United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 20, 2013 No. 71

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 20, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DENHAM 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 would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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 1 minute 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. BENTIVOLIO) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

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

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

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

Raise up, O God, women and men from every nation who will lead toward the paths of peace and whose good judgment will heal the hurt between all peoples.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

KEYSTONE WILL CREATE JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, time and time again, the President and the liberal-controlled Senate have disregarded initiatives to create jobs.

This week, the House will vote on an all-of-the-above energy policy that will create 20,000 shovel-ready jobs, 100,000 additional jobs, and invest $20 billion into our struggling economy, working with Canada, America's best energy partner.

For over a year and a half, the current administration has blocked efforts to build the Keystone pipeline. On numerous occasions, the President has claimed to support an all-of-the-above energy plan; however, his actions do not match his words.

This project directly affects families across our great Nation. In South Carolina's Second Congressional District, Michelin Tire Corporation in Lexington produces earthmover tires at $60,000 each, 12 feet high, used in Alberta, Canada, and MTU Diesel of Tognum America in Graniteville manufactures engines for oil sand recovery.

It is my hope that my colleagues will join in voting for this legislation, which will help put American families back to work.

Printed on recycled paper.

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

SEQUESTRATION EFFECTS

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Secretary of Defense, Chuck Hagel, announced that the furloughs of civilian DOD employees will be 11 days for the balance of this fiscal year. This decision, driven by sequestration, is damaging and degrading the military readiness of our country. These are individuals who provide critical services for the men and women in uniform who serve all across America and all across the world.

Sequestration is acting like a slow-acting poison, which is now affecting the economy. Moody's Investor Services announced last week that it will take a full point off of GDP growth this year and will result in, over time, the loss of 700,000 jobs.

It is time for this institution to focus on this self-inflicted damage that Congress caused by not turning off sequester as previous Congresses back in the eighties and nineties did when sequestration was in effect.

We should stop wasting our time on repeal debates for health care—37 times as of last week—and focus on what's really important in the immediate future. It's to turn off sequester. It is time for the leadership of this House to stop wasting our time and get focused on the issue that matters the most to the American people.

GANG OF 8 BILL PUTS SAFETY OF CITIZENS AT RISK

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amnesty bill gives amnesty to illegal aliens regardless of public safety and the danger to American citizens. For example, the Department of Homeland Security must waive misdemeanor criminal convictions when determining amnesty eligibility. That means crimes like assault, vehicular homicide, possession of drug manufacturing equipment, DUI, and sex offenses. Even gangsters get amnesty.

Chris Crane, President of the National Immigration and Customs Enforcement Council, says:

> The idea that we're going to give known gang members the opportunity to renounce their affiliation—and believe them—and then give them legal status in our country is outrageous.

Letting illegal alien criminals stay in America is outrageous, yet amnesty for criminals is exactly what the President and Senate Gang of 8 advocate.

Mr. Speaker, this amnesty bill is so bad it should be renamed the ''Loopholes for Criminals Act.''

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

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

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I rise today as an Eagle Scout and one who has a stake in the future of our scouting programs.

Some of us in America still believe in the concept of sexual morality, that sex is intended for one man and one woman within the institution of marriage. Organizations that hold this philosophy and promote it among our youth should be commended—or at least, you would think, tolerated.

Unfortunately, the intolerant left bullies and browbeats private organizations like the Boy Scouts into accepting their philosophy. Notice, they didn't start their own organization; they went after the Boy Scouts of America.

The left's agenda is not about tolerance and it's not about diversity of thought. It's about promoting a world view of relativism, where there is no right and wrong, then using the full force of the government to silence opposition and reshape organizations like the Boy Scouts into instruments for social change.

To my friends on the left, this is not tolerance.

But here's the good news about true tolerance: the most tolerant One of all has the ability to redeem us all.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS CODY TOWSE

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I stand to honor Private First Class Cody Towse, whose life was lost in Afghanistan. America lost one of its best and Utah lost one of our best.

This is a young soldier who had dedicated his life to helping save others. At the age of 18, he went to become an EMT and then a firefighter, and later joined the Army. He had recently won the Army Combat Medic Ribbon for saving another life under fire. As a bomb went off near Kandahar, he went to rush to the person who was injured, when a second bomb went off that took his life.

Today, I stand to honor him and all the men and women who serve and sacrifice for this country, for the United States of America. May God bless them, and may God bless the United States of America.

□ 1410

THE EPA CONTINUES ITS WAR ON ASTHMATICS

(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, people going to the Environmental Protection Agency's Web site find that May is National Asthma Month. Many people might be surprised to know that starting January 1, 2012, the Environmental Protection Agency has prevented the sale of the only over-the-counter asthma inhaler upon which millions of Americans have relied for emergency asthma treatment.

