn to my colleague from North Dakota and ask that she comment on the legality of the issue as well as her thoughts in terms of the fairness and the States rights aspect, which truly makes this an issue our colleagues should join and support. This is exactly what could happen to them, and it could happen to their States.

I turn to Senator HEITKAMP for her thoughts in that regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I say thank you to my colleagues from North Dakota and South Dakota. Mr. President, this is not a new issue. This is an issue—even back in the 1990s—I dealt with as the State's attorney general. Why do I mention that? I mention it because we were able to persuade the corps at the time that the intake pipe they were attempting to charge for surplus water was actually in the original river bed. I—just tongue-in-cheek—suggested I would charge them for putting their water on top of our water, and maybe they should pay a fee to us for the storage we were going to allow them.

In all seriousness, this is not an issue that is going to go away. If any of our colleagues think this is an issue where we can just let it go and ride it out, this is an issue that has percolated for a lot of years. It has culminated right now to this effort to be proactive in this body to prevent litigation, prevent excess expense, and prevent a deterioration of a relationship that is essential to making sure we have flood protection and all of the other good that came out of the Flood Control Act.

So the time is now to take an immediate step to prevent this issue from going any further and to address the concerns that upstream States have.

I want to spend just a few moments talking about this from a legal perspective and what could happen if, in fact, the Federal Government engaged in litigation with the States.

We have heard today from both South Dakota and North Dakota Senators. I am reasonably sure Montana would not allow this precedent to stand without some pushback and an absolute commitment from a bipartisan standpoint from all the upstream States for a pushback.

Let's talk about why there are legal problems with the corps approach. Charging fees for surplus waters, I believe, would violate a State's right to the water that naturally flows through the boundaries as historically recognized by the Federal Government and as recognized by the 10th Amendment.

Charging fees would violate statutory law. Section 1 of the 1944 Flood Control Act provides protection for water resources in Western States. We have a common law water rights argument, a historic argument, and we have a statutory argument.

I think charging fees would reverse decades of corps policy on surplus water and create a precedent which should not be established, not only in the upper Missouri basin but should not be established anyplace in this country. That is why this is an issue that is not just about the Dakotas, it is not just about Montana and the upstream States, it is an issue that every one of our colleagues has an interest in reviewing. If they can do it in this case, why can't they do it in any other reservoir.

Charging fees would penalize Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota by charging for water that is freely available in the absence of the corps reservoir. If there were no reservoir, there would be no issue. In fact, if they tried to charge, most of our colleagues would find that absolutely atrocious. This is in the face of what we know we have sacrificed for flood control in that basin.

I want to mention the unique interest that the Mandan, Hidatsa, Arikara Nation, along with the Standing Rock Nation have and what they have sacrificed for flood control, what they have sacrificed in terms of loss of their

land, division of their reservation boundaries, and division of their property. Now, the corps is saying: Yes, we took your land. Yes, we disrupted your natural boundaries and your natural way of life, and now we are going to charge you for the water that sits on your historic homeland.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for another 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. We have a vote locked in at 5 p.m., so the Senator can speak up until 5 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m., the Senate vote in relation to the Inhofe, Barrasso, and Sanders amendments as provided under the previous order; that following the vote in relation to the Sanders amendment, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes; further, that when the Senate resumes consideration on S. 601 on Wednesday, May 15, it resume the voting sequence in the previous order with all after the first vote being 10 minutes and all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. For the information of all Senators, it is our expectation that the Inhofe amendment will be the subject of a voice vote. If that occurs there will be two rollcall votes this evening, and the remainder of the votes will occur tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

Ms. HEITKEMP. So when we look at water surplus fees and we think about the fact that we have given our land, we have given our opportunity to have free access to our water, we have done all of this with the idea that it is for the better good of this country, to now charge our citizens and people who have always had historic access to that water—this fee looks a whole lot like a tax—it is adding insult to injury.

I can guarantee that this issue will not go away. If we don't prevail, what we are buying is a lawsuit because the Corps of Engineers is not going to give up. The Corps of Engineers will continue to advance and promote this idea until they implement this idea, and then we are going to be in litigation.

This issue will not go away. The easiest way to resolve this issue in an amiable way and in a way that is going to maintain the kind of historic relationship we have with our tribes is to deal with it today. We need to deal with it within the Water Resources Development Act we are enacting. We need to support amendment No. 909, the amendment of my good friend and colleague JOHN HOEVEN, the Senator from North Dakota, and put this idea to bed once and for all that the corps cannot charge us for water that historically and legally belongs to the States where that water is located.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HOEVEN. I wish to thank again my colleague for her comments in regard to the legal aspect; again, she brings a lot of direct experience working with this issue. So I thank her for her comments with regard to the legal aspect, but she makes another very important point. This isn't just about States rights; this would be a taking of tribal rights too.

I am going to turn to my colleague from South Dakota and ask him a question on this very same subject. But, in fact, in North Dakota, it is going to be one of our tribes that is most disenfranchised by this action of the corps. Because, again, we have made the point we can take water out of the river. We can continue to do that. They can't charge us for water coming from the river.

The other place they are trying to charge for water is out of the reservoir. But most of the reservoir in North Dakota is inside the tribe reservation, so the people who would be most dramatically impacted, in fact, would be Native Americans in our State.

I am going to turn to our colleague from South Dakota. I am guessing that is true in South Dakota as well.

Mr. THUNE. I would just say to both of my colleagues from North Dakota, that is an absolutely accurate observation.

If we look at who is impacted—and we have the Standing Rock Tribe that is partly in North Dakota and partly in South Dakota so it crosses the State border. We have the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, the Coal Creek Sioux Tribe, the Yankton Tribe. We have a whole bunch of reservations as we go right down that corridor of the Missouri River that would be profoundly impacted. As we mentioned earlier, when this land was given up, when the dams were built, this was a lot of not only private land but tribal-held land which they gave up. This would directly impact the access they would have to water that is rightfully theirs.

So in addition to the concerns our States have and our attorneys general have, we also have a lot of tribes that have a very vested interest in making sure this doesn't happen. That is why it is so important that our colleagues support the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, because as was pointed out by Senator HEITKAMP, this is precedent setting. If they can do this here, they may try and do it someplace else.

I also think—and the point was made by both of my colleagues—this is a very practical consideration. It will cost the Federal Government and our States a lot more than what they are saying this is going to achieve in terms of revenues when this goes to court. Both the States and the Federal Government will be locked up, I would suspect, in litigation for some time. The amount of revenues that would be raised by the fees that would be imposed under the various proposals that are being advanced by the corps simply would pale in comparison to the litigation costs that would be involved.

So that is a very practical consideration. I concur. I am not a lawyer, and I certainly am not a former attorney general or former Governor. I know both of my colleagues have experience with these issues. But I can tell my colleagues from talking with our Governor and our attorney general they are highly confident that legally this is a very open-and-shut situation and a case in which our State would prevail. So it seems sort of crazy in a way that we would even have to go down that trail, and I hope we can prevent it from happening by having our colleagues join us in support of this amendment.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague from South Dakota and turn to my colleague from North Dakota for any final thoughts before we yield the floor.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, my colleagues from North and South Dakota and I come from practical States. We come from States where we try to anticipate problems and we solve problems before they turn into big, expensive pieces of litigation, and that is what that amendment does. This amendment addresses, in a proactive way, a policy we know will not be put to bed until this body speaks. Let's do it now. Let's do it kind of in the way we do it in our States. Let's be proactive. Let's make sure we aren't wasting money and wasting relationships on litigation and that we are moving forward to manage the Upper Basin as best we can and that we do what is right by the people of our State and the people in our tribal governments and our Native American neighbors.

AMENDMENT NO. 909

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, with that, I wish to set aside the pending amendment and call up the Hoeven amendment No. 909.

I wish to close with a couple other thoughts. Senator BAUCUS from Montana wanted to join with us in the colloquy, but the timeline didn't work out. So I wished to express my appreciation for his support and sponsorship of this legislation as well.

I wish to again make the point that this isn't about using the water. Our respective States will still use the water. The issue is about being charged for it. That is a very important point, so that nobody tries to confuse this issue in order to try to get opposition to the issue. We will still use the water; it is just that we will be charged for it unfairly, except for the fact—as we said, this would be tied up in litigation creating a bunch of costs for the State and the Federal Government, so that wouldn't really happen. So what we are doing is solving a very important problem. It is one that all of the States need to be cognizant of, because

if a Federal agency can come in and try to do it to one State, it can do it to any one of the States. This is a fundamental issue regarding States rights.

If any of our colleagues have questions or concerns about the amendment, I encourage them to come to us. We want to talk to them about it. We truly believe, if they understand the facts, they will be strongly supportive.

Again, I wish to turn to my colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. One final point of clarification and perhaps the Senator from North Dakota can react and comment on this as well.

My understanding is, of course, that this doesn't have any impact on the master manual, the way in which the corps manages the reservoir. So the degree to which there might be concern about whether this is our water versus their water, which historically has plagued a lot of the discussions about the Missouri River—upstream-downstream interests. As the Senator from North Dakota pointed out, the water is going to get used. It is water that is either stored or used. I think it is a question of whether we are going to be charged, the users of that water are going to be charged, and that does, of course, create precedent. If that is something they can do here, the question is, What is the next State? Because this violates a principle of federalism, as pointed out by the attorney general of South Dakota in his letter to the Corps of Engineers.

But I wanted to say for the record, perhaps to those who are viewing this as an upstream-downstream battle, that is not the case. This does not affect the master manual, to my knowledge, and I ask the Senator from South Dakota to react to that as well.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely right. I wish to thank him for emphasizing that point. It is very important. Again, that is why I encourage any of our colleagues to discuss this issue with us if they have any concerns whatsoever. It is just a fundamental fairness issue, and we ask for an affirmative vote from our colleagues.

With that, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Without objection, the clerk will report the Hoeven amendment.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HOEVEN] proposes an amendment numbered 909.

Mr. HOEVEN. 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:

AMENDMENT NO. 909

(Purpose: To restrict charges for certain surplus water)

On page 190, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 2060. RESTRICTION ON CHARGES FOR CERTAIN SURPLUS WATER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No fee for surplus water shall be charged under a contract for surplus water if the contract is for surplus water stored on the Missouri River.

(b) OFFSET.—Of the amounts made available under Public Law 113–6 (127 Stat. 198) for operations and maintenance under the heading ''Corps of Engineers—Civil'', $5,000,000 is rescinded.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 868

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, shortly we are going to vote; I believe it will be a voice vote on the Inhofe amendment. It is not a controversial amendment; everybody agrees to it. Then we will proceed to the Barrasso amendment which I have spoken about before.

I wish to urge my colleagues to be very careful on this one because it has unintended consequences. The way the Barrasso amendment is drafted, it tries to say, in advance of a rulemaking, that if the rulemaking includes any infrastructure from the guidance that has been put forward by the corps and the EPA—if it even contains anything like it—''the rule will be considered as having been vacated.'' That is a quote.

So the bottom line is, the Barrasso amendment is such an overreach that we will keep the whole issue of waters of the United States in chaos—and it is in chaos. We received letters from business people begging us to allow the rulemaking to go forward, but because of the way the Barrasso amendment is drafted, essentially we are not going to ever have a rule.

So why is it important to have a rule that is very clear and explains what waters are covered under the Clean Water Act? Let me tell my colleagues why. Without protections of a rule, dangerous pollutants could be put into our waterways. This isn't just hyperbole. We are talking about toxic heavy metals such as arsenic and lead. We are talking about toxins that cause cancer and harm the health of infants and children in particular. Who are the vulnerables? The infants, the children and the elderly and those who are disabled. They are the ones who are the victims of filthy, dirty water.

I am not saying my friend Senator BARRASSO wants to get people sick. I am not saying that. But I am saying there is an unintended consequence of the overreach in this amendment which is pretty clear to all who read it. It says if the draft guidance that has already been looked at is included in any way, shape or form into a final rule, then the whole rule is thrown out on its face and that leaves the situation in chaos.

Say I come to the Presiding Officer and say: I am going to write a book about mathematics. The Presiding Officer says: That is very exciting, but there is only one thing. I am your publisher and you can't put one single number in the book—not a 1 to a 2 to a 3. You can write a book on mathematics, but it can't contain any numbers. That is the most ridiculous situation. But this is the essence of the Barrasso amendment. It is telling people who are going to write a rule that they can't take anything that was put in the draft guidance and put it into that rule. It makes absolutely no sense.

I want to protect people from toxics such as lead and arsenic. Without these safeguards of the rule, our drinking water supplies would be more at risk and the laws of these protections would increase the risks of dangerous floods in downstream communities because it would eliminate wetlands protections.

One of the things I learned when I was a county supervisor a very long time ago is that wetlands kept in their natural state and enhanced are the best way to have flood protection. When I went to Louisiana after Katrina, I was struck by the fact that the whole community understood the importance of the wetlands, because they absorb the floodwaters.

So now, because we are not going to be able to define what is a body of water that falls under the Clean Water Act, we are going to have a major problem with our wetlands. We are going to have a major problem with our rivers. We are going to have a major problem with our streams. We are talking about enormous bodies of water that are unprotected now because there is no rule. Under the Barrasso amendment, my opinion is—and it isn't just my opinion—there will not be any rule because if the rule picks up anything in the guidance at all—anything substantially similar to the guidance at all—it will be automatically overturned.

I wish to say to my friend, if he doesn't like a rule, he has the CRA, the Congressional Review Act. He can wait until he gets the rule. Don't prejudge it. Don't say the rule is vacated. That is pretty dictatorial to people who are in charge of protecting our water supply.

Nobody wants our kids to get more cancer. Nobody wants this to happen. We have to protect streams that provide drinking water for up to 117 million Americans. We have 20 million acres of wetlands that provide flood protection, improve water quality, and serve as wildlife habitat.

So the hour of 5 o'clock is upon us. We are going to vote on the Inhofe amendment first. Then we will turn to Senator BARRASSO for a moment to make his case, and then I will have 1 minute after that. So at this time we return to regular order. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 797

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I call up Inhofe amendment No. 797.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 797.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 797) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To authorize a land exchange)

At the end of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12___. TULSA PORT OF CATOOSA, ROGERS COUNTY, OKLAHOMA LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 87 acres of land situated in Rogers County, Oklahoma, contained within United States Tracts 413 and 427, and acquired for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas Navigation System.

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''non-Federal land'' means the approximately 34 acres of land situated in Rogers County, Oklahoma and owned by the Tulsa Port of Catoosa that lie immediately south and east of the Federal land.

(b) LAND EXCHANGE.—Subject to subsection (c), on conveyance by the Tulsa Port of Catoosa to the United States of all right, title, and interest in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the Tulsa Port of Catoosa, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(c) CONDITIONS.—

(1) DEEDS.—

(A) DEED TO NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary may only accept conveyance of the non-Federal land by warranty deed, as determined acceptable by the Secretary.

(B) DEED TO FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary shall convey the Federal land to the Tulsa Port of Catoosa by quitclaim deed and subject to any reservations, terms, and conditions that the Secretary determines necessary to—

(i) allow the United States to operate and maintain the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System; and

(ii) protect the interests of the United States.

(2) LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—The exact acreage and legal descriptions of the Federal land and the non-Federal land shall be determined by surveys acceptable to the Secretary.

(3) PAYMENT OF COSTS.—The Tulsa Port of Catoosa shall be responsible for all costs associated with the land exchange authorized by this section, including any costs that the Secretary determines necessary and reasonable in the interest of the United States, including surveys, appraisals, real estate transaction fees, administrative costs, and environmental documentation.

(4) CASH PAYMENT.—If the appraised fair market value of the Federal land, as determined by the Secretary, exceeds the appraised fair market value of the non-Federal land, as determined by the Secretary, the Tulsa Port of Catoosa shall make a cash payment to the United States reflecting the difference in the appraised fair market values.

(5) LIABILITY.—The Tulsa Port of Catoosa shall hold and save the United States free from damages arising from activities carried out under this section, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or a contractor of the United States.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, what is the order at this time?

AMENDMENT NO. 868

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on amendment No. 868 offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. BARRASSO.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, this amendment restricts the expansion of Federal authority to encompass all wet areas of farms, ranches, and suburban homes across the United States. They want to do it through guidance, this proposed guidance that is used by Federal agencies. It seems that they are preparing to expand the definition of waters of the United States to include ditches and other dry areas where water flows only for a short duration after a rainfall.

This guidance is going to have a huge impact on farmers, ranchers, and small businesses that need to put a shovel in the ground to make a living. This guidance will, in fact, trump States rights by preempting State and local governments from making local land and water use decisions.

I have always believed the State and local governments, not Washington, know best how to protect their communities from environmental harm. The guidance does exactly the opposite and puts the power of these decisions in the hands of bureaucrats in Washington.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, the way my colleague and friend has drafted his amendment is very dangerous to the process because he wants to say if, in the rulemaking where we will define the waters of the United States, if they even so much as refer to the guidance that has been put forward, the draft guidance, there will be no rule.

The problem of not having a rule is we leave in place chaos. States cannot go ahead and handle this themselves. Local governments cannot. Under the law, according to all the rules of the Court and everybody else, we have to have a definition. No one I know wants to classify a ditch or a puddle as a water of the United States. That is always brought up, but that is just a red herring.

We need to make sure we have a Clean Water Act that protects the people, protects their drinking water, and makes sure they are safe when they swim in a lake. If we do not move forward with a rule, at the end of the day this amendment will not allow that to happen, and we are in chaos. It does not protect our people from arsenic, from lead, from whatever objects there may be in a body of water. So I hope we will reject this. I thank my friend for offering it, but I think it is misguided.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 119 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Fischer	McCaskill
Ayotte	Flake	McConnell
Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Begich	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hagan	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Pryor
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Landrieu	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Donnelly	Manchin	
Enzi	McCain	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reid
Baucus	Harkin	Rockefeller
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Casey	Levin	Udall (NM)
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Cowan	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Reed	

NOT VOTING—4

Lautenberg	Murray
Murkowski	Nelson

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I want to tell my colleagues what the plan is for tonight and tomorrow on the WRDA bill and thank everyone so much on both sides of the aisle for their cooperation. Senator VITTER and I are so happy we are able to have this open process, and we will finish this bill tomorrow. This will be the last vote this evening. We will continue late morning and complete our work. Right now we are going to have the Sanders amendment, with 2 minutes equally divided, and both Senators from Vermont would like to be heard.

AMENDMENT NO. 889

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 889, offered by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. This amendment impacts Vermont today, but it can impact any and every State in this country if it experiences a major flood or a natural disaster.

We all know FEMA compensates communities for rebuilding bridges and culverts damaged during storms such as Irene, but what is not widely known is that FEMA insists that local communities, in order to get reimbursed, must build culverts and bridges to the same standards that already failed and are likely to fail again. It is not terribly sensible. That is what this amendment deals with.

I yield to my colleague from Vermont, Senator LEAHY.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, all we are saying is that if you are going to be getting relief from the Federal Government but you have a better way to rebuild your culverts, you can do it that way rather than to have the ones that failed before.

I am sure there are a whole lot of States here that will be affected by this amendment, and I hope it will be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, as ranking member on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, I know there are a lot of problems with FEMA and the Stafford grant, but this is essentially an earmark for an improvement before FEMA has even determined whether it is going to give mitigation grant money to the State of Vermont.

We need to do a lot in the way of changes with FEMA and grants and the Stafford grant monies. We know that, and we are working on that in Homeland Security. But this starts a process that sets a precedent that will be terrible. This is nothing right now but an earmark for one area, to benefit one State, when we need to make improvements in the whole process.

I hope my colleagues will look at the big picture rather than the small picture, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 120 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Pryor
Baucus	Hagan	Reed
Begich	Harkin	Reid
Bennet	Heinrich	Rockefeller
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Sanders
Boxer	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Stabenow
Carper	Klobuchar	Tester
Casey	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Collins	Levin	Vitter
Coons	Manchin	Warner
Cowan	McCaskill	Warren
Donnelly	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wicker
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murphy	

NAYS—40

Alexander	Fischer	McConnell
Ayotte	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johanns	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Kirk	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	
Enzi	McCain	

NOT VOTING—4

Lautenberg	Murray
Murkowski	Nelson

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise today to speak on S. 601, the Water Resources Development Act, WRDA. I would like to focus on Senate Amendment No. 801, a bipartisan provision to provide regulatory relief to our country's farmers and ranchers. Senate Amendment No. 801 is based on S. 496, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Stewardship Act, FUELS Act.

The FUELS Act was introduced by Senator MARK PRYOR and has 10 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle including Senators JOHN BOOZMAN, SAXBY CHAMBLISS, THAD COCHRAN, JOHN CORNYN, HEIDI HEITKAMP, JAMES INHOFE, JOHNNY ISAKSON, MIKE JOHANNS, MARY LANDRIEU, and myself. It was referred to the Senate Environment & Public Works Committee, of which I am a member.

I filed the FUELS Act as an amendment to WRDA when it was considered earlier this year by the Senate Environment & Public Works Committee. The amendment was not considered at that time.

The House version of the FUELS Act, H.R. 311, was introduced by Congressman RICK CRAWFORD and has 69 cosponsors. In the 112th Congress, the FUELS Act, H.R. 3158, was reported by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and passed the House by voice vote. The House Committee Report for H.R. 3158 (Report 112–643) provides background and discusses the need for legislation:

The EPA mandated Oil Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures program, or SPCC, requires that oil storage facilities with a capacity of over 1,320 gallons must make infrastructure improvements to reduce the possibility of oil spills. The regulations require farmers to construct a containment facility, like a dike or a basin, which must retain 110 percent of the fuel in the container. These mandated infrastructure improvements—along with the necessary inspection and certification by a specially licensed Professional Engineer will cost many farmers tens of thousands of dollars. Sometimes compliance costs reach higher than $60,000.

The SPCC program dates back to 1973, shortly after the Clean Water Act was signed into law. In the last decade, it has been rigorously applied to agriculture lands, and has been amended, delayed, and extended dozens of times. The Obama administration updated the rule in 2009 to expand regulation under the SPCC program—applying it to nearly all farms, and lifting a 2006 rule that suspended compliance requirements for small farms with oil storage of 10,000 gallons or less. It applied to crop oil, vegetable oil, animal fat, and even milk. Further revisions came during April of 2011 when the EPA decided to exempt milk.

The 2009 rule—minus regulating milk spills was scheduled to go into effect in November 2011. A few weeks before the November deadline, EPA issued a statement saying they would not begin enforcement until May of 2013. While enforcement has been delayed until 2013, the underlying regulation has not been fixed.

The FUELS Act requires that EPA revise the SPCC regulations to be reflective of a producer's spill risk and financial resources. The exemption level would be adjusted upward from 1,320 gallons of oil storage to an amount that would protect small farms: 10,000 gallons. The proposal would also place a greater degree of responsibility on farmers and ranchers to self-certify compliance if their oil storage facilities exceed the exemption level. If the amount exceeds 42,000 gallons, a professional engineer must certify the SPCC plans for a farm. The bill provides another layer of protection by requiring the producer to be able to demonstrate that he or she has no history of oil spills, or to fully comply with the SPCC regulations.

The University of Arkansas, Division of Agriculture did a study that concluded that, for the entire country, H.R. 3158 would save farmers and ranchers up to $3.36 billion.

Agricultural production is an energy-intensive endeavor. Farmers need fuel to power machinery, equipment, and irrigation pumps. Because these operations are in rural areas where regular access to fuel supplies is limited, producers rely upon on-farm fuel storage capacity to provide the supply we need at the times we need it.

My family operates a cattle ranch in the Nebraska Sandhills, so I can tell you firsthand that farmers and ranchers take great pride in the work we do. Our success is the direct result of careful stewardship of our natural resources, which we depend upon for our livelihoods. In agriculture, we know the value of clean water, and we work hard to protect the quality of our streams and aquifers. When it comes to preventing spills from our on-farm fuel storage, farmers already have every incentive to do so—not the least of which is the high cost of diesel and gasoline.