What is most alarming is that this inhaler was taken off the market not because it was unsafe or ineffective for treating asthma—it had been around for 50 years safely and effectively treating acute asthma attacks—but the Environmental Protection Agency claimed that the miniscule amount of chlorofluorocarbon contained was creating a hole in the ozone. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that the Nation's asthmatics are not causing a hole in the ozone layer.

When these inhalers were taken offline, we were told that the Food and Drug Administration would quickly approve a substitute inhaler; but here we are months and months and months later with no inhaler in sight.

What has been the response of the EPA? They've been dismissive of Congress' concerns.

I urge people to contact their Member of Congress to bring back these inhalers that have served so many people so well for so long.

SENATE IMMIGRATION BILL HELPS ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS, NOT AMERICANS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it's hard to believe that the immigration debate is taking place in the United States of America.

Those who favor the Senate immigration bill talk a lot about helping foreign workers and undocumented immigrants, but you never hear them talk about helping American workers and American taxpayers. They can't, because the immigration bill will cost many American workers their jobs or decrease their wages. That's what happens when you give work permits to 10 million illegal immigrants.

As for the cost of additional government services, the American taxpayer picks up that bill—about $43 billion every year.

The air is coming out of the Senate bill fast. It doesn't secure the border, and it hurts American workers and taxpayers.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

MAY 20, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 20, 2013 at 11:33 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 982.

Appointments:

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki).

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

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 13 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. WENSTRUP) at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

MAY 20, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 20, 2013 at 1:42 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 16.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

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.

STOLEN VALOR ACT OF 2013

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 258) to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military declarations or medals.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 258

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 ''Stolen Valor Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. FRAUDULENT REPRESENTATIONS ABOUT RECEIPT OF MILITARY DECORATIONS OR MEDALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 704 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''wears,''; and

(2) so that subsection (b) reads as follows:

''(b) FRAUDULENT REPRESENTATIONS ABOUT RECEIPT OF MILITARY DECORATIONS OR MEDALS.—Whoever, with intent to obtain money, property, or other tangible benefit, fraudulently holds oneself out to be a recipient of a decoration or medal described in subsection (c)(2) or (d) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than one year, or both.''.

(b) ADDITION OF CERTAIN OTHER MEDALS.—Section 704(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''If a decoration'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a decoration'';

(2) by inserting ''a combat badge,'' after ''1129 of title 10,''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) COMBAT BADGE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'combat badge' means a Combat Infantryman's Badge, Combat Action Badge, Combat Medical Badge, Combat Action Ribbon, or Combat Action Medal.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 704 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in each of subsections (c)(1) and (d) by striking ''or (b)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 258, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This Nation is blessed with many valiant men and women who have dedicated their lives to military service. My home State of Georgia has no shortage of these heroes, including Technical Sergeant Barry Duffield, who serves as a bomb disposal technician in the Georgia Guard's 116th Air Control Wing.

While deployed to Afghanistan, Sergeant Duffield's job was to oversee teams responsible for an incredibly dangerous job—neutralizing improvised explosive devices, or IEDs. Sergeant Duffield and his colleagues successfully completed 52 missions and helped destroy more than 1,200 pounds of enemy explosives. On January 7, 2013, Sergeant Duffield was awarded the Purple Heart for injuries he suffered during an IED detonation while deployed to Afghanistan in 2011. Sergeant Duffield also earned the Bronze Star and the Air Force Combat Action Medal for his valor during the same deployment.

The Purple Heart is one of the oldest and most recognized American military medals—dating back to 1782 when George Washington created what was then called the Badge of Military Merit to award ''any singularly meritorious action'' by a member of the military. Today, the Purple Heart is awarded to servicemembers like Sergeant Duffield who were killed or wounded by enemy action.

For almost 100 years, it has been a Federal crime to wear, manufacture, or sell military decorations or medals without proper authorization. In spite of this, many people have fraudulently claimed to be the recipient of military decorations, and this has unfortunately increased in recent years. In just one State, 600 people claimed on tax forms to be a recipient of the Medal of Honor in 1 year, even though at the time there were only 132 recipients alive nationwide.

To address this increase of fraudulent claims, in 2006 Congress enacted the Stolen Valor Act. This important law expands the penalties for falsely representing oneself as a recipient of any medal or honor authorized by Congress for the armed services.

In June 2012, the Supreme Court held in a case called U.S. v. Alvarez that the Stolen Valor Act inappropriately criminalized speech protected by the First Amendment. Specifically, the Court held that lying, even about having received a military decoration, is, by itself, protected speech. The Court, however, did note in this same case:

> In periods of war and peace alike, public recognition of valor and noble sacrifice by men and women in uniform reinforces the pride and national resolve that the military relies upon to fulfill its mission.