I receive calls and letters every day from Nebraska farmers concerned about the compliance challenges associated with the SPCC rule for on-farm fuel storage, a regulation originally designed for oil refineries. Allow me to share a portion of one such constituent email I recently received on this issue:

> We just became aware of this regulation yesterday through an email from Farm Bureau. Since we have a large quantity of on-farm storage capacity, we are not able to self-certify and must hire a professional engineer to create a plan. In order to find a qualified engineer, I first called the EPA, who then told me to call the Region 7 office out of Kansas City, who then told me to call the Nebraska Board of Engineers, who then told me to call the Nebraska Society of Professional Engineers, but the number on their website is no longer in service. When I asked the gentleman from the Nebraska Board of Engineers how much it would cost, he said anywhere from $1500-$4800, depending on the complexity and the engineer's ability to charge more due to high demand due to the approaching deadline. When I asked the gentleman from the EPA Region 7 office why we hadn't heard about it before now, he said the ruling was in place for a long time but they haven't done a good job of getting the word out.

When I shared these frustrations with Gina McCarthy, the nominee for EPA Administrator, she acknowledged at her nomination hearing on April 11, 2013, that ''the agency has bridges to build with the agriculture community.'' The fact is that good stewardship on farms and ranches and environmental improvements are achieved because of producers' application of new technology, best practices, and conservation measures.

Centralized management and mandates are all too often arbitrary, ineffectual, or even counterproductive, lacking the insight of local stakeholders. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the stakeholder groups on this issue that illustrates this point, July 25, 2012 letter to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. This letter from national agriculture groups—including the American Farm Bureau Federation, American Soybean Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Chicken Council, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Milk Producers Federation, National Turkey Federation, and USA Rice Federation explains the arbitrary nature of the current regulation: ''EPA's unusual threshold number of 1,320 gallons has no basis in science or in normal tank sizes for agriculture.''

WRDA will require EPA, in consultation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, to conduct a study to determine the appropriate exemption level ''to not more than 6,000 gallons and not less than 2,500 gallons, based on a significant risk of discharge to water.'' The intent of this provision is to ensure that EPA is not unnecessarily regulating on-farm fuel storage at capacities that do not pose a significant risk to harming water quality. If there is not a significant risk, then regulation is not justified. Compliance costs should not be imposed where there is not a significant risk.

A March 2005 USDA report, Fuel/Oil Storage for Farmers and Cooperatives, states, ''The SPCC rule will have a substantial cost of compliance for the nation's farmers. A total compliance cost of almost $4.5 billion is projected. There is very little evidence of fuel/oil spill by farms.'' The report goes on to state that ''the 1,320 gallons aggregated storage trigger is not supported by the survey data. Compliance at this level not only ignores the physical layouts of farm fuel storage but it also imposes a broad and extreme impact on the majority of farms. Nearly 70 percent of all farms would have to comply, at an average aggregated tank cost of $9,215 and a total compliance cost of $4.5 billion.''

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD other letters of support for the FUELS Act from agricultural stakeholders, including letters from the American Farm Bureau Federation, USA Rice, National Corn Growers Association, American Soybean Association, National Cotton Council, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, and National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, NCFC.

This quote from the NCFC letter illustrates the points I have made, further explains the need for the legislation, and emphasizes the importance of the EPA-USDA study in ensuring that we are not unnecessarily regulating capacity levels at which no significant risk of oil spills has been demonstrated.

> Without question the members of the agricultural sector who grow the nation's food and rely on surface and well water to meet their families' and agricultural operations' needs are highly motivated to ensure that their environmental practices are sound. These producers work daily to ensure a safe environment for their children and the communities in which they live. As such, they can and do take very seriously their responsibility, consistent with the intent and spirit of the SPCC provisions, to properly manage the oil resources used on their operations.
>
> Row crop farms, ranches, livestock operations, farmer cooperatives and other agribusinesses pose low risks for spills and are often seasonal in nature. In fact, data on oil spill on farms, cooperatives, and other agribusinesses is almost nonexistent. The Agency has failed to provide data or even anecdotal evidence of agricultural spills to justify such a resource-intensive rulemaking for America's farmers and ranchers. The risk of such spills from agriculture is extremely low and there is little to no evidence that providing greater flexibility through S. 496 will harm the environment.

The Senate's approval of WRDA will be a huge victory for farmers throughout Nebraska and across America, who should not face unnecessary regulations. The bipartisan provision regarding on-farm fuel storage raises the exemption levels for fuel storage capacity to better reflect the spill risk and financial resources of farms. I appreciate my colleagues' support and cooperation on this issue.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 25, 2012.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. NICK RAHALL,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MICA AND RANKING MEMBER RAHALL: The undersigned organizations would like to express our strong support for H.R. 3158, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship (FUELS) Act, H.R. 3158 would bring some much needed clarity to agriculture on the confusing requirements of the EPA's Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) rule.

As you are aware, farming is an energy-intensive profession. Producers need fuels stored on-farm for everything from fueling mobile equipment to running irrigation pumps. Many of these tanks are seasonal use and stay empty much of the year due to the high cost of fuel and the possibility of theft. Furthermore, EPA's unusual threshold number of 1,320 gallons has no basis in science or in normal tank sizes for agriculture.

In addition, EPA's bifurcation of the rule date (before and after August 16, 2002) has brought immense, unneeded confusion to the farming community as they try to determine whether their current business model is the same that was in operation prior to the 2002 date. The requirement to have Professional Engineers (PEs) sign off on many SPCC plans adds significant costs to the producer as well as the time spent trying to find the limited number of PE's willing to work on this rule in agricultural areas. It has already led to PEs telling producers many things that aren't in the rule as they try to oversell their product.

While the undersigned organizations welcome EPA's extension of the deadline to May 10, 2013, that extension only applies to farms in operation after August 16, 2002, further confusing the industry. Furthermore, farms are still under the costly requirements of providing secondary containment to many seasonal-use tanks and developing complicated 'spill plans'. Despite pleas to the agency for compliance assistance, they have been slow to respond, and despite invitations

to grower meetings, they have little funding for travel.

Thankfully, this Congress has the opportunity to ease this burden on rural America. H.R. 3158 would provide realistic threshold sizes for tank regulation at the farm level and allow more farms to self-certify thus saving time and money that would otherwise be spent in hiring PE's to sign the SPCC plans.

H.R. 3158 is common sense legislation that the undersigned strongly support. We urge the Committee and Congress to pass the bill to help relieve undue regulation on farmers and rural America.

Sincerely,

American Farm Bureau Federation, American Soybean Association, Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation, Montana Grain Growers Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Chicken Council, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Milk Producers Federation, National Turkey Federation, Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Federation, USA Rice Federation.

NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2013.

Hon. MARK PRYOR,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS PRYOR and INHOFE. The National Cotton Council (NCC) supports your efforts to advance S. 496, the FUELS Act.

Your bill will alleviate the costly regulatory burden on farmers resulting from EPA's Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Rule. EPA's unusual threshold number of 1,320 gallons has no basis in science or in normal tank sizes for agriculture. S. 496 will raise that threshold to a more realistic and practical level. Your bill will also allow more farms to self-certify rather than hiring a qualified professional engineer.

NCC is the central organization of the U.S. cotton industry representing producers, ginners, merchants, cooperatives, textile manufacturers, and cottonseed processors and merchandisers in 17 states stretching from California to the Carolinas. NCC represents producers who historically cultivate between 10 and 14 million acres of cotton. Annual cotton production, averaging approximately 20 million 480-lb bales, is valued at more than $5 billion at the farm gate. While a majority of the industry is concentrated in the 17 cotton-producing states, the down-stream manufacturers of cotton apparel and home-furnishings are located in virtually every state. The industry and its suppliers, together with the cotton product manufacturers, account for more than 230,000 jobs in the U.S. In addition to the cotton fiber, cottonseed products are used for livestock feed and cottonseed oil is used for food products ranging from margarine to salad dressing. Taken collectively, the annual economic activity generated by cotton and its products in the U.S. economy is estimated to be in excess of $120 billion.

Again, the Council supports and appreciates your efforts on this issue.

Sincerely,

E. KEITH MENCHEY,
Manager, Science & Environmental Issues.

MAY 6, 2013.

Hon. MARK PRYOR,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS PRYOR AND INHOFE, On behalf of the National Association of Wheat Growers (NAWG), we appreciate your efforts to advance S. 496, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship (FUELS) Act, and would urge its inclusion in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) in the Senate. NAWG and its 22 affiliated state associations work together to help protect and advance wheat growers' interests.

As you are aware, farming is an energy-intensive profession. Producers need fuels stored on-farm for everything from fueling tractors to running irrigation pumps. EPA's unusual 1,320 gallon regulatory threshold under the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) rule has no basis in science or in normal tank sizes for agriculture. S. 496 would raise the exemption threshold to 10,000 gallons, which is a more reasonable level. It would also allow more farms with aggregate storage capacity between 10,000—42,000 gallons to self-certify rather than hiring a professional engineer.

This common sense amendment to WRDA would ease the burden on smaller producers, and we strongly encourage its adoption. Thank you for your support on this important issue.

Sincerely,

BING VON BERGEN,
President,
National Association of Wheat Growers.

AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION,
St. Louis, MO, May 2, 2013.

Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR INHOFE: I am writing on behalf of the American Soybean Association in support of your efforts to include S. 496, the FUELS Act, during Senate consideration of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA). ASA represents all U.S. soybean farmers on domestic and international issues of importance to the soybean industry. ASA's advocacy efforts are made possible through the voluntary membership in ASA by over 21,000 farmers in 31 states where soybeans are grown.

New rules will take effect at the end of this fiscal year that will require that oil storage facilities with a capacity of over 1,320 gallons make structural improvements to reduce the possibility of oil spills. The plan requires farmers to construct a containment facility, like a dike or a basin, which must retain 110 percent of the fuel in the container.

Most soybean farmers find these threshold levels to be unacceptably low. Your amendment would raise the exemption level to a more reasonable 10,000 gallons for a single container, with farmers able to self-certify compliance if aggregate storage capacity is between 10,000 to 42,000 gallons.

ASA supports this amendment, and urges the Senate to adopt it.

Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

DANNY MURPHY,
ASA President.

MAY 2, 2013.

U.S. Senator MARK PRYOR,
Dirksen Senate Building,
Washington, DC.
U.S. Senator JAMES INHOFE,
Russell Senate Building,
Washington, DC.
U.S. Senator DEB FISCHER,
Hart Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS, The National Cattlemen's Beef Association (NCBA) thanks you for your support of the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship (FUELS) Act (S. 496). The FUELS Act eases the burden on farmers and ranchers in implementing the Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) rule for farms. NCBA represents over 100,000 cattle producers across the country as the nation's oldest and largest trade association representing cattle ranchers. Our members believe the FUELS Act is a common-sense measure that balances environmental concerns with the burden and cost of the regulation.

U.S. cattle ranchers are proud of their tradition as stewards of our country's natural resources. Our members take very seriously their commitment to protecting water quality from events like fuel spills. They also believe however that the economic burdens of developing spill plans certified by a profession engineer outweigh the marginal benefit that would come with requiring these plans on all farms. Compliance with the rule will cost producers thousands of dollars at a time when their budgets are very limited due to historic drought and other economic factors. In addition, in the rural areas there is an inadequate number of Professional Engineers (P.E.S) to do the engineering work required. The FUELS Act takes into account these considerations. It raises the threshold for fuel storage capacity from a mere 1,320 gallons to 10,000 gallons, which eases the burden on many smaller operations. It also allows more operations to self-certify their plans, eliminating the need for more P.E.s and the increased cost.

The SPCC rule for farms will take effect October 1, 2013 and therefore it is imperative that Congress act to prevent this regulation from creating unnecessary financial burdens on many farmers and ranchers. Thank you for your leadership on this important issue.

Sincerely,

SCOTT GEORGE,
President,
National Cattlemen's Beef Association.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC.

SENATOR,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation, I would like to commend you for introducing S.496, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship Act. This legislation will help clarify the uncertainty created by existing regulations and the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) confusing and potentially costly compliance assistance efforts. AFBF supports the legislation and hopes it will receive strong bipartisan support.

Modern agricultural equipment requires a lot of energy. EPA's current regulatory requirements for farms appear to have little basis in science nor alignment with tank sizes currently in use in agriculture. Equally confusing is EPA's inability to provide clarity with regard to language that asks farmers and ranchers to comply with Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) regulations if the operation could reasonably be expected to discharge oil to waters of the U.S. As it stands, this ambiguous term might

apply to features that farmers and ranchers would more likely associate with dry land than water. It is therefore not reasonable for EPA to include such an expectation if it has done nothing to clarify a reasonable understanding of jurisdiction waters that is consistent with congressional intent and judicial case law

S. 496 is common-sense legislation that the Farm Bureau strongly supports. We urge the Senate to pass this amendment to help relieve undue regulation on farmers and rural America.

Sincerely yours,

DALE MOORE.

Senator MARK PRYOR,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Senator JIM INHOFE,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS PRYOR AND INHOFE: The USA Rice Federation would like to express our strong support for S. 496, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship Act (FUELS Act), as an amendment to WRDA, the Water Resources Development Act. This bill would bring some much needed clarity to agriculture on the confusing requirements of the EPA's Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) rule.

As you are aware, farming is an energy-intensive profession. Producers need fuels stored on-farm for everything from fueling mobile equipment to running irrigation pumps. Many of these tanks are in use seasonally and stay empty much of the year due to the high cost of fuel and the possibility of theft. Furthermore, EPA's threshold number of 1,320 gallons has no basis in science or in normal tank sizes for agriculture.

In addition, EPA's bifurcation of the rule date (before and after August 16, 2002) has brought immense, unneeded confusion to the farming community as they try to determine whether their current business model is the same that was in operation prior to the 2002 date. The requirement to have Professional Engineers (PEs) sign off on many SPCC plans adds significant costs to the producer as well as the time spent trying to find the limited number of PE's willing to work on this rule in agricultural areas.

The USA Rice Federation has joined other groups in our support of EPA's extension of the deadline to May 10, 2013, but that quickly approaching extension only applies to farms in operation after August 16, 2002, further confusing the industry. Furthermore, farms are still under the costly requirements of providing secondary containment to many seasonal-use tanks and developing complicated and expensive 'spill plans'. Despite pleas to the agency for compliance assistance, they have been slow to respond, and despite invitations to grower meetings, they have little funding for travel.

Thankfully, the Senate has the opportunity to ease this burden on rural America. S. 496 would provide realistic threshold sizes for tank regulation at the farm level and allow more farms to self-certify thus saving time and money that would otherwise be spent in hiring PE's to sign the SPCC plans. S. 496 is a piece of common sense legislation that we strongly support. We urge the Senate to pass the bill to help relieve undue regulation on farmers and rural America as a part of the Water Resources Development Act.

Sincerely,

LINDA C. RAUN,
Chairwoman,
USA Rice Producers' Group.

MAY 3, 2013.

Hon. MARK PRYOR,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS PRYOR AND INHOFE, On behalf of the National Corn Growers Association (NCGA), we appreciate your efforts to advance S. 496, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship (FUELS) Act, and would urge its inclusion in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) in the Senate. Founded in 1957, NCGA represents approximately 38,000 dues-paying corn growers and the interests of more than 300,000 farmers who contribute through corn checkoff programs in their states. NCGA and its 48 affiliated state associations and checkoff organizations work together to help protect and advance corn growers' interests.

As you are aware, farming is an energy-intensive profession. Producers need fuels stored on-farm for everything from fueling tractors to running irrigation pumps. EPA's unusual 1,320 gallon regulatory threshold under the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) rule has no basis in science or in normal tank sizes for agriculture. S. 496 would raise the threshold the exemption threshold to 10,000 gallons, which is a more reasonable level. It would also allow more farms with aggregate storage capacity between 10,000–42,000 gallons to self-certify rather than hiring a professional engineer.

This common sense amendment to WRDA would ease the burden on smaller producers, and we strongly encourage its adoption. Thank you for your support on this important issue.

Sincerely,

PAM JOHNSON,
President,
National Corn Growers Association.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2013.

Hon. MARK PRYOR,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS PRYOR AND INHOFE: On behalf of the more than two million farmers and ranchers who belong to farmer cooperatives, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives (NCFC) applauds your outstanding work to create sound policies that maintain the economic and environmental health of farms, ranches, and the rural communities where they operate. This commitment is evident in S. 496, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship Act (FUELS Act).

The SPCC rule was originally promulgated on December 11, 1973. In 1991, a proposed rule was initiated but floundered for more than 11 years. In a move that caught many off guard, the Agency published a final rule on July 17, 2002, amending the SPCC regulations. This new rule became effective on August 16, 2002, and applied to any facility—including farms—with an aggregate of 1,320 gallons of oil on their property in aboveground tanks of 55 gallons or greater, where the spill might eventually reach navigable waters. That rulemaking showed a lack of understanding of production agriculture and as a result, required multiple revisions and compliance deadline extensions that spanned over decade.

While we welcomed the extension of the compliance deadline to May 10, 2013, that extension only applied to those agricultural operations that currently have an SPCC plan or new facilities that came into operation after the rule was effective. Specifically, if a farm was in existence prior to August 16, 2002, the compliance extension was not applicable as these farms were supposed to be in compliance with the SPCC rule and have a plan in place. EPA's bifurcation of the rule date (before and after August 16, 2002) has brought immense, unneeded confusion to the farming community as they try to determine whether their current business structure was in place prior to the 2002 date.

At the same time, the Agency has unfortunately struggled with efforts to prepare guidance and mobilize specific outreach activities in a timely manner in order to provide the farming community with the understanding and necessary tools to comply with the final rule.

Throughout the history and evolution of the SPCC rule, NCFC has strived to maintain a constructive dialogue with EPA to ensure that any agency action regulating oil spill prevention and response take into account the uniqueness of the agricultural industry; be based on sound science, need, and identified risk; and that final regulations be clear and allow time for education and implementation. While the Agency has shown good faith in working to improve the SPCC rule for agriculture, these efforts have proceeded in fits and starts.

Without question the members of the agricultural sector who grow the nation's food and rely on surface and well water to meet their families' and agricultural operations' needs are highly motivated to ensure that their environmental practices are sound. These producers work daily to ensure a safe environment for their children and the communities in which they live. As such, they can and do take very seriously their responsibility, consistent with the intent and spirit of the SPCC provisions, to properly manage the oil resources used on their operations.

Row crop farms, ranches, livestock operations, farmer cooperatives and other agribusinesses pose low risks for spills and are often seasonal in nature. In fact, data on oil spill on farms, cooperatives, and other agribusinesses is almost nonexistent. The Agency has failed to provide data or even anecdotal evidence of agricultural spills to justify such a resource-intensive rulemaking for America's farmers and ranchers. The risk of such spills from agriculture is extremely low and there is little to no evidence that providing greater flexibility through S. 496 will harm the environment.

We strongly believe S. 496 will bring much needed clarity to agriculture on the confusing requirements of the SPCC rule. Specifically, it would provide realistic threshold sizes for tank regulation at the farm level and allow more farms to self-certify thus saving time and money that would otherwise be spent in hiring Professional Engineers to develop and sign the SPCC plans.

The FUELS Act is common-sense legislation and we strongly encourage the Senate to support its passage as part of the Water Resources Development Act.

Sincerely,

CHARLES F. CONNER,
President & CEO.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Virginia.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 25

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I rise to make a few brief remarks. I will leave most of those remarks until after I make another request for unanimous consent. I think I know where this unanimous consent request is headed. I am disappointed. I think we are on, I believe, day 51 at this point as to the request that many of us have made in this Chamber to go back to regular order. Part of that regular order is after a budget has passed for budget conferees to be appointed so we can resolve what I believe is the most important issue facing our Nation, the question of our debt and deficit, so we can try to take the actions needed to get this economy jump-started again. I will reserve most of my time for the remarks afterward.

In the meantime, let me make this request:

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent 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; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I ask consent the Senator modify his request so that 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator so modify?

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object, simply as someone who has spent an awful lot of time on this issue, both sides need to be willing to comprise. We need to deal with both the revenue side of this challenge as well as the entitlement reforms that are needed to make sure we can get our close-to-$17-trillion debt back under control. Recognizing the Senator's request would take part of the opportunity to reach that common ground off the table, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I simply want to again take a moment here, 52 days after we spent until 5 o'clock in the morning debating a budget—the budget that had over 100 amendments offered, a budget that had amendments from both sides offered and rejected but also accepted. Amendments from both sides were accepted into this budget. It passed with a majority.

I know there are some of my colleagues on the other side who say we should go into the next step of this debate with certain things taken off the table. I do not understand how we are ever going to get to the point which every economist from left to right has all agreed upon, that we have to put this issue of lurching from one budget crisis to another behind us.

The fact is there is an awful lot of consensus about what we need to do. Starting back with the Simpson-Bowles report, then followed up by the Gang of Six and the Domenici-Rivlin report, everyone agrees we need to do at least $4 trillion over the next 10 years. We don't have to solve the whole problem, we just have to take a good step forward.

The remarkable thing is even lurching from crisis to crisis we are over half the way there. Depending on how you want to count, we have done between $2.2 and $2.5 trillion of deficit reduction. That means we need about $2 trillion more to be done for us to again not only provide the boost to the American economy, not only to no longer make Congress the object of more than late-night jokes about our inability to get things done, not only to be able to ensure we have driven our debt-to-GDP ratio back down, headed in the right direction, but, perhaps most important, demonstrate to the American people that when we have an issue of this importance we can actually find that common ground.

To do that is going to require, candidly, everyone in this body and our friends down the hall in the House to be willing to give a little bit. That means we are going to have to find ways to generate additional revenues. I believe, for one—I know sometimes many on my side disagree with me—we are going to have to find ways to reform our entitlement programs so the promise of Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid, some of the best initiatives ever put forward, are going to be here 30 years from now.

But if we are going to reach that kind of compromise, it means the regular order has to proceed. It means we have to have these two very different budgets, one passed by the House, one passed by the Senate, resolved through the regular order of a conference committee. If we do not do this—if we do not do this—my fear is we are going to continue to do the kind of actions we have been on over the last number of months where we continue to cut back on that relatively small piece of Federal spending which is discretionary spending.

We are already seeing, in States such as Massachusetts and Minnesota and Virginia, the effects of sequestration where we have put forward a policy that was viewed by everyone when it was originally thought up as so stupid, so beyond the pale, that no rational group of folks would ever allow it to come to pass. We are now 3 or 4 months into allowing that to come to pass. While we have taken action on certain items such as relieving the challenge of our air traffic controllers, we have not taken action on making sure the funds have been replaced for the 70,000 to 80,000-plus kids who have lost their Head Start funding. We have not taken action to ensure the NIH cancer grants that are being cut, where we have done multigrant years—where the preceding years of research are now going to be flushed because we cannot do the final year of the grant, we cannot take action on that.

We have not taken action on the fact that now, as announced by the Secretary of Defense, while we have made some progress, where no longer are there 22 days of furloughs, we are now seeing 11 days of furloughs to our defense civilian employees. This is at a time that makes enormous challenges to their budgets but beyond that to the readiness of the men and women who defend our Nation.

We can continue this path on sequestration, frankly, retarding our ability to keep our military ready, holding back our ability to have the kind of economic recovery we would all like to see or we can allow the regular order, a regular order that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle called for, for the last couple of years, for us in this Senate to pass the budget.

We passed that budget. Now we need to take the next step in the process and appoint conferees and let us try to find that common ground between the House and Senate budget so we can address this issue of debt and deficit, so we can demonstrate to the American people that we can do our most basic responsibility, which is to make sure we pay our bills and operate the basic functions of government, and that we can do our job to restore the faith that this institution can work in a way the Founders set up.

Unfortunately, we are not going to take that step today because now, for the fifty-second day in a row, our Republican colleagues have objected to the next step in regular order. I am greatly disappointed, but I know I and other colleagues will come down on a regular basis and continue to make this request. My hope is that at some point in the not too distant future we can let the process continue, and we can get to the hard work of resolving the differences of the House and Senate so we can put this issue of lurching from budget crisis to budget crisis in the rearview mirror.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I thank the former Governor of Virginia. He knows how to balance a budget and how to have a strong budget for the good people of this country. I share his frustration that we are not able to bring this long-awaited budget that we finally passed in the Senate to conference with the House. I hope minds will change and we will be able to get this done.

Again, I thank the Senator for his leadership and for a balanced approach on reducing the debt.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I come to the floor today to speak on the importance of passing the Water Resources Development Act or, as we know it around Washington, the WRDA bill.

In my State they know it as a bill that is good for our harbors, rivers, and the flood protection we need in the Fargo-Moorhead area or, as I like to call it in Minnesota, the Moorhead-Fargo area.

The bill advances a critical front to protect the Red River of the north to Moorhead, MN, and Fargo, ND. I visited this region twice over the last year, and I have been back literally every year I have been in the Senate because of flood threats—these years more than ever.

This is literally an every-year occurrence now to the point where people have major sandbag operations filled with volunteers, seniors, and people from the prisons. Everyone is working together, but there must be a better way to do this. Just because we do it so well in North Dakota and Minnesota and have such an incredible spirit of voluntarism doesn't mean there is going to be one year where the flood is too great or that we should continue on this path when, in fact, we have the opportunity to have long-term flood protection.

The river has been above major flood stage 6 out of the last 8 years. In 2009, the year of the record flood, the river rose to more than 40 feet.

I will remind the Presiding Officer of the Grand Forks flood and what happened there. It was literally just about an hour away from Fargo. So we were that close to that happening in Fargo and Moorhead.

In Minnesota and North Dakota, the Red River doesn't divide us, it unites us. It is in that spirit of solidarity that we drive our efforts to help the Red River Basin. This year we were fortunate that the flooding was not nearly as severe as it had been projected. A week before the crest went down, it was projected to be the second biggest flood in history with the late snow.

In 2009 and 2010 homes and farms with ring dikes around them looked like small islands floating in the floodwaters. If anyone thinks this lasts for a day or week, it literally lasts for months. Entire towns create ring dikes, and they can only get out of them with boats. That is what is happening near the Canadian border in Minnesota and North Dakota. The town of Georgetown, MN, is threatened every time the Red River rises and the Buffalo River overflows.

The volunteer who was working at the emergency center—I went up to him and said: It is so nice that you are making lunches for people. He said he lost his entire home.

I said: And you are here?

He said: Yes, this is the only thing I could think of to do to help other people who had the same bad experience as me. That is the spirit of voluntarism in our States.

I think we can do better. The annual threat of flooding in the Fargo-Moorhead area underscores the need for permanent flood protection. We know about the devastating impact of floods. The flood diversion project, which is authorized in the WRDA bill, is critical to safety and economic development.

I have enjoyed working with Congressman PETERSON on flood diversion efforts, including retention, which he cares a lot about, and we did get some funding for that. I was able to get funding in the farm bill today to help with that. I have also worked with Senator HOEVEN, Senator HEITKAMP, and Senator FRANKEN on this long-term project to have actual permanent solutions to our flooding project in Fargo and Moorhead.

We have a problem, and the WRDA bill is the beginning of a solution. Also included in this bill is a Roseau River project, which is at a critical point. The WRDA bill helps address flood protection for Roseau, MN. Roseau has recovered from a flood in 2002 that caused widespread damage, but the area needs flood protection to reduce the flood stages in the city. The next phase of the plan will include a diversion channel, a restriction structure, and two storage areas designed to remove the city from the regular 100-year regulatory floodplain and reduce future flood damages by nearly 86 percent.

The WRDA bill also advances our Nation's water infrastructure, which is something the Presiding Officer knows a little bit about in Massachusetts. It is clear that our 21st-century economy demands 21st-century infrastructure, and we cannot afford to sit back any longer and allow it to crumble. No place knows this better than Minnesota.

I lived six blocks from that 35W bridge, which is an eight-lane highway. One day, in the middle of a summer day, the bridge fell down in the middle of the Mississippi River. As I said that day, a bridge just shouldn't fall down in the middle of America, but it did.

We are seeing the same crumbling infrastructure and problems with many of our ports across the country. Failure to take action will have consequences no one likes. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, inefficiencies in infrastructure are estimated to drive up the cost of doing business by an estimated $430 billion, and that is just in this decade.

The civil engineers' 2013 report card gives our Nation's infrastructure an overall D-plus grade. As someone who has taught students before, I think the Presiding Officer knows that is not a good grade. Our inland waterways infrastructure, which includes our locks and dams on the Mississippi River, gets a D-minus, and our ports received a C grade. We cannot be satisfied with those grades.

When people hear ''ports'' they think of places such as Massachusetts, South Carolina, Florida, and California. But, in fact, the Great Lakes—including Lake Superior, which we are so proud of in Minnesota—have very significant ports.

In fact, when I first came to the Senate, I was assigned to the Commerce Committee and somehow found myself on the oceans subcommittee. I remember sitting at my first meeting thinking: What am I doing here? I am on the oceans subcommittee. I wrote a note to the Senator from New Jersey, FRANK LAUTENBERG, that said: I am the only Senator on the subcommittee who doesn't have an ocean. I kept the note he wrote back to me. The note said: It is easy, next year just come back and ask for one.

Well, in fact, I found out since then that the oceans subcommittee included the Great Lakes so it gave me a platform to advocate for our Great Lakes. The Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, which is so important to our ocean-bordering States, also includes the Great Lakes. The Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund collects $700 million each year more than it spends on dredging. In other words, it collects $700 million more each year than it spends on dredging and maintenance.

Meanwhile, our ports and navigation channels wait for basic maintenance. We need to correct this disparity and ensure the funds are spent to address the needs of the shippers and ensure that the Great Lakes system does not fall into further disrepair.

I was just up at the Port of Duluth-Superior to highlight the need for dredging and maintenance on the Great Lakes. The Port of Duluth-Superior is ranked among the top 20 ports in the U.S. by cargo tonnage. It sees 40 million short tons of cargo and nearly 1,000 vessel visits every year. I think people would be surprised by that since Minnesota has lakes. In fact, we have 1 of the top 20 ports in the country.

We have 11,500 jobs that are dependent on cargo shipments in and out of the port. The port is critical to the economy of northeastern Minnesota where my dad was born and my grandpa worked as an iron ore miner. Guess what. That is how they got the iron ore out of Minnesota and out to the world.

It is critical that high-use ports like Duluth and Two Harbors get dredged so they can support the ships. It is vital

that their trading partners throughout the Great Lakes system receive maintenance as well. Both Duluth and Two Harbors, MN, ports are considered deep-water ports, so they come into a classification which has tended to get the funding, but, in fact, the entire Great Lakes navigation system is in trouble.

The backlog of sediment due to insufficient dredging is more than 18 million cubic yards and estimated at $200 million. When ships on the Great Lakes have to ''light load''—having to reduce the amount of cargo they carry because channels are not deep enough—our economy suffers.

At first some people might think: What does light loading mean? At the end of 2012, the light loading to navigate the Soo Locks on the St. Mary's River between Lake Superior and Lake Huron meant 10,000 tons of cargo could not be transported on the final voyage. Think of it. These are American goods that our workers produced, and we want them to make more of it. Yet we literally cannot put them on the ships because we have not maintained our ports the way we are supposed to.

The ships that are coming in cannot take the goods. They have to wait until the winter is done. That is what happened this year and has been happening many years.

We are an export economy. America's way forward is to make goods again, invent, and export to the world. Well, that is not going to happen if we cannot get our goods to market. That is why I have been working so closely with Senators from across the Great Lakes to address this backlog. We have been able to make some progress.

I cosponsored an amendment with Senator LEVIN to direct the Secretary of the Army Corps to manage the Great Lakes navigation system as an interconnected system. This would ensure that maintenance and dredging is done throughout the system. There is much more to do. I will continue to work with Senator LEVIN, Senator STABENOW, and other Great Lakes Senators on this bill.

The WRDA bill will go a long way toward increasing the efficiency of the shipping across the Great Lakes system, thereby strengthening the economic standing of our agriculture, mining, manufacturing, and other industries.

The bill also makes critical reforms to our Nation's rivers and waterways. The inland waterway system in this country spans 38 States and handles approximately one-half of the inland waterway freight. Farmers and businesses in my State transport soybeans, corn, and other commodities from Minnesota to other terminals in the South. From there, ships are loaded and the commodities are eventually delivered to trading partners.

Again, if we want to produce and export to the world, we have to have the transportation system that supports it. With many maintenance and construction projects years overdue, the inland waterways are in dire need of major rehabilitation. The Inland Waterways Trust Fund, which funds these projects, is in steady decline. If we don't make the Inland Waterways Trust Fund sustainable, the industries that are so heavily dependent on the inland waterways will suffer, and this means jobs suffer.

I cosponsored the RIVER Act with Senator CASEY and Senator LANDRIEU to help move forward major construction projects on the inland waterway system. That bill is also supported by Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER. It is a bipartisan bill, and it includes much needed rehabilitation of the locks and dams along the Mississippi River.

This bill includes a number of reforms to the project management process that will ensure that waterway projects are completed on time and minimize cost overruns.

I also, by the way, support the amendment to increase the inland waterways user fee. I am a cosponsor of that amendment. Let me emphasize that the users who pay this fee have asked for it. We have a situation where the industries are willing to pay more so we can improve the locks and dams so they can get their goods to market. That is what is going on here. They understand we are having budget issues, and they are willing to pay a higher fee to pay for the changes.

Industry partners from farmers to shippers to companies, such as cargo companies in my State, strongly support this user fee increase. The increase was, in fact, their idea. They realized that the government wasn't going to fund these and that they were having trouble doing business, and they have agreed to pay for this increased fee. To me, it is the perennial no-brainer that we get this done. They know this modest change would go a long way to making our Nation's rivers and waterways viable for years to come.

While the fee increase will not advance, sadly, in the WRDA bill because it is considered a tax provision, it sends an important message that industry and shippers are at the table and volunteering more to help build the infrastructure our economic future requires. We plan on advancing this part of the river act in another bill—in tax reform or standing on its own—because we think it is so important to be able to fund these improvements to the locks.

Finally, in Minnesota, the fishing and boating industries contribute around $4 billion to our State's economy each year. Sometimes I like to tease people and ask them how much money do they think we spend on worms in Minnesota every year. Well, it is literally tens of millions of dollars. People come to our State and buy worms and bait and other forms of fishing tackle because of their importance to our economy. In fact, for last weekend's Minnesota fishing opener, sadly, cold and ice covered many lakes, but people were still out there looking for that empty hole where there wasn't ice so they could put their line into the water.

In Minnesota, we also know how important it is to address invasive species problems, especially when they threaten our lakes and rivers. In our State the problem of Asian carp is literally swimming and jumping into our lives. Anyone who hasn't seen the YouTube video should look at it. You can see Asian carp literally jumping out of the water and hitting fishermen in the head. We are very concerned because we have seen problems with them downriver in southern Minnesota. They are coming our way, and we do not want them to ruin our way of life in Minnesota, nor do we want them to hurt our jobs and our $4 billion fishing and gaming industry.

I believe we need an ''all-of-the-above'' solution to this challenge that includes research, carp barriers, as well as authority to close the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock. I am very glad the provision was included to allow for greater coordination between Federal agencies when it comes to Asian carp, and this also includes rivers and not just the Great Lakes.

So we are continuing to work on this bill when it comes to Asian carp and other invasive species, but I think there are some other good provisions in this bill as well.

I wish to commend Senators BOXER and VITTER for their great work to put together this bipartisan legislation. I support its passage, from fighting to protect towns from flooding to critical waterway infrastructure. This legislation is vital to our economy, to our environment, to our cities, and to our towns. I am excited to be a part of it. I hope my colleagues support it and we can get this done.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF KENTUCKY BUS CRASH TRAGEDY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate a sad and tragic event in Kentucky history that happened 25 years ago today: on May 14, 1988, a horrific bus crash occurred on I–71 near Carrollton, KY. Twenty-seven people were killed, 24 of them children, and 34 were injured when a drunk driver traveling in the wrong direction hit the bus. It remains the worst drunk-driving crash in American history.

On this day 25 years ago, the Radcliff First Assembly of God Church in Radcliff, KY, organized a youth trip to a nearby amusement park, and drove 170 miles to Cincinnati in the church bus. The bus was full with 67 passengers. After a fun day of roller coasters and ice cream, at 10:55 that night, on the return trip, a drunk driver in a pickup truck traveling north in the southbound lane of I–71 struck the church bus directly head-on.

The impact ruptured the bus's 60-gallon gasoline tank, starting a fire which reached 2,500 degrees Fahrenheit and filled the bus with smoke. With the front door blocked by collision damage, and no emergency exits in the windows or roof, most of the survivors exited through a single emergency exit at the rear of the bus. Of the 40 survivors, only 6 escaped uninjured. Many others suffered severe burns and other injuries. And 27 lives were lost in that crash.

I want to extend my gratitude to the Kentucky State Police, who not only provided rescue efforts at the scene and crash reconstruction analysis afterwards, but were also the lead investigative agency for this tragedy, following the case through to the prosecution phase. Current Kentucky State Police Commissioner Rodney Brewer was one of the investigators who worked on the challenging case.

Remembrances and observances in honor of the victims are happening in Kentucky today, where dozens of families remain grief stricken by the senseless loss of their beloved child. Those who survived the crash are still haunted by what happened. I wish to express my deepest sympathies for the victims' families, the survivors, first responders, and all those who were touched by this tragedy. The people of Kentucky stand with you today and share your sorrow.

If any good can be said to have come from this awful event, it is that it directed national attention on driving safety, the dangers of drunk driving, and safety requirements in buses. Kentucky took the lead in responding to this tragedy by requiring school buses to have more emergency exits than the Federal standard and instituting stricter drunken driving laws.

Madam President, I know my colleagues in the Senate join me today in paying tribute to the 27 people who were killed in this bus crash, to their families who grieve today, to the surviving passengers who must still live with the nightmare of what happened, to their families, to the law enforcement officers and first responders who assisted in rescuing the passengers, and to every Kentuckian whose life was altered by the events of that fateful day.

Even today, 27 people are killed every day in America as a result of drunken driving. In 2011, drunk driving killed 9,878 on America's roads and injured over 300,000. I believe one way we can honor the memories of the victims of this terrible accident is to continue to speak out against the dangers of drunk driving and work towards its elimination. No family should have to endure the suffering that so many Kentucky families did on this day 25 years ago.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the 27 crash victims be included in the RECORD following my remarks. I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the names of the 27 victims of the tragedy of May 14, 1988, were entered into the RECORD as follows:

Jennifer Ann Arnett, Cynthia Anne Atherton, Sandy Brewer, Joshua Conyers, Mary Catheryn Daniels, Julie Ann Earnest, Kashawn Etheredge, Shannon Rae Fair, Dwailla Fischel, Richard Keith Gohn, Lori Kathleen Holzer, Charles ''Chuck'' Kytta, Anthony Marks.

April Mills, Phillip Lee Morgan, Tina Michelle Mustain, William J. Nichols, Jr., Patricia Susan Nunnallee, John R. Pearman, Emillie S. Thompson, Crystal Erin Uhey, Denise Ellen Voglund, Amy Christine Wheelock, Joy Williams, Kristen Williams, Robin Williams, Chad Anthony Witt.

PLIGHT OF THE BAHÁ'Í COMMUNITY

• Mr. KIRK. Madam President I wish to call attention to the plight of the Bahá'í community and the atrocious human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Today marks the fifth year Fariba Kamalabadi, Jamaloddin Khanjani, Afif Naemi, Saeid Rezaie, Behrouz Tavakkoli, and Vahid Tizfahm have been behind bars in Iran due to their faith. These six individuals, along with Mahvash Sabet, imprisoned 2 months earlier, make up the ''Yaran-I-Iran,'' or Friends of Iran, which is the former leadership group of the Bahá'í community of Iran. We must not let up on our efforts to defend the Bahá'í community until the Iranian Government's intensifying persecution comes to an end.

Iran outlawed Bahá'í institutions in 1983, leading to the establishment of an ad hoc leadership group to meet the basic spiritual and social needs of the Bahá'í community of Iran. In August 2010, the Government of Iran sentenced the Yaran to 20-year prison terms on the absurd charges of ''spying for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, propaganda against the regime and spreading corruption on earth.''

The Bahá'í faith is an independent world religion that began in 19th-century Persia. Its central tenets include unity, peace, and understanding. The Bahá'ís are currently the largest non-Muslim minority in Iran, numbering some 300,000 members, and the Bahá'í faith is one of the world's fastest growing religions with more than 5 million followers worldwide. Since the Iranian Revolution in 1979, the Bahá'ís have been a target of systematic government-sponsored persecution. Roughly 200 Bahá'ís in Iran have been killed by government authorities since 1978 and more than 650 Bahá'ís have been arrested since 2005 alone.

In May 2011, the government conducted raids on the Bahá'í Institute of Higher Education, an informal learning system created by the Bahá'í community in response to the exclusion of Bahá'ís from universities. Several educators were arrested and detained. Seven of them—Mahmoud Badavam, Noushin Khadem, Vahid Mahmoudi, Kamran Mortezaie, Farhad Sedghi, Riaz Sobhani, and Ramin Zibaie—were sentenced to 4 and 5-year prison terms, although Vahid Mahmoudi has since been released. Since October 2011, four more BIHE instructors were imprisoned.

The 2013 U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom Report stated that ''during the past year, the already poor religious freedom conditions continued to deteriorate, especially for religious minorities, in particular for Bahá'ís.'' On February 28, 2013, the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran reported that there were 110 Bahá'ís currently imprisoned in Iran solely for practicing their faith. Bahá'ís in Iran are restricted from filling public and private jobs, denied business licenses, and excluded from university. In recent years, the state-sponsored media in Iran embarked on a systematic campaign to demonize and incite hatred against Bahá'ís through the use of false and offensive propaganda pieces. An increasing amount of personal property has been confiscated, an increasing number of Bahá'í-owned businesses have been vandalized and attacked, and an increasing number of Bahá'í cemeteries have been desecrated over the past year across the country.

Despite being bound to numerous international treaties, the Iranian Government continues to persecute those who seek to exercise their freedom of expression, thought, conscience, and religion. As Americans, we honor our fundamental rights and freedoms by speaking out for the rights and freedoms of the Bahá'ís and all others who are oppressed in Iran. And it is incumbent on the Senate to reveal the truth about the situation of the Bahá'í community in Iran and take steps to eradicate the violence and injustice.

Illinois is home to the world-renowned Bahá'í Temple, so the plight of Bahá'ís in Iran holds special significance for our citizens. I am proud to have joined with my Illinois colleague, Senator DURBIN, in introducing S. Res. 75, a resolution that condemns the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Bahá'í minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights. Today, we reaffirm our solidarity with the faithful Bahá'ís in Iran who are subject to discrimination, detention, or worse solely for their beliefs and views. It is my hope that S. Res. 75 will bring the persecution of Bahá'ís and the issue of human rights in Iran to the forefront of the international agenda.•

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, it has been 5 years since the Iranian regime arrested and imprisoned seven members of the Bahá'í community's ad hoc leadership group. Today I rise to mark this sad anniversary and to remind folks of the persecution that religious minorities continue to face in Iran.

The Bahá'í faith was founded in Iran during the 19th century. It is an independent religion not a sect of Islam

and it rejects violence. The Bahá'í faith is practiced today by more than 5 million people around the world, roughly 300,000 of whom still live in Iran.

But rather than celebrate its own religious history, the Iranian regime considers the Bahá'í faith to be a heresy and brutally represses its practitioners. The regime routinely seizes personal property from members of the Bahá'í community, denies them access to education and employment opportunities, and detains them based solely on their religious beliefs. According to some reports, more than 600 Bahá'ís have been arrested since 2004. The American Bahá'í community counts 115 Bahá'ís currently in Iranian prisons and another 437 awaiting trial, appeal, sentencing, or for their sentence to begin.

Five years ago, the Iranian regime arrested seven leaders of the Bahá'í community—Fariba Kamalabadi, Jamaloddin Khanjani, Afif Naeimi, Saeid Rezaie, Mahvash Sabet, Behrouz Tavakkoli, and Vahid Tizfahm—and detained them in Iran's notorious Evin prison. Iranian leaders accused the seven of espionage for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, and propaganda against the Islamic Republic.

These seven have since faced sham trials in kangaroo courts. One of their lawyers, Nobel Peace Prize laureate Shirin Ebadi, reported difficultly establishing basic, meaningful access to counsel. She also stated that the regime had no evidence against the accused and that their trial was riddled with irregularities. Despite these concerns the regime sentenced all seven to 20 years in prison in 2010.

I and many others found these sentences unconscionable and said so at the time. Imagine being sentenced to prison because your faith recognized the divine origin of the world's great religions, the oneness of the human race, and the equality of men and women. Imagine losing 20 years of your life because somebody objected to your personal beliefs.

For the Iranian regime, I am sorry to say, this is more business as usual. This religious persecution is hardly limited to the Bahá'ís either. In fact, since 1999 the State Department has designated Iran as a ''country of particular concern'' for its human rights record. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom's 2012 annual report cited the regime for engaging in ''systematic, ongoing, and egregious violations of religious freedom, including prolonged detention, torture, and executions based primarily or entirely upon the religion of the accused.'' The report goes on to state that ''even the recognized non-Muslim religious minorities protected under Iran's constitution—Jews, Armenian and Assyrian Christians, and Zoroastrians—faced increasing discrimination, arrests, and imprisonment.''

The Iranian regime must stop its assault on religious expression and freedom of conscience, and there is no better day to do so than this sad and dubious anniversary. I call upon Iran's rulers to immediately release the seven Bahá'í leaders and all other prisoners held on account of their beliefs. I also want to urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring S. Res. 75, introduced by Senators KIRK and DURBIN. This resolution condemns the Iranian regime for its state-sponsored persecution of its Bahá'í minority and for its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights, to which Iran is a party.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE MAINE TROOP GREETERS

• Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, on May 18, Americans will join together in observance of Armed Forces Day to thank the men and women of our military for their courageous and dedicated service to our Nation. This occasion has a special significance in my home State, as it marks the 10th anniversary of a remarkable group of patriots called the Maine Troop Greeters.

The story of the Maine Troop Greeters is that of hundreds of patriotic citizens who, since May of 2003, have gathered at Bangor International Airport to greet every single flight carrying our military personnel across the Atlantic to Iraq, Afghanistan, Kuwait, or other overseas assignments or bringing them home. Whether these flights land at Bangor in the light of day or the dark of night, in fair weather or foul, the Troop Greeters are there with cookies and coffee, cheers and songs, and handshakes and hugs.

It is the story of more than 1.3 million servicemembers and nearly 350 military dogs who have landed in Bangor on some 6,700 flights. Without exception, our troops have been astonished, overwhelmed, encouraged, and most of all, welcomed and thanked by this spontaneous outpouring of gratitude and respect.

Bangor's tradition of greeting troop flights began long before 2003. On a frigid March morning in 1991, a large group of grateful Mainers came to the airport to welcome home returning troops from Operation Desert Storm. One of those soldiers, MSG Kevin Tillman of Kentucky, borrowed a saxophone from a high school musician and performed a spine-tingling rendition of our national anthem. It was a moment that electrified America.

To underscore the powerful and lasting impact of the Maine Troop Greeters, Master Sergeant Tillman returned to Bangor in 2011, 20 years after that unforgettable moment, to perform in concert with our high school band.

I am often asked by my Senate colleagues why this Troop Greeter phenomenon is so powerful in Bangor. It is not just that the city I am proud to call home is the location of the easternmost airport in the United States, a former Air Force base that can accommodate transatlantic flights. For many of our troops, Bangor is either the last American soil they touch upon deployment or the first they touch upon their return.