The Court also provided that false claims about military decorations demean the high purpose of such awards. This harm alone does not overcome the high level of scrutiny afforded protected speech. However, the Court did find:

> Where false claims are made to effect a fraud or secure moneys or other valuable considerations, say offers of employment, it is well established that the government may restrict speech without affronting the First Amendment.

H.R. 258, the Stolen Valor Act of 2013, narrows the law to make it a crime when people falsely claim to be a recipient of military decorations in order to carry out a fraud. The bill rewrites the statute to prohibit holding oneself out to be a recipient of certain military decorations or medals with the intent to obtain money, property, or

other tangible benefit. The penalty is limited to fraudulent claims related only to the Congressional Medal of Honor and those decorations or medals listed in the statute, including the Purple Heart.

This legislation enjoys strong bipartisan support, and a similar bill was passed by the House with overwhelming support last Congress. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 258, 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. 258, the Stolen Valor Act of 2013. H.R. 258 is an important bill because it upholds the integrity of military medals and decorations as well as corrects a constitutional flaw in a statute intended to protect the integrity of these honors.

Without question, all of those who serve our Nation deserve to be honored, and those who have gone beyond their peers in serving our Nation deserve special recognition. It is especially appropriate that we consider this bill just before Memorial Day, a special day when we remember and honor the sacrifice of those who died serving our country in the military.

One way in which our Nation recognizes the outstanding bravery and sacrifice of servicemembers is to award these dedicated men and women special medals and decorations.

□ 1710

Recipients of these distinctions often have received serious injuries or made supreme sacrifices defending our Nation. To ensure that these honors bestowed on these recipients are not diminished, Congress must do all within its power to prevent anyone from falsely claiming that they have received these medals or decorations.

While that was the goal of the original Stolen Valor Act enacted in 2006, the Supreme Court, in 2012, found that the breadth and scope of that legislation ran afoul of the First Amendment's free speech protections. In that case, Justice Kennedy wrote that while ''few may find the respondent's statements anything but contemptible, his right to make those statements is protected by the Constitution's guarantee of freedom of speech and expression.''

But Justice Kennedy, in writing that opinion, also set out certain parameters he suggested that would pass constitutional muster should Congress seek to rewrite the legislation. He advised:

> Where false claims are made to effect a fraud or secure moneys or other valuable considerations, say offers of employment, it is well-established that the government may restrict speech without affronting the First Amendment.

The text of H.R. 258 was crafted to carefully comply with that guidance. As drafted, the bill prohibits individuals from fraudulently representing themselves as recipients of a narrow group of special military honors in order to obtain money, property, or other tangible benefits. H.R. 258 ensures that anyone who falsely represents that they have been awarded these honors in order to benefit in some material way will be subject to criminal sanction.

I support the bill because it protects the honor of our military medals and decorations, while also respecting the First Amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm now pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), the sponsor of this legislation and a tireless advocate for servicemen and -women.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join with me in restoring the honor and valor of our military heroes by passing H.R. 258, the Stolen Valor Act of 2013.

On June 28, 2012, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down the Stolen Valor Act of 2005, concluding that the broad nature of the law infringed upon the guaranteed protection of free speech provided by the First Amendment of our Constitution. The Court determined that the act ''sought to control and suppress all false statements on this one subject, without regard as to whether the lie was made for the purpose of material gain.''

However, in concurring with the decision of the plurality, Justice Breyer stated that a ''more finely tailored statute that shows the false statement caused specific harm, or was at least material, could significantly reduce the threat of First Amendment harm, while permitting the statute to achieve its important protective objective.''

Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what my legislation does. The Stolen Valor Act of 2013 resolves these constitutional issues by clearly defining that the objective of the law is to target and punish those who misrepresent their service with the intent of profiting personally or financially.

Defining the intent helps ensure that this law will pass constitutional scrutiny while, at the same time, achieving its primary objective, which is to preserve the honor and integrity of military service and awards.

In 2006, every Member of both the House and the Senate clearly understood the need to protect the integrity and honor of military service and demonstrated that by unanimously passing the Stolen Valor Act in each Chamber.

That body understood that the proliferation of false claims occurring at the time cheapened the integrity of the military awards system and threatened the trust and honor bestowed upon military servicemembers and veterans by this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the need to protect the honor, service, and sacrifice of our veterans and military personnel is just as strong today as it was in 2006. The need is just as strong today as it was last year when this body passed the 2012 Stolen Valor legislation 410–3. The need will be just as strong as long as there are individuals who continue to lie about service in order to gain notoriety, profit personally and professionally, and to receive benefits reserved for those who fought in defense of this Nation.