That simple answer only scratches the surface. The phenomenon of the Maine Troop Greeters is not merely a matter of geography and facilities but the manifestation of a caring community and of the American spirit. Throughout our Nation's history, young Americans have left the comfort and security of home to defend our freedom and to extend the blessing of freedom to others. And behind patriots in uniform have stood patriots at home to honor their service.

The Maine Troop Greeters are individuals acting out of personal conviction, but their efforts are magnified by the support of local businesses, civic organizations, and the Bangor International Airport. Their generosity strengthens the spirit of volunteerism that is a core American value.

One of the principles of true service is that it is not something that is done only when convenient but a commitment sincerely made and faithfully kept. That is the principle that guides our men and women in uniform and that guides those who honor and support them.

It has been said that it is easy to take for granted that which has never been taken away. Thanks to the veterans who served in the past, America has never lost its freedom. Thanks to those who serve today, we never will. Armed Forces Day reminds us of the high price some pay for what we all cherish, and the Maine Troop Greeters exemplify the gratitude all Americans share.•

RECOGNIZING THE MAINE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

• Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I am delighted to commend the Maine School of Science and Mathematics, MSSM, of Limestone, ME, on being recognized among the best high schools in our country. MSSM was recently awarded an outstanding 13th-place ranking among more than 21,000 public high schools included in the 2013 U.S. News and World Report national rankings on school achievement. I would like to engage my fellow Senator from Maine in saluting this accomplishment, which makes us both proud.

This award recognizes that MSSM students achieve at the highest level academically. MSSM is a top-performing school on State-required assessments, and staff at the school use assessments throughout the academic year as a tool for improving and customizing instruction. The school's faculty works closely with students to forge a strong school community where students are encouraged to pursue their interests.

I applaud the students who are working hard to excel and in doing so, making their families, communities, and State proud. I also want to commend the administrators, teachers, and staff of MSSM who are succeeding in their mission to generate confidence and momentum for learning. They are making a difference in the lives of their students and are helping them reach their full potential as independent, responsible learners and engaged citizens.

I am pleased that the U.S. News and World Report has recognized the achievements of the Maine School of Science and Mathematics, and I congratulate the entire community for this outstanding achievement. Having grown up in Northern Maine, I could not be more proud of what these students and this faculty have achieved.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the comments of the senior senator from Maine. I too am proud to congratulate the Maine School of Science and Mathematics, MSSM, for its 13th-place showing in this year's U.S. News and World Report on high school rankings. In addition, U.S. News ranked MSSM first in New England and third in the United States among magnet schools. This impressive achievement is a testament to the exceptional caliber of the school's students, faculty, and staff.

Founded by the Maine State Legislature in 1995, MSSM is a residential magnet school that specializes in science and mathematics education. It is the only school of its kind in New England. MSSM serves a diverse student body made up of young people from across the State of Maine and around the world. Graduates of MSSM are prepared for rigorous postsecondary programs and have gone on to notable success in fields as diverse as academia, engineering, public service, and the military.

It bears mentioning that when the school was proposed during my first year as governor, I was opposed to funding it for budgetary reasons. During a time of fiscal restraint, I was uncertain of the wisdom in devoting funds to a new school. Boy, was I wrong—MSSM has become a real gem, and I have never been so glad to have been wrong.

The U.S. News ranking reflects the school's ongoing commitment to excellence. Just last year, MSSM entered into a learning partnership with the University of Maine at Presque Isle that affords MSSM students the opportunity to earn college credit for select coursework. This collaborative approach is precisely the kind of innovative thinking that forges connections between high schools and postsecondary institutions and ensures that students are able to envision clear educational pathways for themselves.

The world-class education offered in Limestone would not be possible without the talented teachers, administrators, and staff who have fostered a genuine community of learning and exploration and who have dedicated themselves to educating the next generation of innovative and well-rounded scholars. The foundation of any successful school lies in the dedication of its staff, and I commend the many individuals who lead and support this outstanding institution.

In its 18 years of existence, MSSM has become a point of pride for the residents of Limestone and for the whole State of Maine. I am delighted to offer my hearty congratulations to all members of the MSSM community, and I look forward to hearing of the school's continued success in the years to come.●

COMMENDING UTAH'S ACADEMY NOMINEES

● Mr. LEE. Madam President, today I wish to recognize eight exemplary Utahns and future officers in the U.S. military. Each of them will begin their education at a military academy this fall.

Jonson Henry, graduating from Park City High School, will be attending the Naval Academy. An accomplished runner, he was captain of his cross-country team and participated in track and field. He is an avid outdoorsman and an accomplished musician. He was also an AP Scholar with Distinction.

Phillip Lowry, a Weber High School graduate, will be attending the Naval Academy. Phillip was an Eagle Scout, captain of his rugby team, and accomplished in Jujitsu and mixed martial arts. He was also an accomplished musician and an AP Distinguished Scholar. His Father is currently Active Duty with the Army and is serving in Afghanistan.

Amanda Ley, from Viewmont High School and Northwestern Preparatory School, will be attending the Air Force Academy. Amanda was a member of the National Honor Society and earned her Academic Letter. She was captain of the swim team and actively volunteered with South Davis Community Hospital. Her father is an Air Force veteran.

McKenna Cox graduated from Mountain View High School and will be attending the Air Force Academy. McKenna was a student body officer and a member of the National Honor Society. A great example of a student athlete, she was Academic All-State in soccer and was the captain of the basketball team, the softball team, and the cross-country team. She organized food drives for the Utah Food Bank and care packages for the military.

William Estes, from Dugway High School and attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, was a National Honor Society and participated in ice hockey, baseball, track and field, and was Academic All-State in basketball. He was also band president and participated in the JROTC. His father is currently serving in the Army.

Russell Landes will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Russell attended the American Leadership Academy, where he was student body president. He was captain of the wrestling team and also participated on the football and track teams. He also earned his Eagle Scout award.

Benjamin Lemon, from Bountiful High School and the University of Utah, will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Benjamin was a member of the National Honor Society and earned his Eagle Scout. He was captain of the football team and participated in wrestling and the track and field team. His brother also served honorably in the armed services, where he was wounded in the service of his country.

Thomas Maddox, a graduate of Juan Diego Catholic High School, will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He was an outstanding scholar and captain of the lacrosse and ice hockey teams. He has over 75 hours of community service. He was student government class officer and founder and president of the Patriots Club.

One of my greatest honors as a Senator has been to get to know and nominate each of these young men and women. I know that our Nation's future is bright in the hands of these exemplary individuals who have distinguished themselves amongst their peers.●

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR NATHAN KLINE

● Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I wish to honor the remarkable service of a great Pennsylvanian to our Nation's defense and its veterans. Maj. Nathan Kline, U.S. Air Force, Retired, served for nearly half a century in our country's Armed Forces. After enlisting in the U.S. Army Air Forces in 1942, he served in highly hazardous positions as a bombardier and navigator on a B–26 Marauder. His 65 air combat missions included the D-day invasion and the Battle of the Bulge. Incredibly, he survived after his aircraft was shot down twice during the campaign in Europe. For his actions, he earned the Distinguished Flying Cross and 10 Air Medals. After the war, the French Ambassador welcomed Major Kline into the coveted Legion d'Honneur for his service in the liberation of France.

Major Kline did not seek a quiet postwar civilian life. He continued his military service in the Reserves while working in support of the veterans' community. His advocacy on behalf of veterans and their families became a lifelong endeavor. Major Kline was a founding member of the Lehigh Valley Military Affairs Council. In this capacity, he raised funds to provide scholarships to deployed servicemembers' children, managed assembly and shipment of care packages and helped veterans to find employment.

In honoring Major Kline, we recognize his commitment to service during times of war and peace.

As Congress confronts the dual challenges of ensuring our national security and putting our fiscal house in order, it must remember its profound responsibility to keep our Nation safe and care for its veterans. For well over 200 years, our servicemembers and veterans, like Maj. Nathan Kline, have steadfastly served our Nation and have set a stellar example for those who will follow in the generations to come.●

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 953. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, to limit earnings stripping by expatriated entities, to provide for modifications related to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

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–1461. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Horses Protection Act; Requiring Horse Industry Organizations To Assess and Enforce Minimum Penalties for Violations; Correction'' ((RIN0579–AD43) (Docket No. APHIS–2011–0030)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1462. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Recordkeeping for Approved Livestock Facilities and Slaughtering and Rendering Establishments'' ((RIN0579–AC61) (Docket No. APHIS–2007–0039)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1463. A communication from the Management Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''United States Standards for Wheat'' (RIN0580–AB12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1464. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rules of Practice and Procedure; Adjusting Civil Money Penalties for Inflation'' (RIN3052–AC87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1465. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to three violations of the Antideficiency Act occurring with the Federal Highway Administration's Highway Infrastructure Investment and TIGER Grants accounts within the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–1466. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to several violations of the Antideficiency Act occurring with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's Administrative account, Motor Carrier Safety Grant account, and the Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs account; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–1467. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general and brigadier general, respectively, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1468. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of twelve (12) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general and brigadier general, respectively, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1469. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the training of the U.S. Special Operations Forces with friendly foreign forces during fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1470. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, a report of proposed legislation entitled ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1471. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1472. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13413 with respect to blocking the property of persons contributing to the conflict taking place in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1473. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency relative to the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan as declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1474. A communication from the Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Consumer Financial Civil Penalty Fund'' ((RIN3170–AA38) (Docket No. CFPB–2013–0011)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1475. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Section 232 Healthcare Facility Insurance Program—Strengthening Accountability and Regulatory Revisions Update Final Rule Amendment—Revision of Date of Applicability'' (RIN2502–AJ05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1476. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Contractor Legal Management Requirements; Acquisition Regulations'' (RIN1990–AA37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1477. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Regulations'' (RIN1024–AD99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1478. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning operations at the Naval Petroleum Reserves for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1479. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''U.S. Department of Education Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Performance Report and Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Performance Plan''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1480. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Wood River Levee System Reconstruction project, Madison, County, Illinois; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1481. A communication from the Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2012 Performance and Accountability Report of the Administrative Conference of the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1482. A communication from the Chief, Washington Field Office, U.S. Office of Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2012 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1483. A communication from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Quarterly Report for April 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1484. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the six-month period from October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1485. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Civil Rights, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's fiscal year 2012 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1486. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–54, ''Permanent Supportive Housing Application Streamlining Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1487. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–59, ''Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Time Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1488. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–60, ''Egregious First-Time Sale to Minor Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1489. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–63, ''Captive Earthquake Property Insurance Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1490. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19–632, ''Local Budget Autonomy Amendment Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1491. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on the Activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Schools for Fiscal Year 2012''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1492. A communication from the Chairman of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2014–2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1493. A communication from the Chair, U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the federal sentencing guidelines that were proposed by the Commission during the 2012 - 2013 amendment cycle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1494. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Bureau of Prisons' compliance with the privatization requirements of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1495. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on applications made by the Government for authority to conduct electronic surveillance for foreign intelligence during calendar year 2012 relative to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1496. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Lorcaserin Into Schedule IV'' (Docket No. DEA–369) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1497. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Hart-Scott-Rodino Annual Report: Fiscal Year 2012''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. STABENOW, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 954. An original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Deborah Kay Jones, of New Mexico, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Libya.

Nominee: Deborah Kay Jones.

Post: Libya.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None
2. Spouse: None
3. Children and Spouses: None
4. Parents: None
5. Grandparents: None
6. Brothers and Spouses: None
7. Sisters and Spouses: None

---

*James Knight, of Alabama, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad.

Nominee: James Knight.

Post: N'Djamena, Republic of Chad.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: James Knight, $200, Mar 2008, Barack Obama; $200, Mar 2008, Hillary Clinton; $200, Mar 2008, John McCain; $200, Sep 2008, Barack Obama; $200, Sep 2008, John McCain.

2. Spouse: Amelia Bell Knight; 0.

3. Children and Spouses: Mary Amelia Walker: 0; Christopher P. Alvarez: 0; Richard Adrian Walker III—unmarried, (deceased); James Davis Knight, $50, 2008, John Edwards; $200, 2008, Barack Obama; Cheryl Knight, 0; James Lee Knight—unmarried, 0.

Parents: Father Kimo C. V. Courtenay—deceased; Mother Perry Nell Jones—deceased; Stepfather Roy Arthur Knight—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Maternal grandfather Perry W. Caraway—deceased; Paternal grandfather James Crosby Little—deceased; Maternal grandmother Bessie Mae Caraway—deceased; Paternal grandmother Marjorie Elder Little—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Brooke Courtenay, 0; Spouse name unknown, 0; Paul K. Lindo, 0; Spouse name unknown, 0.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Kathryn Marie Harris, 0; Hugh G. Harris, 0.

Tamsen N. F. Courtenay no response to query for contributions since 2008 unmarried

Note: Brooke Courtenay, Paul K. Lindo, and Tamsen N. F. Courtenay are half-siblings with whom I had no contact prior to father's terminal illness in 2011, hence not reported earlier.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 936. A bill to increase oversight of small business assistance programs provided by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 937. A bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from applying disproportionate scrutiny to applicants for tax-exempt status based on ideology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 938. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow certain veterans to use educational assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs for franchise training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 939. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to treat certain misfiled documents as motions for reconsideration of decisions by the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

S. 940. A bill to provide grants to States to improve high schools and raise graduation rates while ensuring rigorous standards, to develop and implement effective school models for struggling students and dropouts, and to improve State policies to raise graduation rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COATS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 941. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent discriminatory misconduct against taxpayers by Federal officers and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 942. A bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 943. A bill to establish an alternative accountability model; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 944. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require courses of education provided by public institutions of higher education that are approved for purposes of the

All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program and Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to charge veterans tuition and fees at the in-State tuition rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. HAGAN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 945. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. LEE, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 946. A bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 947. A bill to ensure access to certain information for financial services industry regulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 948. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 949. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 950. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 951. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State all right, title, and interest in and to a percentage of the amount of royalties and other amounts required to be paid to the State under that Act with respect to public land and deposits in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of church pension plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. REID, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 953. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, to limit earnings stripping by expatriated entities, to provide for modifications related to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 954. An original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; placed on the calendar.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. Res. 140. A resolution commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifices made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REID, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. Res. 141. A resolution recognizing the goals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 214

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 214, a bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market.

S. 217

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 217, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to collect information from coeducational elementary schools and secondary schools on such schools' athletic programs, and for other purposes.

S. 294

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors 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. 309

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. COWAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) 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. 316

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 316, a bill to recalculate and restore retirement annuity obligations of the United States Postal Service, to eliminate the requirement that the United States Postal Service prefund the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund, to place restrictions on the closure of postal facilities, to create incentives for innovation for the United States Postal Service, to maintain levels of postal service, and for other purposes.

S. 351

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 351, a bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 382

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 382, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 425

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing maternity care quality measures and supporting maternity care quality collaboratives.

S. 463

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 463, a bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to modify the definition of the term ''biobased product''.

S. 466

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms.

COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 466, a bill to assist low-income individuals in obtaining recommended dental care.

S. 506

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 506, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide recruitment and retention incentives for volunteer emergency service workers.

S. 538

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 538, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the authorities and responsibilities of convening authorities in taking actions on the findings and sentences of courts-martial.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors 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. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 669

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 669, a bill to make permanent the Internal Revenue Service Free File program.

S. 674

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 674, a bill to require prompt responses from the heads of covered Federal agencies when the Secretary of Veterans Affairs requests information necessary to adjudicate claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

S. 700

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to ensure that the education and training provided members of the Armed Forces and veterans better assists members and veterans in obtaining civilian certifications and licenses, and for other purposes.

S. 755

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 755, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to apply the Medicaid primary care payment rate to additional physician providers of primary care services.

S. 764

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 764, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require the disclosure of information regarding how certain taxes and fees impact the amount of premiums, and for other purposes.

S. 789

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) 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 Ms. CANTWELL, her 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. 862

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor 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. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) 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. 871

At the request of Mr. BENNET, his name was added as a cosponsor 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.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 871, supra.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 897

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 897, a bill to prevent the doubling of the interest rate for Federal subsidized student loans for the 2013–2014 academic year by providing funds for such loans through the Federal Reserve System, to ensure that such loans are available at interest rates that are equivalent to the interest rates at which the Federal Government provides loans to banks through the discount window operated by the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to protect State and local witnesses from tampering and retaliation, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 133

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 856

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 856 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. 857

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 857 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. 868

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 868 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. 874

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 874 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. 893

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 893 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. 907

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 907 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. 909

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 909 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 944. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require courses of education provided by public institutions of higher education that are approved for purposes of the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program and Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to charge veterans tuition and fees at the in-State tuition rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, today, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am proud to introduce the Veterans' Educational Transition Act of 2013.

My colleague and ranking member of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Senator BURR, joins me in introducing this important legislation.

The Department of Defense estimates that approximately 250,000 to 300,000 servicemembers will separate annually for the next 4 years. That is more than one million brave men and women who will face the harsh reality of transitioning back to civilian life. Many of them will elect to further their education by using the most lucrative benefit afforded to them since WWII—the Post-9/11 GI Bill. Since 2009, the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, has paid nearly 1 million Post-9/11 GI Bill beneficiaries more than $28 billion.

The Post-9/11 GI Bill stands as a testament of our willingness to invest in our newest generation of veterans. Unfortunately, this investment often falls short of what they need to complete a post-secondary education and successfully transition back to civilian life. They deserve better.

Given the nature of our Armed Forces, servicemembers have little to no say as to where they serve and where they reside during their military service. Thus, when transitioning servicemembers consider what educational institution they want to attend, many of them choose a school in their home State or a State where they previously served.

I have heard from too many veterans that many of these public educational institutions consider them out-of-State students. Given that the Post-9/11 GI Bill only covers in-State tuition and fees for public educational institutions, these veterans are left to cover the difference in cost between the in-State tuition rate and the out-of-State tuition rate. In some States, this difference can be more than $20,000 per year. As a result, many of our Nation's veterans must use loans to cover this difference and in the process become indebted with large school loans that will take years to pay off.

I applaud the States that have taken initiative to assist our veterans by recognizing them as in-State students for purposes of attending a public educational institution. Yet, there are too many States that still require transitioning veterans to meet stringent residency requirements before they can be considered in-State students. Recently separated veterans may not be able to meet such requirements because of their military service, and once enrolled, they cannot legally establish residency because of their status as full-time students.

The Veterans Educational Transition Act of 2013 would require States, as a condition for course approval under the Post-9/11 GI Bill or Montgomery GI Bill, to recognize certain veterans and their dependents using these education benefits as in-State students for purposes of attending a public institution. The veteran must be within 2 years from the date of discharge, and the individual using the benefit must live in the State while attending the school.

This legislation would help our brave men and women who have sacrificed so much in defense of our country transition to the civilian workforce by giving them a fair shot at attaining their educational goals without incurring an additional financial burden simply because they chose to serve their country.

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. 944

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' Educational Transition Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. APPROVAL OF COURSES OF EDUCATION PROVIDED BY PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR PURPOSES OF ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE CONDITIONAL ON IN-STATE TUITION RATE FOR VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3679 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter and subject to paragraphs (3) through (5), the Secretary shall disapprove a course of education provided by a public institution of higher education to a covered individual pursuing a course of education with educational assistance under chapter 30 or 33 of this title while living in the State in which the public institution of higher education is located if the institution charges tuition and fees for that course for the covered individual at a rate that is higher than the rate the institution charges for tuition and fees for that course for residents of the State in which the institution is located, regardless of the covered individual's State of residence.

''(2) For purposes of this subsection, a covered individual is any individual as follows:

''(A) A veteran who was discharged or released from a period of not fewer than 180 days of service in the active military, naval, or air service less than two years before the date of enrollment in the course concerned.

''(B) An individual who is entitled to assistance under section 3311(b)(9) or 3319 of this title by virtue such individual's relationship to a veteran described in subparagraph (A).

''(3) It shall not be grounds to disapprove a course of education under paragraph (1) if a public institution of higher education requires a covered individual pursuing a course of education at the institution to demonstrate an intent to establish residency in

the State in which the institution is located in order to be charged tuition and fees for that course at a rate that is equal to or less than the rate the institution charges for tuition and fees for that course for residents of the State.

''(4) The Secretary may waive such requirements of paragraph (1) as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(5) Disapproval under paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to educational assistance under chapters 30 and 33 of this title.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (c) of section 3679 of title 38, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section) shall apply with respect to educational assistance provided for pursuit of programs of education during academic terms that begin after July 1, 2015.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of church pension plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today my colleague Senator PORTMAN and I are introducing this legislation, which refines the language included in a previous bill, S. 3532, introduced in the 112th Congress by Senator Hutchison and myself.

Our goal is to ensure the retirement security of our Nation's clergy, church lay workers, and their families by resolving an unfortunate application of our current pension rules on church pension beneficiaries.

Churches and synagogues established some of the first pension plans in the country, some dating back to the 18th century, and they are designed to ensure that our pastors and lay staff have adequate resources during their retirement years.

Church pensions are critically important compensation plans that help support over one million clergy members across the country in their retirement—particularly those who dedicated their careers to serving in economically disadvantaged congregations.

Church plans developed structures and mechanisms that reflect the differing church polities they serve and their unique status has been recognized in law. However, recent IRS regulations governing 403(b) pension programs and legislative changes have resulted in uncertainty and compliance issues for church pension plans.

The Church Plan Clarification Act is straightforward, non-controversial, and has bipartisan support. I hope we can work quickly to provide clarity for these distinctive plans by enacting this legislation and thereby ensuring that those who dedicate their lives to religious service are not inappropriately and unfairly disadvantaged.

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. 952

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 ''Church Plan Clarification Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. CHURCH PLAN CLARIFICATION.

(a) APPLICATION OF CONTROLLED GROUP RULES TO CHURCH PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 414(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''For purposes'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes'', and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) CHURCH PLANS.—

''(A) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), for purposes of this subsection and subsection (m), an organization that is otherwise eligible to participate in a church plan as defined in subsection (e) shall not be aggregated with another such organization and treated as a single employer with such other organization unless—

''(i) one such organization provides directly or indirectly at least 80 percent of the operating funds for the other organization during the preceding tax year of the recipient organization, and

''(ii) there is a degree of common management or supervision between the organizations.

For purposes of this subparagraph, a degree of common management or supervision exists only if the organization providing the operating funds is directly involved in the day-to-day operations of the other organization.

''(B) NONQUALIFIED CHURCH-CONTROLLED ORGANIZATIONS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), for purposes of this subsection and subsection (m), an organization that is a nonqualified church-controlled organization shall be aggregated with one or more other nonqualified church-controlled organizations, or with an organization that is not exempt from tax under section 501, and treated as a single employer with such other organizations, if at least 80 percent of the directors or trustees of such organizations are either representatives of, or directly or indirectly controlled by, the first organization. For purposes of this subparagraph, a 'nonqualified church controlled organization' shall mean a church-controlled organization described in section 501(c)(3) that is not a qualified church-controlled organization described in section 3121(w)(3)(B).

''(C) PERMISSIVE AGGREGATION AMONG CHURCH-RELATED ORGANIZATIONS.—Organizations described in subparagraph (A) may elect to be treated as under common control for purposes of this subsection. Such election shall be made by the church or convention or association of churches with which such organizations are associated within the meaning of subsection (e)(3)(D), or by an organization determined by such church or convention or association of churches to be the appropriate organization for making such election.

''(D) PERMISSIVE DISAGGREGATION OF CHURCH-RELATED ORGANIZATIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), in the case of a church plan (as defined in subsection (e)), any employer may permissively disaggregate those entities that are not churches (as defined in section 403(b)(12)(B)) separately from those entities that are churches, even if such entities maintain separate church plans.

''(E) ANTI-ABUSE RULE.—For purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), the anti-abuse rule in Treasury Regulation section 1.414(c)–5(f) shall apply.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICATION OF CONTRIBUTION AND FUNDING LIMITATIONS TO 403(b) GRANDFATHERED DEFINED BENEFIT PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 251(e)(5) of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (Public Law 97–248), is amended—

(A) by striking ''403(b)(2)'' and inserting ''403(b)'', and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and shall be subject to the applicable limitations of section 415(b) of such Code as if it were a defined benefit plan under section 401(a) of such Code and not the limitations of section 415(c) of such Code (relating to limitation for defined contribution plans).''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply as if included in the enactment of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982.

(c) AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT BY CHURCH PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall supersede any law of a State that relates to wage, salary, or payroll payment, collection, deduction, garnishment, assignment, or withholding which would directly or indirectly prohibit or restrict the inclusion in any church plan (as defined in this subsection) of an automatic contribution arrangement.

(2) DEFINITION OF AUTOMATIC CONTRIBUTION ARRANGEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''automatic contribution arrangement'' means an arrangement—

(A) under which a participant may elect to have the plan sponsor make payments as contributions under the plan on behalf of the participant, or to the participant directly in cash, and

(B) under which a participant is treated as having elected to have the plan sponsor make such contributions in an amount equal to a uniform percentage of compensation provided under the plan until the participant specifically elects not to have such contributions made (or specifically elects to have such contributions made at a different percentage).

(3) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The plan administrator of an automatic contribution arrangement shall, within a reasonable period before such plan year, provide to each participant to whom the arrangement applies for such plan year notice of the participant's rights and obligations under the arrangement which—

(i) is sufficiently accurate and comprehensive to apprise the participant of such rights and obligations, and

(ii) is written in a manner calculated to be understood by the average participant to whom the arrangement applies.

(B) ELECTION REQUIREMENTS.—A notice shall not be treated as meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A) with respect to a participant unless—

(i) the notice includes an explanation of the participant's right under the arrangement not to have elective contributions made on the participant's behalf (or to elect to have such contributions made at a different percentage),

(ii) the participant has a reasonable period of time, after receipt of the notice described in clause (i) and before the first elective contribution is made, to make such election, and

(iii) the notice explains how contributions made under the arrangement will be invested in the absence of any investment election by the participant.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) ALLOW CERTAIN PLAN TRANSFERS AND MERGERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(y) CERTAIN PLAN TRANSFERS AND MERGERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Under rules prescribed by the Secretary, except as provided in paragraph (2), no amount shall be includible in gross income by reason of—

''(A) a transfer of all or a portion of the account balance of a participant or beneficiary, whether or not vested, from a plan described in section 401(a) or an annuity contract described in section 403(b), which is a church plan described in subsection (e) to an annuity contract described in section 403(b), if such plan and annuity contract are both maintained by the same church or convention or association of churches,

''(B) a transfer of all or a portion of the account balance of a participant or beneficiary, whether or not vested, from an annuity contract described in section 403(b) to a plan described in section 401(a) or an annuity contract described in section 403(b), which is a church plan described in subsection (e), if such plan and annuity contract are both maintained by the same church or convention or association of churches, or

''(C) a merger of a plan described in section 401(a), or an annuity contract described in section 403(b), which is a church plan described in subsection (e) with an annuity contract described in section 403(b), if such plan and annuity contract are both maintained by the same church or convention or association of churches.

''(2) LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a transfer or merger unless the participant's or beneficiary's benefit immediately after the transfer or merger is equal to or greater than the participant's or beneficiary's benefit immediately before the transfer or merger.

''(3) QUALIFICATION.—A plan or annuity contract shall not fail to be considered to be described in sections 401(a) or 403(b) merely because such plan or account engages in a transfer or merger described in this subsection.

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

''(A) CHURCH.—The term 'church' includes an organization described in subparagraph (A) or (B)(ii) of subsection (e)(3).

''(B) ANNUITY CONTRACT.—The term 'annuity contract' includes a custodial account described in section 403(b)(7) and a retirement income account described in section 403(b)(9).''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to transfers or mergers occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) INVESTMENTS BY CHURCH PLANS IN COLLECTIVE TRUSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of—

(A) a church plan (as defined in section 414(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), including a plan described in section 401(a) of such Code and a retirement income account described in section 403(b)(9) of such Code, and

(B) an organization described in section 414(e)(3)(A) of such Code the principal purpose or function of which is the administration of such a plan or account,

the assets of such plan, account, or organization (including any assets otherwise permitted to be commingled for investment purposes with the assets of such a plan, account, or organization) may be invested in a group trust otherwise described in Internal Revenue Service Revenue Ruling 81–100 (as modified by Internal Revenue Service Revenue Rulings 2004–67 and 2011–1), or any subsequent revenue ruling that supersedes or modifies such revenue ruling, without adversely affecting the tax status of the group trust, such plan, account, or organization, or any other plan or trust that invests in the group trust.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall apply to investments made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 140—COMMEMORATING AND ACKNOWLEDGING THE DEDICATION AND SACRIFICES MADE BY THE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS WHO HAVE BEEN KILLED OR INJURED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 140

Whereas the well-being of all people in the United States is preserved and enhanced as a direct result of the vigilance and dedication of law enforcement officers;

Whereas more than 900,000 men and women, at great risk to their personal safety, serve the people of the United States as guardians of the peace;

Whereas peace officers are on the front lines in protecting the schools and schoolchildren of the United States;

Whereas, in 2012, 120 peace officers across the United States were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas Congress should strongly support initiatives to reduce violent crime and to increase the factors that contribute to the safety of law enforcement officers;

Whereas more than 19,000 Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers whose names are engraved upon the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, District of Columbia, lost their lives in the line of duty while protecting the people of the United States;

Whereas, in 1962, President John F. Kennedy designated May 15 as ''National Peace Officers Memorial Day''; and

Whereas, on May 15, 2013, more than 20,000 peace officers are expected to gather in Washington, District of Columbia, to join the families of their recently-fallen comrades to honor those comrades and all others who went before them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates and acknowledges the dedication and sacrifices made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty;

(2) recognizes May 15, 2013, as ''National Peace Officers Memorial Day''; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Peace Officers Memorial Day with appropriate ceremony, solemnity, appreciation, and respect.

SENATE RESOLUTION 141—RECOGNIZING THE GOALS OF NATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WEEK AND HONORING THE VALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TRAVEL AND TOURISM TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REID, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 141

Whereas National Travel and Tourism Week was established in 1983 through the enactment of the Joint Resolution entitled ''Joint Resolution to designate the week beginning May 27, 1984, as 'National Tourism Week' '', approved November 29, 1983 (Public Law 98–178; 97 Stat. 1126), which recognized the value of travel and tourism;

Whereas National Travel and Tourism Week is celebrated across the United States from May 4 through May 12, 2013;

Whereas more than 120 travel destinations throughout the United States are holding events in honor of National Travel and Tourism Week;

Whereas one out of every 8 jobs in the United States depends on travel and tourism and the industry supports more than 14,600,000 jobs in the United States;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry employs individuals in all 50 States and all the territories of the United States;

Whereas international travel to the United States is the single largest export industry in the country, generating a trade surplus balance of approximately $45,000,000,000;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry, Congress, and the President have worked to streamline the visa process and make the United States welcoming to visitors from other countries;

Whereas travel and tourism provide significant economic benefits to the United States by generating nearly $2,000,000,000,000 in annual economic output;

Whereas leisure travel allows individuals to experience the rich cultural heritage and educational opportunities of the United States and its communities; and

Whereas the immense value of travel and tourism cannot be overstated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes May 4 through May 12, 2013, as National Travel and Tourism Week;

(2) commends the travel and tourism industry for its important contributions to the United States; and

(3) commends the employees of the travel and tourism industry for their important contributions to the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 916. Mrs. BOXER 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.

SA 917. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 906 proposed by Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr.

PRYOR, and Ms. LANDRIEU) to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 918. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 797 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 916. Mrs. BOXER 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, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

SA 917. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 906 proposed by Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PRYOR, and Ms. LANDRIEU) 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 3, line 15, insert ", consistent with the authorized purposes of the water resource projects in the greater Mississippi River Basin" after "navigation".

SA 918. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 797 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 4, strike line 2 and insert the following:

the United States.

SEC. 12_____. GREATER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN SEVERE FLOODING AND DROUGHT MANAGEMENT STUDY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GREATER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN.—The term "greater Mississippi River Basin" means the area covered by hydrologic units 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11, as identified by the United States Geological Survey as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER.—The term "lower Mississippi River" means the portion of the Mississippi River that begins at the confluence of the Ohio River and flows to the Gulf of Mexico.

(3) MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.—The term "middle Mississippi River" means the portion of the Mississippi River that begins at the confluence of the Missouri River and flows to the lower Mississippi River.

(4) SEVERE FLOODING AND DROUGHT.—The term "severe flooding and drought" means severe weather events that threaten personal safety, property, and navigation on the inland waterways of the United States.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a study of the greater Mississippi River Basin—

(1) to improve the coordinated and comprehensive management of water resource projects in the greater Mississippi River Basin relating to severe flooding and drought conditions; and

(2) to evaluate the feasibility of any modifications to those water resource projects, consistent with the authorized purposes of those projects, and develop new water resource projects to improve the reliability of navigation and more effectively reduce flood risk.

(c) CONTENTS.—The study shall—

(1) identify any Federal actions that are likely to prevent and mitigate the impacts of severe flooding and drought, including changes to authorized channel dimensions, operational procedures of locks and dams, and reservoir management within the greater Mississippi River Basin, consistent with the authorized purposes of the water resource projects;

(2) identify and make recommendations to remedy challenges to the Corps of Engineers presented by severe flooding and drought, including river access, in carrying out its mission to maintain safe, reliable navigation, consistent with the authorized purposes of the water resource projects in the greater Mississippi River Basin; and

(3) identify and locate natural or other physical impediments along the middle and lower Mississippi River to maintaining navigation on the middle and lower Mississippi River during periods of low water.

(d) CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with appropriate committees of Congress, Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies, environmental interests, agricultural interests, recreational interests, river navigation industry representatives, other shipping and business interests, organized labor, and nongovernmental organizations;

(2) to the maximum extent practicable, use data in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) incorporate lessons learned and best practices developed as a result of past severe flooding and drought events, including major floods and the successful effort to maintain navigation during the near historic low water levels on the Mississippi River during the winter of 2012–2013.

(e) COST-SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out the study under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study carried out under this section.

(g) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section impacts the operations and maintenance of the Missouri River Mainstem System, as authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 897, chapter 665).

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a meeting of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has been scheduled to discuss natural gas issues. The meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 21, 2013, at 10:00 a.m., in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this meeting is to provide a forum to explore what the next applications are for natural gas and how this new demand will be met. Domestic supply and the potential benefits or unintended consequences caused by expansion of natural gas exports will be specific points of interest.

Because of the limited time available for the forum, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to lauren_goldschmidt@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Todd Wooten at (202) 224–4971 or Lauren Goldschmidt at (202) 224–5488.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SR–328A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

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 14, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Advancing Reform: Medicare Physicians Payments."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The ADA and Entertainment Technologies: Improving Accessibility from the Movie Screen to Your Mobile Device'' on May 14, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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 14, 2013, at 10 a.m., in SD–G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, continue its executive business meeting from May 9, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS, TECHNOLOGY, AND THE INTERNET

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 10:30 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''State of Video.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Senate Armed Services Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCE AND, INVESTMENT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 3:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Returning Private Capital To Mortgage Markets: A Fundamental for Housing Finance Reform.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WEEK

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. Res. 141.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 141) recognizing the goals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that there be no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 141) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ACKNOWLEDGING THE DEDICATION AND SACRIFICES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. Res. 140.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 140) commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifices made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 140) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 953

Mr. REID. I understand S. 953 introduced earlier today by Senator REED is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 953) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rates for Federal Direct Stafford loans, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, to limit earnings stripping by expatriated entities, to provide for modifications related to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 15, 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 until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; further, that following morning business the Senate resume consideration of S. 601, the Water Resources Development Act, under the previous order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. There will be a series of up to seven rollcall votes beginning around 10:30 a.m. tomorrow in order to complete action on WRDA.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:39 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 15, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING PETER SOLENDER AND SUZIE RIVO SOLENDER

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two outstanding community leaders as they are honored by the Amherst Chamber of Commerce as the 2013 Stewardship Award Winners, Peter Solender and Suzie Rivo Solender. Few have been so generous with their time and talents as Peter and Suzie.

Peter and Suzie Solender's community involvement begins with their children. As parents, Suzie spent time as a Girl Scout leader, while Peter was active with his son in Cub Scouts.

When their children began attending school, Peter and Suzie became heavily involved in the Williamsville Parent-Teacher Association, Parent-Teacher-Student Association, and Parent-Teacher Association Council. At one point, Suzie held the PTA presidency at both Heim Middle School and Williamsville East High School simultaneously. As a member of the Town of Amherst Youth Board, Suzie currently is serving her second three-year term.

The Solenders devote much of their time to the American Cancer Society, as both Peter and Suzie are cancer survivors. Suzie has sat on many boards for the ACS, including the Advisory Board, and as one of five members of the leadership committee. Suzie's talents as a grant writer allowed her to become a stakeholder with the National ACS. For three years, she reviewed grant applications for areas of cancer research as a stakeholder with the National ACS. Suzie is trained as a Legislative Ambassador on the Congressional level.

Together, Peter and Suzie work at Hope Lodge in Buffalo, where cancer patients and family members can stay if they require outpatient treatment but live too far to commute. They take great pride in directly helping those who face the battle against cancer.

The American Heart Association is close to Peter and Suzie. The Solenders helped with the American Heart Association's yearly walk, and Suzie served on the Gala Board for Heart for three years.

As people of faith, the Solenders are active locally, regionally, and nationally in their house of worship. Both Suzie and Peter have sat on many fundraising committees. Suzie served two terms as Sisterhood President and two terms on the Board of Directors, and together they were involved in B'nai B'rith and B'nai B'rith Woman—a Jewish organization.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize Peter and Suzie Solender, two pillars of our community. I am inspired by their selflessness, grateful for their service, and wish their family the absolute best in all their future endeavors. Their good works have touched innumerable lives in Western New York.

HONORING ALICIA TURNER

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals who are called to contribute to the needs of our community through leadership and service; and

Whereas, Ms. Alicia Turner has answered that call by giving of herself as an educator at Midway Elementary School, and as a daughter, mother and friend; and

Whereas, Ms. Turner has been chosen as the 2013 Teacher of the Year, representing Midway Elementary School; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents for the betterment of our community and our nation through her tireless works, motivational speeches and words of wisdom; and

Whereas, Ms. Turner is a virtuous woman, a courageous woman and a fearless leader who has shared her vision, talents and passion to help ensure that our children receive an education that is relevant not only for today, but well into the future, as she truly understands that our children are the future; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Alicia Turner for her leadership and service for our District and in recognition of this singular honor as 2013 Teacher of the Year at Midway Elementary School; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim May 8, 2013 as Ms. Alicia Turner Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 8th day of May, 2013.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF GEORGE WEYERHAEUSER JR.

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and achievements of George Weyerhaeuser Jr. He was an extraordinary civic leader and businessman in Tacoma, Washington and will be remembered for his contributions to the community and the forestry business.

George began his business career in 1978 by joining his family-owned pulp and paper company, the Weyerhaeuser Company, in Dierks, Arkansas. He served in various capacities, including time as a forester, contract logger administrator, and sawmill supervisor. His dedication to his family's business continued for thirty years in several executive positions including vice president for containerboard and vice president for the company's pulp and paper business.

George's role quickly expanded as he helped steer the success of Weyerhaeuser Company. He was president and chief executive officer of Weyerhaeuser Canada from 1993 to 1998. In 1998, he became senior vice president of technology, procurement, and transportation. George represented the company and the timber industry on many boards and through all of his business endeavors. Throughout his career, he never failed to recognize his hardworking employees and loyal customers.

Although George was a dedicated and successful businessman, his true passion was for civic betterment. He served as board chairman for the Tacoma Museum of Glass from 2004 to 2008 and, more recently, served as president of the Thea Foss Waterway Development Authority. Community members agree that without George's relentless support and enthusiasm, the museum and waterway would not have become the successes that they are today.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I offer my condolences to the family and friends of George Weyerhaeuser Jr. His reputation as a community leader, mentor, and forward-thinker all highlight the profound impression he has left on the Pacific Northwest.

RECOGNIZING ANSAR KHAN AND JAMES O'LEARY FOR AMBUR POINT OF SALE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ansar Khan and James O'Leary, inventors of the revolutionary Ambur Point of Sale app, as they are honored by the Amherst Chamber of Commerce as recipients of the 2013 Trailblazer Award.

Ansar Khan immigrated from Pakistan to Buffalo, New York in 2001 with his family. Inspired to share their culinary traditions with their new community, the Khan family opened Kabab & Curry, an Indian and Pakistani restaurant on Transit Road in East Amherst, New York. Ansar worked in the restaurant from the time he was 11 years old, providing him with an intimate understanding of all facets of the restaurant industry.

James O'Leary met Ansar at Williamsville North High School. James worked server at Kabab & Curry, but his true passions were Apple products and computer programming.

Together, Ansar and James developed the Ambur Point of Sale mobile application to empower independent restaurant owners to regain control of their business.

Previously, aspiring entrepreneurs had only two options for managing the moment at which a transaction occurs. The difficult point

of sale software inhibited aspiring entrepreneurs and frustrated small business owners.

Ambur Point of Sale's straightforward, customizable design provides a simple solution for restaurant owners to wirelessly manage their business. The product has become an international success.

Ansar and James remain local, housing their business in the University at Buffalo Technology Incubator. Their seven additional employees primarily hail from Western New York and most attended the University at Buffalo.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to recognize these two mobile software pioneers for their incredible contributions. Ansar and James are brilliant young entrepreneurs and I look forward to seeing what their careers hold. I wish them the absolute best in all their future endeavors.

HONORING MAINE'S STATE POLICE

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the law enforcement officers from Maine and around the world that are joining us for National Police Week. Every year, thousands come to Washington to honor and remember those who valiantly gave their lives serving their communities.

We honor the memory and sacrifice of the fallen officers throughout the world that strive to make our lives safe.

Each day, law enforcement officials like Maine State Trooper Douglas Cropper risk their safety for our protection. Just last summer, Trooper Cropper raced ahead of a driver going in the wrong direction on a very busy interstate. Cropper, without hesitation, pulled in front of the disoriented driver so that his Police vehicle would collide into the oncoming vehicle. The vehicle came to rest, preventing any serious injury to the driver and possibly saving lives of innocent motorists.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the thousands of law enforcement officers like Trooper Cropper who selflessly put their safety on the line every day.

HONORING REV. R.B. COTTONREADER, JR.

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizen of Distinction.

Whereas, the Civil Rights Movement had many soldiers in the trenches, laying down the bedrock of the road to equality; and

Whereas, Rev. R.B. Cottonreader, Jr., a citizen of Lithonia was one of those elite soldiers for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, serving as a field director mobilizing the community and playing essential roles in assisting Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and other widely known leaders in the fight for civil rights; and

Whereas, at the height of the most turbulent times, this highly effective motivator utilized his skills to aid in the growth and development of the movement through the church, the Congress of Racial Equality and intensive field work in Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi; and

Whereas, Rev. R.B. Cottonreader, Jr., led by action both behind the scenes and on the front lines as a warrior for justice, a man of great integrity who until the end, remained true to the uplifting of the community; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a special recognition upon Rev. R.B. Cottonreader, Jr., for his leadership, tenacity, courage and strength, Now, therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby attest to the 113th Congress of the United States that Rev. R.B. Cottonreader, Jr., of Lithonia, DeKalb County, Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Recognition" by declaring Rev. R.B. Cottonreader, Jr., U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 8th day of January, 2013.

RECOGNIZING MIKE BEAN AND BEAN MEDIA PRODUCTIONS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bean Media Productions as they are honored by the Amherst Chamber of Commerce as the recipient of the 2013 President's Award.

Bean Media Productions was founded in 2006 by Mike Bean to provide a wide variety of digital marketing services to local companies.

As the internet became ubiquitous, Bean Media kept pace, adopting a sophisticated business strategy emphasizing web marketing and web media development.

Bean Media excelled at internet marketing. The firm developed advanced strategies, using popular search engines and media sharing sites like Google and Youtube to access consumers, broadening their clients' reach through promoting videos online.

As a web marketing company with foundations in traditional media marketing, Bean Media Productions appeals to a wide audience, from the consumers of today to the future base of our economy.

Bean Media's focus on local companies is commendable. The success of such an advertising firm instills confidence in consumers to purchase local goods, ensuring our small businesses remain competitive with larger national chains.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize Mike Bean and Bean Media Productions for their excellence in advertising and great efforts to promote business in Western New York.

RECOGNIZING THE NEWLY INSTALLED BEVERLY HILLS VETERANS MEMORIAL

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the newly installed Beverly Hills Veterans Memorial which will be dedicated in Beverly Park on Memorial Day 2013.

In May of 2011, Paul Kleppert and Ron Berndt attended the city's Memorial Day Parade and Service. After the moving annual tribute to area veterans, they imagined a monument which would permanently memorialize the men and women who have served and, in some cases, given the ultimate sacrifice, to protect their fellow residents.

The community supported their vision and gave generously. The monument was funded with 99% private funds. In fact, they raised so much money that they were able to purchase a large, full standing, black granite monument with engraving on both sides. It will read, "In Honor of All the Men and Women of Beverly Hills who Served in the Armed Forces of the United States of America," with the official seals of the five branches of the Armed Services beneath and an American flag etched in the background.

As the community of Beverly Hills commemorates this milestone monument, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in thanking not only the veterans of Beverly Hills, Michigan but all of the veterans across this free country, for their dedicated service. I congratulate the residents, elected officials, and businesses as they celebrate the veterans, the heroes amongst them, preserve their rich local heritage, and look forward to growing the monument in the future.

CONGRATULATING THE MARSHALLTOWN PUBLIC LIBRARY

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Marshalltown Public Library for receiving the 2013 National Medal for Museum and Library Service. It is an honor to have this great community resource in my district.

This award is the nation's highest honor for museums and libraries for service to their community. Home to one of the earliest Children's Rooms in the country, the Marshalltown Public Library has served its community with its commitment to early literacy programs.

The Marshalltown Public Library also offers services to the growing immigrant population in their region. Through their annual Dia de los Ninos/Dia de los Libros festival, they introduce Spanish-speaking families to the services the library provides, as well as all children in the area to celebrate Hispanic culture. They also partner with youth mentoring programs to introduce youth from all cultures to library services.

Today, I congratulate the Marshalltown Public Library on receiving the National Medal

from the Institute of Museum and Library Services. I look forward to the future of this institution as it strives to provide for the needs of education, recreation, and cultural awareness of the vibrant and diverse population that it serves.

RECOGNIZING MBMS, INC.

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize MBMS, Inc. as it is honored by the Amherst Chamber of Commerce as the 2013 First Niagara Bank Sponsor's Award winner.

Founded in 1985 by James E. Kunert, MBMS, Inc. initially focused on mortgage servicing system consulting and software development for mortgage servicing and risk management systems.

Under the pressure of an increasingly digital economy, Gary Andalora joined MBMS in 1987 and worked with James to expand the software development business. One year later, MBMS chose to focus on software development exclusively.

Despite initial struggles, by 1992 MBMS had grown into a firmly established company. Today, their clients include 9 out of the 10 largest banks in the nation. MBMS remains American–owned and domestically based, providing all services from their main office in Amherst, New York.

A winner of the "Best Companies to Work for in New York State" for the past four consecutive years, MBMS's loyalty and dedication to their employees undoubtedly contributes to their success.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to recognize MBMS, Inc. for their 27 years of service to Western New York and our nation. I wish them the best of luck in all their future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO THE ATLANTA METROPOLITAN SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation.

Whereas, Atlanta Metropolitan Seventh-day Adventist Church has been and continues to be a beacon of light to our State for the past forty years; and

Whereas, Pastor Chris Montrose and the members of the Atlanta Metropolitan Seventh-day Adventist Church family today continues to uplift and inspire those in our community; and

Whereas, the Atlanta Metropolitan Seventh-day Adventist Church has been and continues to be a place where citizens are touched spiritually, mentally, and physically through outreach ministries and community partnership to aid in building up communities throughout the State of Georgia; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious Church of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the needy, and empowered our community for the past forty (40) years by preaching the gospel, teaching the gospel, and living the gospel; and

Whereas, the Atlanta Metropolitan Seventh-day Adventist Church has produced many spiritual warriors, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders, and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who have shared not only with their Church, but with the State of Georgia and the world their passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Atlanta Metropolitan Seventh-day Adventist Church family for their leadership and service to our district on this the 40th anniversary of their founding;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim March 30, 2013 as Atlanta Metropolitan Seventh-day Adventist Church Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 30th day of March, 2013.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE SEATTLE-TACOMA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport (Sea-Tac), for earning the 2013 Skytrax World Report Award for Best Airport Staff in North America. The Seattle-Tacoma International Airport is operated by the Port of Seattle.

The Skytrax World Report Awards honors global airport excellence based on 12.1 million customer surveys which evaluate 39 airport service and product performance indicators. The World Airport Awards acknowledge global airport distinction and are known in the industry as the Passenger's Choice Awards.

The Seattle-Tacoma International Airport is the 15th largest airport in the United States and 40th largest in the world by passenger volume, serving over 33.2 million passengers in 2012. Regionally, Sea-Tac generates $13.2 billion in business revenue and produces and supports 138,000 jobs. The airport houses 23 airlines, which serve 72 non-stop domestic and 19 international destinations.

At Sea-Tac, high-quality services are provided in every aspect of travel, which has contributed to the positive experiences of Sea-Tac travelers. The Port of Seattle values its commitments to both its customers and the region that it serves. The overall friendliness and quality of staff proudly represent the hard-working individuals that drive our regional economy in Washington State and the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize Seattle-Tacoma International Airport and its staff's laudable performance.

RECOGNIZING THE WILLIAMSVILLE BUSINESS ASSOCIATION

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Williamsville Business Association as it is honored by the Amherst Chamber of Commerce as the 2013 Small Business Organization of the Year.

The Williamsville Business Association was established 28 years ago to promote positive economic development in the village of Williamsville. Since its beginnings, the Association has garnered a membership of over 130 business and professional leaders.

The Association is a centralized resource for the business community, government, and village residents, which encourages cooperation between key economic actors in the village. By providing a platform for collaboration, the Association fosters a cohesive vision for the future of Williamsville.

The Williamsville Business Association has been tremendously successful in their mission to transform the village into a destination. Williamsville is known locally, regionally and internationally for its shops, music, arts, and cultural life, regularly attracting from across Western New York and as far away as Canada. Their website features every event and activity occurring in the village, ranging from farmers markets and concerts to the discounts offered by village shops.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the Williamsville Business Association. I am grateful for their outstanding efforts towards developing Western New York's economy.

TRIBUTE TO MILLER GROVE HIGH SCHOOL

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation.

Whereas, only a few schools excel in competition on a state level and our own Miller Grove High School is one of those; and

Whereas, after making state history as the first boys basketball team to win five consecutive state championships; and

Whereas, under the leadership and guidance of Coach Sharman L. White, the Miller Grove High School Boys Basketball team is being hailed as a Georgia basketball dynasty; and

Whereas, the Wolverines of Miller Grove have demonstrated the will to win, the courage to win, the mechanics of teamwork and an astounding spirit of triumph in many mental and physical battles; and

Whereas, the 8th day of March, 2013 will go down in history as the day that our Miller Grove High School Boys Basketball team became the 5 time, 5–A champions of Georgia; and

Whereas, this team has exhibited great moral character on and off the basketball court and throughout the halls of Miller Grove High and the community; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Miller Grove High School Basketball Team for its achievements bringing joy and honor to our District: Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim May 13th as Miller Grove High School Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 13th day of May, 2013.

HONORING LAIRD COVEY

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Mr. Laird Covey, who is retiring this month after more than 23 years of dedicated service to the Central Maine Medical Center and the surrounding community.

The State of Maine has long benefited from Laird's tenure in the health care field. In addition to serving as President of CMMC since July 2008, Laird has also helped direct the center as Chief Operating Officer and Vice President for Medical Affairs. Outside of CMMC, he spent 3 years serving as Chief Executive Officer at Bridgton Hospital in Bridgton, Maine and was Vice President at North Country Hospital in Newport, Vermont.

Few people can claim to embody the spirit of compassion and community engagement as completely as Laird. He is a proud and active member of the Lewiston Auburn Future Forum, which has been a driving force behind community efforts to make Lewiston and Auburn a better place to live. He has also served as Chairman of the Board at the Androscoggin Home Care and Hospice (AHCH) and as President of the Board at Camp Sunshine, an institution for families of children with life-threatening diseases in Casco, Maine.

In 2011, I was proud to join Laird in announcing CMMC's collaboration with Maine Research Associates on a new medical research expansion project. The study, which focuses on treatments for conditions such as arthritis, diabetes and cardiovascular disease, has enabled hundreds of patients in Maine to access cutting-edge medicines. It also helped draw national attention to the important work being done in Maine to help solve some of our nation's most persistent health challenges. This project would not have been able to move forward so successfully without Laird's leadership.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in congratulating Mr. Laird Covey on an exceptional career in the field of public health.

RECOGNIZING TOM ULBRICH

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Tom Ulbrich as he is awarded the 2013 Small Business Advocate of the Year Award by the Amherst Chamber of Commerce.

Few have been so generous with their time and talents as Tom Ulbrich. As one of our community's most passionate advocates for small business, and a business owner himself, Tom intimately understands the incredible significance of entrepreneurship to the economy and culture of the United States of America.

Tom has selflessly dedicated his personal and professional work to small business advocacy. Tom is a member of the National Federation for Independent Business's New York State Leadership team, and a frequent author and orator on topics concerning the importance of small business and entrepreneurship to the vitality of the American economy.

A testament to Tom's insights is his recent TED talk, "Is There a Better Way?" which explores the necessity of developing entrepreneurial skills and spirit in students from a young age. In a world where modern technology and unprecedented access to information have rendered entrepreneurial skills essential, Tom's keen business sense and inimitable knowledge are invaluable.

Currently, Tom serves as the Executive Director of the University at Buffalo School of Management's Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership. Since assuming the role in 2008, Tom has worked tirelessly to advance the Center's mission of invigorating the Western New York economy and community through entrepreneurial development. Under Tom's direction, the Center has expanded its sophisticated interdisciplinary approach to educating emerging business leaders.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to recognize Tom Ulbrich, a true champion for the American economy.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN OSCAR BOONE, SR.

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizen of Districtiion.

Whereas, our nation is blessed to have this innovator and pioneer touch the lives of thousands through his leadership and service; and

Whereas, Mr. John Oscar Boone, Sr.'s legacy is present throughout the nation and the world for all to see, being the first African American appointed to head a major state prison in the United States, serving many roles in the American Correctional System: Commissioner, Superintendent and Director; he valiantly served our country in the U.S. Army Air Force during World War II; and

Whereas, this giant of a man transformed the American Correctional System, he was instrumental in the implementation of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1965 and he represented our nation on an international level, he inspired elected officials, motivated the young and the old, as he accomplished so much during his time on this earth; and

Whereas, this remarkable man gave of himself, his time, his talent and his life; Mr. Boone inspired others to do the same by witnessing him walk the walk and talk the talk, he opened doors for others to enter; and

Whereas, Mr. Boone led by doing behind the scenes and on the front lines for many; Mr. Boone was a husband, a father, a grandfather, a brother and a friend; he was our warrior, our patriarch, a man of great integrity who remained true to the uplifting of the community until his end; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow an honorable distinction and recognition on Mr. John Oscar Boone, Sr., for his leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens of Georgia and throughout the Nation; as a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby attest to the 112th Congress that Mr. John Oscar Boone, Sr., of Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honorable Distinction": Mr. John Oscar Boone, Sr., U.S. Citizen of Distinction In the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 8th day of December, 2012.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF REVEREND DR. SAMUEL BERRY MCKINNEY

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Reverend Dr. Samuel Berry McKinney for his more than 55 years of service and leadership building Mount Zion Baptist Church and the community of Seattle, Washington.

Rev. McKinney moved to Seattle in 1958 to lead one of Seattle's oldest and most prominent Black churches. During his time as Senior Pastor, he mentored over 40 ministers and lectured throughout the nation. With an eye toward the future, Rev. McKinney also oversaw the building of the church's educational unit and encouraged economic development in the church and the community.

Rev. McKinney grew up in Cleveland, Ohio in the 1920s and 1930s as the son of a prominent and politically engaged African-American minister. He attended Morehouse College, where he was a classmate of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. He also served as a minister in Providence, Rhode Island in the mid-1950s.

When Rev. McKinney arrived in Seattle, he quickly became a leader in the movement for human rights, which included playing a major role in the Central Area Civil Rights Committee. Always committed to social justice, he was a founding member of the Seattle Civil Rights Commission and he facilitated the only visit of the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to Seattle.

In addition, Rev. McKinney was a founder of Liberty Bank, the first African-American-owned bank in Seattle and was the first African-American President of the Church Council of Greater Seattle. He has served on the board of the Meredith Mathews East Madison YMCA, the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, and the Washington Mutual Savings Bank.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize the work Reverend Dr. Samuel McKinney has done for his church and the community.

HONORING FRANKLIN COUNTY, ALABAMA AND THEIR ANNUAL WATERMELON FESTIVAL

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Franklin County, Alabama and their annual Watermelon Festival. The Franklin County Watermelon Festival began in 1981 with a group of local farmers gathering to sell their harvest of watermelons. This gathering created what is now the largest festival in Franklin County. This annual festival is organized by the Franklin County Chamber of Commerce and is sponsored by Franklin County businesses and individuals. This two day event, on the third weekend of August, is held at the Franklin County seat in the City of Russellville.

Franklin County and Russellville welcome over 35,000 guests to this festival from neighboring counties and states each year.

Civic clubs and organizations participate with their own special watermelon events as a time of fund raising.

The Franklin County Chamber of Commerce sponsors Watermelon Contests and the Watermelon Pageant which produces a Queen for the festival. The Watermelon Queen presents awards for: best dressed melon, seed spitting, best tasting melon, most unusual melon, and of course the largest, heaviest melon.

The Franklin County Watermelon Festival is made possible by volunteers who work year round to produce the best of entertainment, arts & crafts, food, activities and watermelon to please every palate.

Again, it is my honor to recognize Franklin County, Alabama as the Watermelon Capital of Alabama.

RECOGNIZING THE MOSES INSURANCE GROUP

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Moses Insurance Group and its members as they are honored by the Amherst Chamber of Commerce with the 2013 Family Owned Business Award.

The Moses Insurance Group was founded by Charles ''Herky'' Moses in 1955. Herky was a true community servant with an incredible work ethic. During World War II, he served his country by joining the Marines. Herky later continued his service as a volunteer firefighter, coach, and community youth mentor, in addition to being an active member of several service organizations including the Kiwanis, Knights of Columbus, Chamber of Commerce, Boy Scouts of America, George Lamm Post, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The Moses Insurance Group remains a family-owned business. Herky's son Robert joined the firm in 1977, followed by his sons Ken in 1979 and Douglas in 1984. Robert and Ken remain with the firm to this day, serving as President and Vice President, respectively. Their sister, Carole, and brother, Charles Jr., came on board in 1988. Carole serves as the Human Resources Department and keeps the company's books, while Charles worked part-time as a sales producer. Jeffrey Moses, a member of the third generation of the Moses family, is the newest hire, after receiving his P&C Insurance Brokers' License in 2008.

Inspired by Herky's tradition of service, the members of the Moses Insurance Agency are active in many service organizations today. Agency owners are members of or volunteers with the Independent Insurance Agents Association, Trusted Choice Agents, Amherst Chamber of Commerce, Williamsville Business Association, Western New York Food Shuttle, Amherst Lions Club, Amherst Senior Citizens Foundation, several committees at St. Leo the Great and St. Gregory the Great churches, Sacred Heart Academy High School, American Heart Association Walk-a-thon, Cancer Diamond Society Ball, and the Boy Scouts of America Troop 431.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the good works of this service-minded, family-owned business. I admire their commitment to our community and am grateful for their continued involvement.

NORTHWESTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT MEMORIAL CEREMONY

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize the Northwestern Wisconsin Regional Law Enforcement Memorial Ceremony.

For over two decades law enforcement agencies from across Northwestern Wisconsin have held an annual ceremony during National Police Week to honor and remember those officers that were killed in the line of duty while serving their local communities. This year's ceremony commemorates 45 law enforcement officers from 20 Wisconsin counties whose names are among the over 19,000 inscribed in marble at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, DC. Each one of these officers made the ultimate sacrifice for the safety and protection of our citizens.

The ceremony, which includes a vehicle procession, formal honor guard presentation, wreath laying, rifle salute, speakers, and music, will also be accompanied by a public screening of the documentary film, Heroes Behind the Badge. The film highlights the selfless acts of bravery committed by the men and women of law enforcement in the line of duty. The event will provide an opportunity for law enforcement officers to come together and interact with the public in order to heighten awareness of the dangers police officers face each day and the sacrifices they make to protect our communities. Proceeds from the event will go to benefit the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Concerns of Police Survivors (C.O.P.S), and the Northwest Regional Law Enforcement Memorial.

As a former prosecutor in western Wisconsin, I've had the honor of working closely with law enforcement officers. I am greatly humbled by the selfless service and bravery exemplified by these individuals, and it is with my deepest appreciation that I stand today to honor those who have given their lives to ensure the safety of our communities.

IN HONOR OF THE CENTRE SQUARE FIRE COMPANY'S CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Centre Square Fire Company (CSFC), located in Whitpain Township, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, which is celebrating its centennial anniversary.

One hundred years ago, on February 21, 1913, a group of property owners of Centre Square, Blue Bell and surrounding areas met at the Centre Square Hotel to explore the establishment of a fire company. The 35 members of the founding group established the charter which reads, ''The said Company is formed for the purpose of the support of fire engine, hook and ladder, hose company, for the purpose of protecting life and property, in case of fire. The said Corporation is to exist perpetually.'' These words hold true today.

Over the years, the Centre Square Fire Company has served the residents of Montgomery County in fire protection and much more. Most recently, the Centre Square Fire Company took delivery of a 2013 Pierce Velocity 100 foot Platform ladder truck—capable of carrying 500 gallons of water. Although it remains a 95 percent volunteer service, Centre Square has grown over the years to better serve the residents of Montgomery County.

Once again, I congratulate the Centre Square Fire Company as they celebrate its one hundredth anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO GLENDA F. BRITTON

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation.

Whereas, a virtuous woman of God accepted her calling to serve in the Educational System; and

Whereas, Mrs. Glenda F. Britton began her educational career in teaching in Georgia and this year she retires from teaching at Edward L. Bouie, Sr., Elementary Theme School in Lithonia, Georgia, she has served the DeKalb County Public Schools System well and our community has been blessed through her service; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents as a Teacher, Educator and Motivator, giving the citizens of Georgia a person of great worth, a fearless leader, a devoted scholar and a servant to all who want to advance the lives of our youth; and

Whereas, Mrs. Britton is formally retiring from her educational career today, she will continue to promote education because she is a cornerstone in our community that has enhanced the lives of thousands for the betterment of our District and Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Glenda F. Britton on her retirement from the DeKalb County Public Schools System and to wish her well in her new endeavors; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim May 10, 2013 as Mrs. Glenda F. Britton Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 10th day of May, 2013.

HONORING ALAIN E. SHERMAN

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Roslyn High School student, Alain E. Sherman, from Roslyn, NY, in my Congressional District, who has been named a Presidential Scholar. Dedicated and talented young people like Alain reflect the exemplary work by the next generation that will lead our nation into the future. I am so proud to recognize him today and it is an honor to represent him in Congress.

I want to applaud Alain for his hard work and dedication, but also want to recognize his family and teachers, who have surely played a critical role in making this achievement possible. Only 141 students from across the country are given this esteemed honor of the thousands upon thousands of high school students nationwide.

Alain serves as Vice President of the Roslyn High School Honor Society and also sits on the school's Model Government Executive Board. During his senior year at Roslyn High School, Alain was a member of the competitive "Partners for the Future" program hosted by Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory. Alain spent ten hours each week conducting biomedical research with a mentor scientist at the lab. Alain's hard work is truly emblematic of what it means to be a Presidential Scholar. I look forward to seeing what breakthroughs result from Alain's research in the future.

The White House Commission on Presidential Scholars, appointed by President Obama, selects scholars annually based on their academic success, artistic excellence, essays, school evaluations and transcripts, as well as demonstrated community service, leadership, and commitment to high ideals. Of the three million students expected to graduate from high school this year, more than 3,300 candidates qualified for the 2013 awards determined by outstanding performance on the College Board SAT and ACT exams, and through nominations made by Chief State School Officers or the National YoungArts Foundation's nationwide YoungArts competition.

The 2013 U.S. Presidential Scholars are comprised of one young man and one young woman from each state, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, and from U.S. families living abroad, as well as 15 chosen at-large and 20 U.S. Presidential Scholars in the Arts.

Since its creation in 1964, the U.S. Presidential Scholars Program has honored more than 6,000 of the nation's top-performing students with the prestigious award given to honorees during an annual ceremony in Washington, DC. The program was expanded in 1979 to recognize students who demonstrate exceptional talent in the visual, literary and performing arts.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to join me in commending Alain for all of his accomplishments and I look forward to seeing his continued academic success.

RECOGNIZING WAUKEGAN PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR RECEIVING THE INSTITUE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES' 2013 NATIONAL MEDAL

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Waukegan Public Library and its staff for receiving the 2013 Institute of Museum and Library Services' National Medal. Waukegan Public Library is one of only 10 institutions nationwide that received this distinguished honor.

I attended the award ceremony last week at the White House, where First Lady Michelle Obama presented Waukegan Library with the medal. She praised the library for its innovation, its passion and its commitment to serving the community.

That commitment is exactly what Richard Lee, the library's Executive Director, wisely pointed out when he explained that success is no longer defined by "the number of books checked out," but rather it is measured by service to the community.

By this standard, the Waukegan Library shines. Their Conversational ESL Program helps create new opportunities for the 55 percent of Waukegan residents whose primary language is something other than English. Their programs do not merely teach skills, but they empower residents with the skills to achieve their own success.

We speak often of our communities and what makes them strong. Institutions like Waukegan Public Library make our communities strong. The library is a pillar of the Waukegan community, and it has enriched the Tenth District.

As doors of opportunity open to more and more residents, we will all prosper, and I congratulate Waukegan Library for helping pave the paths to that future.

CELEBRATING THE DEDICATION OF THE ROSEVILLE FIRE STATION NO. 9

HON. TOM McCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the dedication of the Roseville Fire Station No. 9.

The Roseville, California Fire Department was first organized in 1907 with 16 volunteer firefighters staffing two hose carts to provide nearly 2,500 residents with fire protection. Today the Roseville Fire Department serves over 120,000 residents within 44 square miles. Whether it's a medical emergency, a fire, a hazardous material incident, or natural disaster, the Roseville firefighters are prepared to respond to the needs of their community.

The opening of a ninth fire station reflects the vision of the Roseville Fire Department to operate effectively and efficiently to protect and enhance the safety and well-being of its residents, businesses, customers and partners. The new facility is the result of a community effort that will provide for the advancement of public safety and the delivery of exceptional service for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to overestimate the necessity of fire protection or to measure the countless contributions these firefighters make to our community. It is with great pleasure that I rise today to thank the Roseville Fire Department for its great service and contributions throughout the region.

HONORING MR. ANISWORTH MALLETT, MRS. JACQUELINE MALLETT, AND MASTER DREW MALLETT

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizens of Distinction.

Whereas, our community has been blessed by the lives of Anisworth, Jacqueline and Drew Mallett; they have given of themselves daily to bring joy, service and the true meaning of friendship and family to our district; and

Whereas, Mr. Anisworth Mallett being a father, husband and business leader in our community established and operated two businesses in our district, A and J Lawn Care and Golden Krust, LLC, he was tenacious and successful in his home, his business and his community; and

Whereas, Mrs. Jacqueline Mallett being a mother, wife and Administrative Assistant in the DeKalb County Public Schools was very active and engaged in the affairs of the community, she was the walking definition of a Proverbs 31 woman, phenomenal in every way; and

Whereas, Drew Mallett was the ideal young man, a seventh grader at Stephenson Middle School in Stone Mountain, he was a young gentleman, an athlete, a musician; he loved cars, girls and bringing joy to everyone he would meet being an ambassador of goodwill, he enhanced our district with his charisma; and

Whereas, this remarkable family gave of themselves, their time and their talents; being leaders and servants in the Fourth Congressional District; and

Whereas, Anisworth, Jacqueline and Drew Mallett led by example, encouraging, motivating, serving and enhancing the lives of others; they are model citizens not only to our community, but to our Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a Congressional Recognition on Mr. Anisworth Mallett, Mrs. Jacqueline Mallett and Master Drew Mallett for their unyielding leadership, friendship and service;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby attest to the 113th Congress that Mr. Anisworth Mallett, Mrs. Jacqueline Mallett and Master Drew Mallett of the 4th Congressional District of Georgia are deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Recognition": Mr. Anisworth Mallett, U.S. Citizen of Distinction; Mrs. Jacqueline Mallett, U.S. Citizen of Distinction; Master Drew Mallett, U.S. Citizen of Distinction.

Proclaimed, this 5th day of January, 2013.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ROSE WILDER

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a trailblazing educator who has been recognized as the 2014 South Carolina Superintendent of the Year. Dr. Rose Wilder is a remarkable leader and visionary who serves with distinction as the Superintendent of Clarendon School District 1, the historic school district that was the birthplace of the landmark desegregation case Brown v. Board of Education. She is very deserving of this tremendous honor.

Dr. Wilder is a native South Carolinian; the daughter of Mr. Laco Davis and the late Mrs. Ruby Mae Davis. She was one of seven Davis children born and raised in the Orangeburg County town of Santee.

From an early age she loved learning and appreciated the value of education. She did her undergraduate work at South Carolina State University and Columbia College. Her postgraduate work was at South Carolina State University, the Citadel and Cornell University. She earned an undergraduate degree in guidance and counseling, a master's in special education, and a PhD in education administration.

In 1979, Dr. Wilder began her teaching career in her home county of Orangeburg as a reading teacher at Galliard Primary School in the Town of Eutawville. After eight years in the classroom, she became assistant principal at Manning Primary School in neighboring Clarendon County. She then went on to serve as the first principal of the new Manning Elementary School and later returned as principal of Manning Primary.

In 1994, Dr. Wilder was appointed as assistant superintendent of instruction for Clarendon School District 2. Later that same year she was chosen to lead the school district and made history by becoming the first African American female superintendent in South Carolina since the Reconstruction era. She served in that capacity for seven years, and in 1999, she was named Outstanding Superintendent by the South Carolina School Board Association.

She left Clarendon County to serve as superintendent for the Fairfield County School District for two years and as a curriculum facilitator for Richland County School District 1. In 2004, she returned to Clarendon County to serve as superintendent of school district 1 in the Summerton area.

During her nine years leading the district, Dr. Wilder has challenged the notion that poor students cannot achieve high academic standards. Once a chronically underperforming district, Clarendon School District 1 is now the second highest academically performing high poverty district in the state of South Carolina, despite having a 95 percent poverty index rating. She has also brought the district out of a $1 million deficit into financial solvency. Her other achievements include earning the district accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, completing the new Summerton Early Childhood Center, and refurbishing the old middle school campus as a community resource center. Next school year, Scott's Branch High School will become a New Tech Network Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) school, one of only two schools in the state to institute this project-based curriculum.

Dr. Wilder's motto is "every child, every chance, every day," and that is clearly reflected in the school district's philosophy and achievements.

Her other achievements include serving on the transition team for State Superintendent of Education Jim Rex in 2006. She is a 1994 graduate of Leadership South Carolina, and a 2009 graduate of the Riley Leadership Diversity Institute at Furman University. She holds a life membership in the NAACP and the United Council of Negro Women. She is an active member of several professional organization and serves as President elect of the South Carolina Association of School Administrators. She is also a member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.

Dr. Wilder is married to James C. Wilder. They share three children and two grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Rose Wilder for her selection as 2014 South Carolina Superintendent of the Year, and wish her well as she competes for the national honor. She has done an outstanding job during her tenure at Clarendon School District 1, and, as a former teacher, I applaud her dedication to her schools, her students and her community. I am proud to call her a friend and claim her as a constituent of the 6th Congressional district.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE PASSAGE OF THE BAN THE BOX ACT

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Minnesota Senator Bobby Joe Champion's accomplishment in passing the "Ban the Box" Act in the Minnesota Legislature. Elected to the Minnesota House of Representatives in 2008 and the Minnesota Senate in 2012, Senator Champion is a recognized lawyer, activist, and legislator. He has a long list of legislative accomplishments, including spearheading the Bottineau Corridor transit project, advocating for the creation of the Minnesota African-American History Museum, and supporting the renovation of Nicollet Mall and Orchestra Hall.

One of Senator Champion's most important contributions has been helping those with a criminal record reintegrate successfully into their communities. Senator Champion is the author of the "Ban the Box" Act, which prohibits employers from asking the job applicant whether he or she has ever been arrested or convicted of a crime, with a few exceptions for sensitive positions. The "Ban the Box" Act is a crucial step forward in the fight against poverty and the effort to reduce recidivism.

The past crimes of former felons often follow them throughout their lives, preventing them from getting jobs ten, twenty, or even thirty years later. Job applicants who have finished serving criminal sentences face many challenges and few opportunities to restart their lives, making recidivism rates high.

The "Ban the Box" Act targets the main reason people who have committed a felony never have a chance at a job—a check off box on a job application that asks the applicant to state whether he or she has ever committed a felony. By barring employers from asking this question on a job application, the Act allows individuals with criminal histories to stand on their own merits. The "Ban the Box" Act will provide employment opportunities to those who have served their sentence, raising their quality of life and their chance for success and leading to reduced crime.

Through Bobby Joe Champion's leadership and perseverance, this legislation passed both the Minnesota Senate and the Minnesota House of Representatives with accolades from both sides of the aisle, and was signed into law by Governor Dayton on May 13, 2013.

I commend Senator Champion for his important work on Minnesota's historic "Ban the Box" legislation.

RECOGNIZING HOSPITAL CORPSMAN 1ST CLASS (FMF) JOSEPH SANTOS ON BEING NAMED U.S. PACIFIC FLEET'S 2012 SEA SAILOR OF THE YEAR

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate Hospital Corpsman 1st Class (FMF) Joseph Santos on being named U.S. Pacific Fleet's 2012 Sea Sailor of the Year.

Petty Officer Santos was nominated by his commander, and was chosen from a pool of 13,000 other sailors in the Pacific Fleet. He will be meritoriously promoted to the rank of chief petty officer.

Petty Officer Santos, a native to Saipan and youngest of nine children, moved to Dededo, Guam, with his family when he was just an infant. In 1999, after graduating from John F. Kennedy High School, he joined the United States Navy. Upon completion of basic training, he reported to Naval Hospital Corps School in Great Lakes, Illinois, where he graduated with distinction. He also trained at Field Medical Service School (FMSS) at Camp Pendleton, California.

Petty Officer Santos craved adventure. He wanted to help people and save lives, and he knew the job of a Navy hospital corpsman would help him fulfill these goals.

He has served two tours in Iraq and one in Afghanistan. In 2004, while deployed in Fallujah, he earned a Purple Heart. On September 6, 2004, a large convoy in Fallujah was hit by a vehicle-borne improvised explosive device and there was a mass casualty.

He was the only corpsman on the scene for the first ten minutes of the attack. Although he was able to help many Marines, there were many others that lost their lives that day.

Furthermore, when several Marines in his unit showed signs of suicidal thoughts, he worked to help them get through it and allowed them to bunk above him during their last days in Afghanistan to ensure their return home was as peaceful as possible. He remains committed to his Marines and makes himself available around-the-clock to discuss these issues.

Petty Officer Santos has received numerous awards and recognition for his exemplary service, including the Purple Heart, Navy Commendation Medal, Navy Achievement Medal, Navy Good Conduct Medal, and a Combat Action Ribbon.

He is married to Easton Santos; together they have a 10-year-old daughter, Keana, and are currently expecting another child.

I congratulate Hospital Corpsman 1st Class (FMF) Joseph Santos on being named U.S. Pacific Fleet's 2012 Sailor of the Year. I join the people of Guam in thanking him for his bravery and selfless service to our nation, and for making our island proud.

TRIBUTE TO LUCILLE SUTTON

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizen of Distinction.

Whereas, the lives of many have been touched by the life of this one woman who has given of herself to her family and her community; and

Whereas, Mrs. Lucille Sutton's spirit is as sweet as pie, she was an exemplary mother, mother-in-law, grandmother, great grandmother, neighbor and friend; and

Whereas, Lucille Sutton was a virtuous woman, a woman of great integrity who remained true to the uplifting of her community and family which in turn uplifted others; and

Whereas, she was an exemplary matriarch, serving as compass and wise counselor and bringing great joy to our district, her family and friends; and

Whereas, this remarkable woman gave of herself, never asking for fame or fortune as she became a quiet storm, a spark that starts a flame; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a Congressional Recognition on Mrs. Lucille Sutton for her leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens of DeKalb County and the nation; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby attest to the 112th Congress that Mrs. Lucille Sutton of DeKalb County, Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Recognition": Mrs. Lucille Sutton, U.S. Citizen of Distinction.

Proclaimed, this 2nd day of January, 2013.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF SSG STEPHEN RYAN

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. SMITH OF WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate SSG Stephen Ryan on being honored with the Howard O. Scott Citizen-Soldier of the Year Award from the Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber's Military Affairs Committee. He is a valued NCO who also serves in the Washington Army National Guard with distinction of more than 12 years.

The Citizen-Soldier Award is given to an exemplary Soldier, Airman, Sailor, Marine, or Coast Guardsman who demonstrates Mr. Scott's belief that giving back to the community is one's responsibility.

SSG Ryan has excelled in each position he has held throughout his career. He is highly regarded in the maintenance community as one of the best practitioners of the Standard Army Maintenance System Enhanced (SAMS—E) in the Washington National Guard.

His off duty work with the 951st Maintenance Company's Family Readiness Program is a tribute to his unit and fellow soldiers. He continues to volunteer and devotes his personal time to the men and women of the 951st as a leader and mentor of our Citizen Soldiers.

For the last six years SSG Ryan has volunteered often with the Pierce County Friends and Athletes (PCFA), one of the largest independent Special Olympics programs in the State. He also is the head usher at Lakewood New Hope Community Church, where he spent a year as a board member.

The Citizen-Soldier Award memorializes Howard Scott who grew up in Tacoma and served his nation when called upon during World War II. He returned to succeed as a banker in Tacoma—giving of much his time to community service organizations, believing that service is a core responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize SSG Stephen Ryan. His dedication to serving our community is an inspiration to others.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $16,755,788,437,042.45. We've added $6,128,911,388,129.37 to our debt in 4 years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING THE 95TH REPUBLIC DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Republic of Azerbaijan as it celebrates its 95th Republic Day on May 28, 2013. Later this year, Azerbaijan will also celebrate the 22nd anniversary of its freedom from the Soviet Union and the establishment of diplomatic relations with the United States.

Azerbaijan's initial independence was short–lived, and was overtaken by the Bolshevik Revolution and the force of Soviet Russia. Many Azerbaijanis lost their lives in 1920, trying to retain their independence. After decades of living under Soviet rule, in 1991, Azerbaijan once again regained its independence after the fall of the Soviet Union.

Over the last two decades Azerbaijan has become an increasingly important partner to the US, with Russia as a neighbor on its' northern border and an extensive border with Iran in the south, Azerbaijan is located in a geopolitically dynamic region between Europe and Asia. It is a predominately Muslim secular democracy noted for religious tolerance that is also home to Christian and Jewish communities.

As highlighted by former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, Azerbaijan plays a key role in supporting the Northern Distribution Network, which provides passage for Coalition supplies bound for Afghanistan. In addition to supporting U.S. security interests in the region, Azerbaijan serves a paramount role in supplying world markets with oil and gas. It is the only secular Muslim country that maintains close ties with Israel, supplying roughly forty percent of Israel's energy needs.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Republic of Azerbaijan on the occasion of its 95th Republic Day. I also encourage my colleagues to join the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus to show support for the important partnership between the United States and Azerbaijan.

HONORING JOYCE GEORGE

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation.

Whereas, a virtuous woman of God accepted her calling to serve in the Educational System; and

Whereas, Mrs. Joyce George began her educational career in teaching in Alabama and this year she retires from teaching at Edward L. Bouie, Sr., Elementary Theme School in Lithonia, Georgia, she has served the DeKalb County Public Schools System well and our community has been blessed through her service; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents as a Teacher, Educator and Motivator, giving the citizens of

Georgia a person of great worth, a fearless leader, a devoted scholar and a servant to all who want to advance the lives of our youth; and

Whereas, Mrs. George is formally retiring from her educational career today, she will continue to promote education because she is a cornerstone in our community that has enhanced the lives of thousands for the betterment of our District and Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Joyce George on her retirement from the DeKalb County Public Schools System and to wish her well in her new endeavors; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim May 10, 2013 as Mrs. Joyce George Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 10th day of May, 2013.

SPRINGFIELD-GREENE COUNTY PARK BOARD 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Springfield-Greene County Park Board's 100th Anniversary.

The Park Board was founded on May 22, 1913 and immediately assumed the maintenance and preservation of Washington and Lafayette Parks, both created shortly after the Civil War. By the end of World War II, it administered Springfield's ten historic parks, including: Dickerson Park Zoo, Doling, Grant Beach, Fassnight, Lafayette, Phelps Grove, Sequiota, Silver Springs, Smith, and Washington.

Tremendous growth took place from the 1950s to the present, particularly under the leadership of longtime Parks Director Dan Kinney, who more than doubled the size of the system during his tenure from 1971 to 2005. The name changed to the Springfield-Greene County Park Board in 1996, when voters approved expansion of the system beyond city limits.

The Park Board now counts more than 100 sites and many more facilities within its county-wide system, ranging from neighborhood playgrounds to multi-use recreational facilities. The system includes three golf courses, three Emily centers, a zoo, a farm park, a botanical center, several sports and athletic complexes, two indoor aquatics centers, six outdoor swimming pools, multiple school-park sites and more than 100 miles of recreational trails.

The Park Board has earned state and national recognition, most notably the "Gold Medal Award" for best overall parks and recreation department of its size in 2000 from the National Recreation and Park Association. In 2003, the City of Springfield, Missouri—Greene County was named "Missouri Sportstown USA" by Sports Illustrated magazine. The United States Olympic Committee has designated the Park Board as one of its select Community Olympic Development Program sites for the sports of tennis, volleyball, archery, and ice hockey.

Each year, park facilities host more than 50 national, regional, state and local tournaments in softball, baseball, soccer, hockey, tennis, volleyball and golf, and it maintains an active partnership with more than 200 volunteer groups and entities in the area, enhancing recreation and outreach both within and beyond parks facilities.

For 100 years, the Park Board has skillfully managed the beautiful parks and recreation facilities throughout the Springfield area, and I am confident that the next 100 years will be even more impressive.

CONGRATULATING ROBERT F. CERVENKA OF PHILLIPS, WISCONSIN, ON BEING PRESENTED THE LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD BY THE PRICE COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the business accomplishments of Robert F. Cervenka of Phillips, Wisconsin, who has been presented the Lifetime Achievement Award by the Price County Economic Development Association.

Bob Cervenka was born and raised in the small town of Phillips, Wisconsin. He graduated from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. After his graduation in 1958, Bob returned to the community that he loved to pursue his new business venture—the Phillips Plastics Corporation.

Phillips Plastics began operations on October 20, 1964, occupying an old creamery building in Phillips. In 1967, the company broke ground on a new 12,000 square foot custom plastic facility where they employed 30 skilled workers dedicated to crafting innovative control knobs for automobiles, dishwashers, fans, dehumidifiers, and dryers. In 1973, Phillips Plastics opened Precision Decorating in Medford, Wisconsin. Shortly thereafter, the facility became known as Phillips Automotive, a full service design, manufacture, decoration, and assembly plant for high volume injection molded components. As industries from the Midwest moved to the south and offshore, Bob recognized that Wisconsin's rural, small community workforce offered a unique competitive advantage. He developed additional plants in Chippewa Falls, Eau Claire, Menomonie, New Richmond, Hudson, and Prescott among others.

Capitalizing on the company's success, Mr. Cervenka and co-founder Louie Vokurka established the independent philanthropic Ann Marie Foundation in 1974. Named after their mothers, the foundation worked to improve the quality of life within local communities that are home to Phillips Plastics facilities. Since its inception, the foundation has given over $8 million to schools and non-profit organizations.

Thanks to the business contributions of outstanding citizens like Robert F. Cervenka, Wisconsin's economic future looks bright. I ask that my colleagues join me today to express our appreciation for Bob's entrepreneurial spirit and our congratulations to him on receiving this well-deserved award.

RECOGNIZING VICE SPEAKER BENJAMIN J.F. CRUZ ON RECEIVING THE JUDICIARY'S 2013 HUSTISIA AWARD FOR GUAM

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate Benjamin J.F. Cruz, the Vice Speaker of the Guam Legislature, on being awarded the Judiciary of Guam's 2013 Hustisia Award.

The Hustisia Award is awarded annually to recognize a person or organization that has contributed to improving the administration of justice and good government.

Vice Speaker Cruz has committed his life to promoting justice in Guam as an attorney, jurist, and current senator. This award recognizes his 40 years of service in advocating for justice and equality and for promoting and strengthening respect for the rule of law. Throughout this career, he fostered building public support for the judiciary, promoted understanding of the judicial system, and encouraged civic responsibility and service.

Born to Antonia C. Franquez and the late Juan Quenga Cruz, former Commissioner of Piti, Vice Speaker Cruz received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science and Economics from Claremont Men's College in 1972. In 1975, he received his Juris Doctor degree from the University of Santa Clara Law School.

Vice Speaker Cruz returned home and became an attorney and member of the Guam Bar Association. Throughout his career, Vice Speaker Cruz has worked for all three branches of government. From 1975 to 1979, he served as Legal Counsel to my late husband, Governor Ricardo J. Bordallo. A few years later, in 1983, he served one year as Director of the Guam Liaison Office in Washington, D.C.

His work in the judicial branch of government began in 1984 when he was appointed a judge of the Superior Court of Guam. He was elevated to the Supreme Court of Guam and served as an associate justice from 1997 to 1999. In 1999, his colleagues elected him Chief Justice of Guam and served in this capacity until his retirement from the bench in 2001.

In December 2003, he was federally appointed as Commissioner of the Guam War Claims Review Commission. He served in this post until June 2004.

He is currently serving his second term as Vice Speaker of the 32nd Guam Legislature; he has served as a senator in the 31st, 30th and 28th Legislatures. He was also the Minority Legal Counsel for the 15th, 16th, and 29th Guam Legislatures.

Additionally, Vice Speaker Cruz remains an active member of our island community. He has been involved in numerous community and civic organizations, and has spearheaded several non–profit corporations focused on social justice issues, cultural preservation, and youth services.

I congratulate Vice Speaker Benjamin J.F. Cruz on receiving the Judiciary of Guam's 2013 Hustisia Award. I join the people of Guam in commending him for his award and thanking him for his many contributions to our community.

IMPROVING EMPLOYMENT & INDEPENDENCE FOR THE BLIND AND VISION IMPAIRED

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as May is Vision Loss Awareness Month, it is my pleasure to recognize and support the AbilityOne Program. The AbilityOne Program, established by the Javits–Wagner–O'Day Act, is the nation's largest initiative that provides career opportunities to more than 50,000 people who are blind or have other significant disabilities. Seven out of 10 working age Americans who are blind or visually impaired are not employed. Through this program, people with disabilities have the opportunity to gain greater independence and quality of life, and enjoy and benefit from participation in their communities.

There are over 600 community–based nonprofit agencies nationwide that participate in the AbilityOne Program. Lighthouse Central Florida, located in Orlando, Florida, is one of the agencies across the country associated with the AbilityOne program to provide individuals who are blind or visually impaired with rehabilitative services, job training and employment opportunities. In August 2012, I was fortunate to visit and tour the Lighthouse Central Florida facility, its recent expansion Lighthouse Works!, and their new call center. On behalf of the citizens of Central Florida, I commend the efforts of Lighthouse Central Florida and the investments they are making in the lives of individuals with vision loss to provide them with job training, work experience and other tools necessary to lead independent, successful lives.

In addition, the AbilityOne Program network manufactures a wide array of products and services such as the National Industries for the Blind's (NIB) SKILCRAFT® brand, which encompasses over 3,000 items including janitorial equipment, office supplies, medical supplies, tools, and uniforms. I am pleased to support the AbilityOne Program and NIB's initiatives by purchasing SKILCRAFT® products for use in my District office.

Federal and state governments save more than $33 million a year through the excellent work being done through the AbilityOne Program. Over the past 75 years, AbilityOne has enriched the lives of individuals who are blind or have other significant disabilities, and over the past 37 years, Lighthouse Central Florida has educated, trained, and helped 100,000 blind and vision impaired individuals. I applaud the efforts of those involved, and I wish them many more years of quality service to our nation.

HONORING JERRICK JACKSON

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizen of Distinction.

Whereas, we are gathered to celebrate the life of Mr. Jerrick Jackson, one of DeKalb County's favorite sons; and

Whereas, Jerrick Jackson was born to Wiley "Chief' Jackson, Sr., and Bobbie Lois Jackson, on April 19, 1966, he was educated in the DeKalb County Public Schools, later working for Delta Airlines and Norfolk Southern Railroad as a conductor; and

Whereas, he was a young man who believed and lived a life for God, country, community and family; and

Whereas, Jerrick Jackson gave of himself, his time, his talent and his life with unwavering commitment to his family; and

Whereas, he was a son, a brother and a friend; he was a man who enjoyed life, savoring the moments with his family and his companion Kimberly E. Little and her daughter, AnBiya Y. Mitchell; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia recognizes Mr. Jerrick Jackson as a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby attest to the 113th Congress that Mr. Jerrick Jackson is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honor" by declaring Mr. Jerrick Jackson, U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia

Proclaimed, this 13th day of May, 2013.

RECOGNIZING THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY FOR ITS SERVICE OVER THE LAST 100 YEARS

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the One Hundredth Anniversary of the American Cancer Society.

Originally founded as the American Society for the Control of Cancer in 1913, the American Cancer Society promotes awareness and education, in addition to demonstrating an unmatched determination and commitment in supporting patients, survivors, and their families.

In 1944, the American Cancer Society began the prioritizing of cancer research and has to date been the largest non–governmental funder of cancer research. The American Cancer Society was instrumental in the passage of the Cancer Act of 1971, which established the National Cancer Institute to advance the detection of cancer and the application of cutting edge treatments.

Thanks in part to the American Cancer Society, the number of cancer deaths in America declined for the first time in history in 2006 and continues to decline today. The Society has made an incredible impact in the race to find the cure. Not only has the American Cancer Society been directly responsible for saving the lives of millions, but also for providing a light of hope in times of despair.

Relay for Life, which is the largest grassroots fundraising event in the world, was originally founded by an American Cancer Society volunteer over twenty years ago. Relay for Life is undoubtedly one of the most emotionally powerful group fundraising events, raising more than three billion dollars to date. This laudable event brings the Nation together to provide hope and strength amongst all those impacted by cancer.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I congratulate the American Cancer Society and its courageous members on the monumental impact they've made over the last one hundred years. My wife Vicki joins me in offering our best wishes in the fight against cancer and for the success of the American Cancer Society.

TRINITY EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church in Danville, Illinois upon the 150th Anniversary of the church. The church celebrated this special occasion on April 25, 2013 with a festival divine service and banquet.

Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church was founded on February 15, 1863 when 14 members signed the constitution which formed the congregation. The first ordained pastor was Gottfried Markworth, who also started Lutheran day school education in Danville, which is celebrating 150 years as well. The congregation moved to the current building on Main Street on April 25, 1915. Today, the church has 727 baptized members and the Pastor is Kent Tibben.

I extend my congratulations to Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church upon this special occasion. It is my prayer that the Lord blesses them with many more years of service.

CLEBRATING MINNESOTA MARRIAGE EQUALITY

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today is a historic day for Minnesota. Marriage equality will become the law in our state, and I stand with my fellow Minnesotans to celebrate the equality of love and access to civil rights for all families. I applaud the courageous legislators who voted with their hearts for justice and equality for all families.

I am inspired by the dedication and compassion of all those who have worked to make the freedom to marry a reality in our state. Just two years ago, a hurtful and discriminatory amendment was proposed to constitutionally exclude Minnesota's same-sex couples from marriage. Yet through countless thoughtful conversations and the brave sharing of personal stories, a coalition was built that defeated the amendment.

Here in Washington I am mindful that much work remains to be done. Same-sex couples who will soon be legally married in Minnesota will still not be federally recognized because the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) discriminates against them. These couples will be denied more than 1,000 federal rights and benefits that their neighbors are eligible to receive. I will continue to work to repeal DOMA and I hope in the coming weeks the U.S. Supreme Court will rule it unconstitutional.

All Americans deserve to be treated equally under the law. I look forward to the day when

we can celebrate marriage equality all across America. Until then, I share in the joy of another step forward in the struggle for equal rights for all, regardless of their race, age, gender, or sexual orientation.

IN RECOGNITION OF FORMER PRESIDENT OF MEXICO, INDIGENOUS LEADER, AND FRIEND TO THE UNITED STATES, BENITO JUAREZ

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, as millions of Mexican Americans across the country commemorate the 5th of May, or "El Cinco de Mayo," I would like to pay particular homage to the indigenous visionary leader and friend to the U.S., Benito Juarez, whose historic actions lead to this celebrated occasion. Born the son of Zapotec Indian peasants, Juarez rose above racial, economic, and political challenges to become one of Mexico's most renowned presidents.

Juarez became a lawyer in 1834, a judge in 1841, Governor of the state of Oaxaca in 1847, President of the Supreme Court of Justice in 1857, interim President of Mexico in 1858, and finally President elect in 1861.

Juarez served his country at a time of tremendous political discord. Inspired by the idea of a modern civil society and free market principles prevalent in its neighboring country to the north, Juarez dedicated himself to ridding his country of its historically corrupt military rule. Juarez also successfully ousted British, Spanish, and French opposition forces while serving as head of state in exile. It was at the Battle of Puebla, on May 5, 1862, that Mexican forces won a victory against the French. Although significantly outnumbered, the Mexicans defeated a much better-equipped French army of more than double their size in numbers. The French army had not been defeated in almost 50 years. On May 9, 1862, Juarez declared that the anniversary of the Battle of Puebla would be a national holiday regarded as "Battle of Puebla Day" or "Battle of Cinco de Mayo."

I note that Juarez maintained a special relationship with President Abraham Lincoln. During Juarez' exile, President Lincoln sent him a message expressing hope "for the liberty of . . . [his] government and its people." Later while Juarez fought against the French, General Ulysses S. Grant, under President Lincoln's direction, issued an order to "concentrate in all available points in the States an army strong enough to move against the invaders of Mexico." President Lincoln also supplied arms and munitions to Juarez, sending as many as 30,000 muskets to reinforce the Mexican line.

In turn, Juarez stood strong against Confederacy efforts to topple the Union armies. When the South sent a delegation under John T. Pickett to Mexico to win over the juaristas, Picket was thrown into a Mexico City jail for 30 days and thereafter expelled from the country.

Upon receiving news of President Lincoln's assassination, Juarez ordered flags at all public buildings and military stations in Mexico to fly at half-mast. In a letter to the Secretary of the Mexican Legation and his charge d'affaires in Washington, D.C., Juarez wrote: "[This] great misfortune has profoundly impressed me, as Mr. Lincoln, who worked with so much earnestness and abnegation for the cause of nationality and freedom, was worthy of a better fate than the poniard of a coward assassin."

Today, Juarez is remembered as being a progressive reformer dedicated to democracy, equal rights for his nation's indigenous peoples, and the defense of national sovereignty. Let us honor him on this day.

TRIBUTE TO DR. STANLEY H. STONE

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of the Fifth Congressional District of Florida and myself, I rise now to offer a tribute to the career and success of my friend, Dr. Stanley H. Stone, who served as the Vice President of Human Resources and Diversity for Valencia College in Orlando, FL for the past ten years. A visionary and scholar Dr. Stanley H. Stone is a true leader of the Central Florida Community and the great State of Florida.

We exalt Dr. Stone for his accomplishments while the legacy honoring the man, husband, father, and a community leader who is beloved by many in the Central Florida area. A man dedicated to education and committed to achieving athletic excellence, Dr. Stone earned a Bachelor's of Arts degree in Political Science in 1974 from Howard University in Washington, District of Columbia while on a track athletic scholarship. During his tenure at Howard, he was acknowledged as a College All-American in Track and Field. This prestigious honor catapulted him toward his aspirations of representing the United States in the Olympics after winning several sprinting competitions. Continuing his pursuit of academic scholarship, Dr. Stone was awarded his Juris Doctorate degree in 1977 from Howard University.

Upon relocating to the State of Florida, Dr. Stone began his professional career as a staff attorney for Central Florida Legal Services, Inc. In 1979, Dr. Stone's call to service lead him to the classrooms of Seminole Community College in Sanford, FL and Valencia Community in Orlando, FL as an adjunct professor, where he taught both business and law classes at each respective institution. Within the year, Dr. Stone became the Program Director of the Paralegal Program at Valencia. Progressing forward, he became the Dean of the Business and Public Services department and served in this capacity for 10 years. Because of his exceptional work ethic, management skills, and business savvy, Dr. Stone was promoted to Provost of Valencia College, East Campus in 1994 and remained in this position until 2003. It was during his tenure as Provost that the East Campus experienced extraordinary growth in student enrollment, increased number of grants awarded to faculty and staff, and the expansion of buildings and facilities. Subsequeetly, by the end of his term, the East Campus bolstered an enrollment of over 17,000 students per semester, greatly exceeding that of the other three respective Valencia Community College campuses. Also as campus Provost, Dr. Stone served as the Chair of the college-wide Equal Access/Equal Opportunity Committee, responsible for recommending college policies and procedures for contlucting employment discrimination investigations, sexual harassment complaints, and provided guidance to administrators on college recruiting and hiring practices. As a result of being an advocate for students, Dr. Stone was awarded an honorary membership into the Phi Theta Kappa Society.

In recognition of exemplifying phenomenal leadership, Valencia's President, Dr. Sanford Shugart, promoted Dr. Stone to the position of Vice-President of Human Resources and Diversity division in 2003. Dr. Stone is the first to hold this position and was the only African American on the president's cabinet. He served as the president's liaison to the College's Black Advisory Committee. Dr. Stone holds memberships in the American Association of the Community Colleges, the Florida Association of Community Colleges and the College and University Public Administrators organization.

As a community leader Dr. Stanley H. Stone efforts are unrivaled. He has served on numerous boards, commissions and panels throughout the Central Florida area. In September, 2006, Orlando Mayor Buddy Dyer appointed Dr. Stone as Chair of the Mayor's Safe Orlando Task Force his unprecedented recommendations to resolve law enforcement issues and reduce crime were unanimously accepted recommendations for implementation. In addition, Dr. Stone serves on the Board of Directors for the African American Chamber of Commerce, the Central Florida Urban League, 100 Black Men organization and Boys and Girls Club. Dr. Stone reached the pinnacle of his volunteerism and philanthropic efforts by being recognized by several organizations such as the Orange County Black History Committee who named Dr. Stone, Educator of the Year in 2006; The Links, Incorporated in 2009; and he was most recently recognized by Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Incorporated as a Blue Indigo award recipient.

Though Dr. Stone H. Stone is a celebrated educator and exemplary community leader, the title that suits him best that which he is most proud of is father. Dr. Stone enjoys leisure time with his son, Terrance, and his loving wife, Barbara. In memory of their most cherished and treasured daughter Shannon, who transitioned in 2007, Dr. and Mrs. Stone established a foundation through which several students have been granted scholarships and book awards. A devoted and active member of Antioch Missionary Baptist Church in Oviedo, Florida, Dr. Stone is a man of great faith. Through his faith he has persevered from his childhood in the inner city to his stellar achievements as a community servant. Always remembering to reach back, Dr. Stone's commitment and dedication to our youth has provided young people with the opportunities that were not so easily afforded to him.

We pay tribute to a man of God Dr. Stanley H. Stone, as a humanitarian, man, husband, father, educator, and community leader in Central Florida whose life work and achievements symbolize compassion, thoughtfulness, patience, wisdom, confidence and faith. He is

a man who has remained the master of his fate, steadfast to being the captain of his soul and is truly a role model for us all.

HONORING CALVIN ''CAL'' SUTKER

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Calvin ''Cal'' Sutker, a political and community leader, a devoted family man, and a treasured friend to many.

Cal Sutker had an illustrious political career that included many elected and appointed leadership positions, beginning as a Trustee in the Village of Skokie from 1965 to 1969, where he helped pass one of the first Fair Housing Ordinances in the State of Illinois.

From 1985 to 1991, Mr. Sutker ably represented his community in the Illinois General Assembly as State Representative and went on to become Cook County Commissioner from 1994 to 2002. Mr. Sutker served as Niles Township Democratic Committeeman for 33 years, from 1973 to 2006. He also served as Chairman of the Illinois Democratic Party and as State Central Committeeman. He was a friend and supporter of many aspiring and serving elected officials, including me, for which I will always be grateful.

In addition to the many laws and ordinances that he authored that have made life better for the people of Illinois, Mr. Sutker has left an indelible physical legacy for our community. He was instrumental in bringing the Skokie Northshore Sculpture Park, the 2nd District Courthouse, and the Illinois Holocaust Museum to Skokie. In 2006, a Cook County Forest Preserve District grove was name for Cal Sutker.

Mr. Sutker was active in Jewish charitable causes, and a staunch support of NA'AMAT USA, in which his beloved wife Phyllis was a leader for many years. He enlisted in the United States Army in 1942, serving in Germany, France and Austria during World War II. He was in the battalion that first entered the Dachau concentration camp and liberated its prisoners, and spoke regularly to community and student groups about his experiences during the war.

He received his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Chicago.

Calvin Sutker and his late wife Phyllis had four children—Edie Sue Sutker, a Skokie Trustee, Shelly Sutker-Dermer, a Circuit Court Judge in Skokie, Sharon McGowan, and Allen Sutker. He is also survived by his eight grandchildren, his sister Ada Rabinowitz, and his brother Irwin Sutker.

RECOGNIZING CHILDREN'S MEDICAL CENTER DALLAS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Children's Medical Center Dallas. This year, Children's Medical Center Dallas celebrates its centennial, marking 100 years of providing quality health care to the Dallas community.

Children's Medical Center Dallas has consistently been recognized among the top children's hospitals in the country by U.S. News and World Report. It has more than fifty specialty and subspecialty programs, and was the first pediatric hospital in Texas to be designated as a Level I Trauma Center. Children's provides more than $65 million in charity health care annually to ensure access to treatment for many children whose families are unable to pay for their care. With nearly seven thousand employees and well over 200,000 patients served annually, Children's is an integral part of the Dallas community.

To expand the treatment options available for patients, Children's has partnered with the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center to create the Children's Medical Center Research Institute. This Institute builds upon the clinical expertise of Children's Medical Center Dallas and the scientific prowess of UT Southwestern Medical Center to conduct transformational pediatric research.

Over recent decades, I have seen Children's Medical Center Dallas grow and develop in its effort to continue providing superior healthcare for children and their families. I congratulate Children's on its 100th year of operation and commend the hardworking nurses, physicians, and staff at Children's for providing care to so many of Dallas' children.

IN RECOGNITION OF SERGEANT GUILLERMO DE LEON

HON. PETE P. GALLEGO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the late Sergeant Guillermo ''Willie'' De Leon.

Staff Sergeant de Leon was the son of a Terlingua miner—born on June 25, 1919 in the 23rd congressional district in Big Bend and raised in Uvalde. He gained his strong work ethic at an early age—learning the stonemason and bricklayers trade during the great depression.

Mr. De Leon was inducted in the U.S. Army in 1940—serving in the 36th Infantry Division in North Africa and Italy. He made the rank of staff sergeant at an early age, becoming one of the first Mexican-American noncommissioned officers and one of the first to command Anglo troops.

Staff Sergeant De Leon led a squad of 12 men in the first wave of the amphibious landing at Salerno Italy in 1943—wading through tracer bullets and his fallen comrades. He was also a member of the 141st Infantry Regiment the all Mexican-American unit that led the attack at the crossing of the Rapido River. Staff Sergeant De Leon was one of only 26 men who survived the attack.

Staff Sergeant De Leon's valor earned him several recognitions. He was awarded the Silver Star, the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart with one cluster, the American Defense Service Medal, the American Campaign Medal, the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with four battle stars, and the World War II Victory Medal.

After his service, he returned to Uvalde to be with his family. He was a true hero. It is fitting that the civic center of Uvalde be named in honor of this brave American soldier—and rededicated on May 27, 2013. He is one of the community's most decorated veterans. The Staff Sergeant Willie De Leon Civic Center will pay tribute to the life of Guillermo De Leon.

CORRECTION

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3391–S3436

Measures Introduced: Nineteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 936–954, and S. Res. 140–141. **Pages S3429–30**

Measures Reported:

S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018. **Page S3429**

Measures Passed:

National Travel and Tourism Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 141, recognizing the goals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States. **Page S3436**

Federal, State, and Local Law Enforcement Officers: Senate agreed to S. Res. 140, commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifices made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty. **Page S3436**

Measures Considered:

Water Resources Development Act—Agreement: Senate resumed 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 S3397–S3400, S3400–21**

Adopted:

Boxer (for Baucus) Amendment No. 847, to modify a provision relating to Northern Rockies headwaters extreme weather mitigation. **Pages S3401–08**

Boxer/Vitter Modified Amendment No. 899, relating to the State of Louisiana's Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast, and to improve a provision relating to dam optimization. **Pages S3401–08**

Vitter (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 895, to clarify the role of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma regarding the maintenance of the W.D. Mayo Lock and Dam in the State of Oklahoma. **Pages S3401–08**

Vitter (for Wicker) Amendment No. 894, to express the sense of Congress that, in recognition of the contributions of Donald G. Waldon to the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, a lock and dam on that waterway should be designated as the "Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam". **Pages S3401–08**

Vitter (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 867, to allow the Secretary to accept and expend non-Federal amounts for repair, restoration, or replacement of certain water resources projects. **Pages S3401–08**

Vitter (for Boozman) Amendment No. 872, to improve planning and administration relating to water supply storage activities. **Pages S3401–08**

Vitter (for Thune/Johnson (SD)) Amendment No. 912, to authorize the Secretary to assist Indian tribes in addressing shoreline erosion in the Upper Missouri River Basin. **Pages S3401–08**

Vitter (for Cornyn) Amendment No. 880, to deauthorize portions of the project for East Fork of Trinity River, Texas. **Pages S3401–08**

Vitter (for Murkowski/Begich) Amendment No. 904, to declare certain areas in Seward, Alaska, as nonnavigable waters of the United States for purposes of navigational servitude. **Pages S3401–08**

Boxer (for Klobuchar) Amendment No. 884, to require the closure of the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam if certain conditions are met. **Pages S3401–08**

Boxer (for Wyden) Modified Amendment No. 870, to modify a provision relating to Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund prioritization. **Pages S3401–08**

Vitter (for Cochran) Modified Amendment No. 911, to provide Crediting Authority for Federally Authorized Navigation Projects. **Pages S3401–08**

Boxer (for Carper) Amendment No. 882, to modify the allocation of funds to the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin to fulfill equitable funding requirements of the respective interstate compacts of the Commissions. **Pages S3401–08**

Vitter (for Murkowski) Modified Amendment No. 903, to authorize the Secretary to enter into deep draft port development partnerships. **Pages S3401–08**

Boxer (for Durbin) Modified Amendment No. 906, to provide for a severe flooding and drought management study of the greater Mississippi River Basin. **Pages S3401–08**

Boxer (for Levin/Stabenow) Amendment No. 893, to provide for the policy relating to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund prioritization. **Pages S3401–08**

Vitter (for Collins) Amendment No. 898, to provide for the reopening of the Cape Arundel Disposal Site as a dredged material disposal site. **Pages S3401–08**

Boxer (for Cardin) Modified Amendment No. 861, to improve a provision relating to project acceleration. **Pages S3401–08**

Boxer (for Brown/Graham) Amendment No. 907, to provide for further project authorizations. **Pages S3401–08**

Boxer (for Wyden) Amendment No. 896, to require the Government Accountability Office to carry out a study evaluating the effectiveness of activities funded by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in maximizing economic growth and job creation in port communities. **Pages S3401–08**

Boxer (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 797, to authorize a land exchange. **Page S3417**

Rejected:

By 52 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 119), Barrasso Amendment No. 868, to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S3409–11, S3412–15, S3416–17, S3417**

By 56 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 120), Sanders/Leahy Amendment No. 889, to address restoration of certain properties impacted by natural disasters. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S3411–12, S3418**

Pending:

Hoeven Amendment No. 909, to restrict charges for certain surplus water. **Pages S3415–16**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that the only remaining amendments in order to the bill be the following: Coburn Amendment No. 815; Coburn Amendment No. 816; Boozman Amendment No. 882; Merkley Amendment No. 866; and Udall (NM) Amendment No. 853; that no second-degree amendments be in order to any of the amendments prior to votes on or in relation to the amendments; that there be two minutes equally divided prior to each vote; and that upon disposition of Hoeven Amendment No. 909, the cloture motion on the bill be withdrawn, and Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended. **Page S3401**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that when the Senate continues consideration of the bill on Wednesday, May 15, 2013, it resume the voting sequence in the previous order with all after the first vote being ten minute votes; and all other provisions of the previous order remain in effect. **Page S3415**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Wednesday, May 15, 2013. **Page S3436**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S3428, S3436**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3428–29**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S3429**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3430–32**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3432–34**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3426–28**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S3434–35**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S3435**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S3435**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—120) **Pages S3417, S3418**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:39 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 15, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3436.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, "Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013".

APPROPRIATIONS: COAST GUARD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Coast Guard, after receiving testimony from Admiral Robert J. Papp, Jr., Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower concluded a hearing to examine Marine Corps modernization 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 of

the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition, and Lieutenant General Richard P. Mills, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Combat Development and Integration, and Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, both of the Department of Defense.

SITUATION IN SYRIA

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on the situation in Syria from James N. Miller, Under Secretary for Policy, Lieutenant General Terry Wolff, USA, Director, Strategic Plans and Policy (J–5), Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Michael Lansdown, Barry Truluck, and Amir Asmar, all Analysts, Defense Intelligence Agency, all of the Department of Defense.

RETURNING PRIVATE CAPITAL TO MORTGAGE MARKETS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance and Investment concluded a hearing to examine returning private capital to mortgage markets, focusing on housing finance reform, after receiving testimony from Mark A. Willis, New York University Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy, and Andrew Davidson, Andrew Davidson and Co., Inc., both of New York, New York; Phillip L. Swagel, University of Maryland School of Public Policy, Chevy Chase; and Robert Van Order, George Washington University, Chicago, Illinois.

STATE OF VIDEO

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet concluded a hearing to examine the state of video, after receiving testimony from Senator McCain; former Senator Gordon Smith, National Association of Broadcasters, Michael K. Powell, National Cable and Telecommunications Association, R. Stanton Dodge, DISH Network L.L.C., and John Bergmayer, Public Knowledge, all of Washington, D.C.

NATURAL GAS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine what the next applications are for natural gas and how this new demand will be met, focusing on pipeline infrastructure and increased use of natural gas in the transportation sector, after receiving testimony from Jeff Wright, Director, Office of Energy Projects, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Department of Energy; Kathryn Clay, Drive Natural Gas Initiative, and Donald Santa, Jr., Interstate Natural Gas Association of America, both of Washington, D.C.; Scott Prochazka, Centerpoint Energy, Inc., Houston, Texas; Jim Arthurs, Cummins Westport Inc., Vancouver, British Columbia; Robert Carrick, Daimler Trucks North America, and Gregg Kantor, NW Natural, both of Portland, Oregon; Richard Cargile, Midstream Energy Transfer Partners, Dallas, Texas; Steve Bolze, GE Power and Water, Fairfield, Connecticut; Gordon van Welie, ISO New England, Holyoke, Massachusetts; Jesus Soto, Jr., Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Francisco, California; and Jim Bruce, UPS, Atlanta, Georgia.

MEDICARE PHYSICIANS PAYMENTS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Medicare physicians payments, focusing on advancing reform, after receiving testimony from Mark E. Miller, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission; and A. Bruce Steinwald, Bruce Steinwald Consulting, and Kavita K. Patel, The Brookings Institution, both of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 793, to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States;

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; and

The nominations of James Knight, of Alabama, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chad, and Deborah Kay Jones, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador to Libya, both of the Department of State.

THE ADA AND ENTERTAINMENT TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Americans with Disabilities Act and entertainment technologies, focusing on improving accessibility from the movie screen to your mobile device, including S. 555, to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to require captioning and video description at certain movie theaters, and S. 556, to amend title 49, United States Code, to improve the accessibility of entertainment programming provided by air carriers on passenger flights, after receiving testimony from Eve L. Hill, Senior Counselor to the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Department of Justice; Karen Peltz Strauss, Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission; John Fithian, National Association of Theatre Owners, Inc., Washington, D.C.; Betsy Beaumon, Benetech, Palo Alto, California; Brian Charlson, Carroll Center for the Blind, Watertown, Massachusetts, on behalf of the

American Council of the Blind; and Andrew Phillips, National Association of the Deaf, Silver Spring, Maryland.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee resumed consideration of S. 744, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, but did not complete action thereon.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 24 public bills, H.R. 7, 1958–1980; and 3 resolutions, H.J. Res. 44–45; and H. Res. 213, were introduced. **Pages H2602–03**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2604–05**

Report Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 180, to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty (H. Rept. 113–54).

H.R. 767, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–55);

H.R. 573, to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa (H. Rept. 113–56); and

H.R. 356, to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled "An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes" (H. Rept. 113–57). **Pages H2601–02**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Webster to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2577**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:06 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H2578**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:11 p.m. and reconvened at 5:03 p.m. **Page H2579**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

National Blue Alert Act of 2013: H.R. 180, amended, to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 406 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 144; **Pages H2579–82, H2586–87**

Affirming the policy of the United States regarding Internet governance: H.R. 1580, to affirm the policy of the United States regarding Internet governance, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 413 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 145; and **Pages H2582–84, H2587**

Authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha: S. Con. Res. 10, to authorize the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 411 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 146. **Pages H2584–86, H2587–88**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:42 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H2586**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2586–87, H2587, and H2587–88. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 271, "Resolving Environmental and Grid Reliability Conflicts Act of 2013"; H.R. 1407, Animal Drug User Fee Amendments of 2013, as amended by the Subcommittee on Health; and H.R. 1919, the "Safeguarding America's Pharmaceuticals Act of 2013".

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

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, 10 a.m., SVC–217.

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 the Air Force and Army, 10 a.m., SD–124.

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, 2:30 p.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Energy, 2:30 p.m., 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, 2 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine advanced vehicle technology and its implications, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine United States Policy toward Iran; to be immediately followed by a closed briefing on an intelligence update on Iran in SH–219, 9:30 a.m., 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, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Full Committee, 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, 2:30 p.m., 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, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold hearings to examine pending benefits legislation, 10 a.m., SR–418.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1947, the "Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013", 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, markup on FY 2014 Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 11 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 271, the "Resolving Environmental and Grid Reliability Conflicts Act of 2013"; H.R. 1407, Animal Drug User Fee Amendments of 2013, as amended by the Subcommittee on Health; and H.R. 1919, the "Safeguarding America's Pharmaceuticals Act of 2013", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "Who Is Too Big to Fail: Does Title II of the Dodd-Frank Act Enshrine Taxpayer-Funded Bailouts?", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled "Recent Developments in the Investigation of the Murder of Human Rights Attorney Patrick Finucane", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, markup on the following measures: H.R. 1897, the "Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2013"; H.R. 1951, the "Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2013"; and H. Res. 131, concerning the ongoing conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the need for international efforts toward long-term peace, stability, and observance of human rights, 11:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing entitled "Preventing a Nuclear Iran", 1:15 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1417, the "Border Security Results Act of 2013", 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Oversight of the United States Department of Justice", 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on the following measures: H.R. 687,the "Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013"; H.R. 761, the "National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013"; H.R. 819, "Preserving Access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Act"; H.R. 910, the "Sikes Act Reauthorization Act of 2013"; H.R. 957, the "American Soda Ash Competitiveness Act"; H.R. 981, the "Resource Assessment of Rare Earths Act of 2013"; H.R. 1063, the "National Strategic and Critical Minerals Policy Act of 2013"; H.R. 1080, to amend the Sikes Act to promote the use of cooperative agreements under such Act for land management related to Department of Defense readiness activities and to amend title 10, United States Code, to facilitate interagency cooperation in conservation programs to avoid or reduce adverse impacts on military readiness activities; H.R. 1169, the "Naval Air Station Fallon Housing and Safety Development Act"; H.R. 1299, the "White Sands Missile Range Security Enhancement Act"; H.R. 1300 to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize

the volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges; H.R. 1384, the ''Wildlife Refuge System Conservation Semipostal Stamp Act of 2013''; H.R. 1574, to amend the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 to rename a site of the park; H.R. 1613, the ''Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act''; H.R. 1672, ''Limestone Hills Training Area Withdrawal Act''; H.R. 1673, to provide for the transfer of certain public land currently administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy for inclusion in Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California; H.R. 1676, the ''Johnson Valley National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area Establishment Act''; and H.R. 1691, the ''Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range Transfer Act of 2013''; 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1062, the ''SEC Regulatory Accountability Act''; and H.R. 45, to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, 1 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Patent Reform Implementation and New Challenges for Small Businesses'', 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, hearing entitled ''Small Business and Pass-Through Entity Tax Reform'', 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee: to hold hearings to examine women in manufacturing, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 15

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10:30 a.m.), Senate will continue consideration of S. 601, Water Resources Development Act, with a series of up to seven roll call votes on or in relation to amendments and passage of the bill.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, May 15

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of the following measures under suspension of the rules: 1) H.R. 701—To amend a provision of the Securities Act of 1933 directing the Securities and Exchange Commission to add a particular class of securities to those exempted under such Act to provide a deadline for such action; 2) H.R. 384—Homes for Heroes Act of 2013, as amended; 3) H.R. 356—Hill Creek Cultural Preservation and Energy Development Act; 4) H.R. 767—To amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project; and 5) H.R. 573—To amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E653
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E655, E656, E657
Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E650
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E659
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E655
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E656
Duffy, Sean P., Wisc., E657
Ellison, Keith, Minn., E655
Faleomavaega, Eni F.H., American Samoa, E659
Gallego, Pete P., Tex., E660
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E649, E649, E650, E651, E651, E652, E653
Israel, Steve, N.Y., E654
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E660
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E649, E650, E651, E651, E652, E653, E654, E656, E656, E658
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E653
Levin, Sander M., Mich., E650
Long, Billy, Mo., E657
McClintock, Tom, Calif., E654
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E658
Meehan, Patrick, Pa., E653
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E650, E652
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E658
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E660
Schneider, Bradley S., Ill., E654
Shimkus, John, Ill., E658
Smith, Adam, Wash., E649, E651, E652, E656
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E658

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.