This House has the opportunity to once again show our servicemembers and veterans that we value the sanctity of their sacrifice while, at the same time, protecting the constitutional rights that they've fought so hard to protect.

This past Saturday was Armed Forces Day, and a week from today is Memorial Day. Mr. Speaker, what better way to show our support for our brave servicemen and -women than by passing this legislation before us today?

H.R. 258 enjoys broad bipartisan support, with 124 cosponsors, and is supported by numerous veterans service organizations, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Association of the U.S. Navy, the Fleet Reserve Association, the National Association for Uniformed Services, the National Guard Association of the United States, the Association of the United States Army, the Military Officers Association of America, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and AMVETS.

I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS for moving this important legislation through the Judiciary Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 258.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back important piece of legislation. I appreciate the gentleman from Nevada bringing this forward and moving it forward as we go ahead. I would, at this point, urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Stolen Valor Act (H.R. 258).

This bill would amend the federal criminal code to rewrite provisions relating to fraudulent claims about military service to be subjected to a fine, imprisonment, or both.

This would apply to an individual who, with intent to obtain money, property, or other tangible benefits, fraudulently holds himself or herself out to be a recipient of a military medal.

This bill was passed with overwhelming support in the previous Congress, but was found by the Supreme Court to violate the first Amendment. I commend Rep. HECK for making the necessary changes and trying again.

The men and women of our Armed Forces unselfishly answer the call of duty to defend our freedom. Congress should not allow anyone to capitalize on their accomplishments.

I urge my colleagues to stand with our Brave Men and Women and support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 258.

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. COLLINS of Georgia. 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.

NUCLEAR TERRORISM CONVENTIONS IMPLEMENTATION AND SAFETY OF MARITIME NAVIGATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1073) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for protection of maritime navigation and prevention of nuclear terrorism, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1073

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 ''Nuclear Terrorism Conventions Implementation and Safety of Maritime Navigation Act of 2013''.

TITLE I—SAFETY OF MARITIME NAVIGATION

SEC. 101. AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2280 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 2280 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)(i), by striking ''a ship flying the flag of the United States'' and inserting ''a vessel of the United States or a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States (as defined in section 70502 of title 46)'';

(B) in paragraph (1)(A)(ii), by inserting '', including the territorial seas'' after ''in the United States''; and

(C) in paragraph (1)(A)(iii), by inserting '', by a United States corporation or legal entity,'' after ''by a national of the United States'';

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 2(c)'' and inserting ''section 13(c)'';

(3) by striking subsection (d);

(4) by striking subsection (e) and inserting after subsection (c):

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section, section 2280a, section 2281, and section 2281a, the term—

''(1) 'applicable treaty' means—

''(A) the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, done at The Hague on 16 December 1970;

''(B) the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, done at Montreal on 23 September 1971;

''(C) the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973;

''(D) International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979;

''(E) the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, done at Vienna on 26 October 1979;

''(F) the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, done at Montreal on 24 February 1988;

''(G) the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988;

''(H) International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997; and

''(I) International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1999;

''(2) 'armed conflict' does not include internal disturbances and tensions, such as riots, isolated and sporadic acts of violence, and other acts of a similar nature;

''(3) 'biological weapon' means—

''(A) microbial or other biological agents, or toxins whatever their origin or method of production, of types and in quantities that have no justification for prophylactic, protective, or other peaceful purposes; or

''(B) weapons, equipment, or means of delivery designed to use such agents or toxins for hostile purposes or in armed conflict;

''(4) 'chemical weapon' means, together or separately—

''(A) toxic chemicals and their precursors, except where intended for—

''(i) industrial, agricultural, research, medical, pharmaceutical, or other peaceful purposes;

''(ii) protective purposes, namely those purposes directly related to protection against toxic chemicals and to protection against chemical weapons;

''(iii) military purposes not connected with the use of chemical weapons and not dependent on the use of the toxic properties of chemicals as a method of warfare; or

''(iv) law enforcement including domestic riot control purposes,

as long as the types and quantities are consistent with such purposes;

''(B) munitions and devices, specifically designed to cause death or other harm through the toxic properties of those toxic chemicals specified in subparagraph (A), which would be released as a result of the employment of such munitions and devices; and

''(C) any equipment specifically designed for use directly in connection with the employment of munitions and devices specified in subparagraph (B);

''(5) 'covered ship' means a ship that is navigating or is scheduled to navigate into, through or from waters beyond the outer limit of the territorial sea of a single country or a lateral limit of that country's territorial sea with an adjacent country;

''(6) 'explosive material' has the meaning given the term in section 841(c) and includes explosive as defined in section 844(j) of this title;

''(7) 'infrastructure facility' has the meaning given the term in section 2332f(e)(5) of this title;

''(8) 'international organization' has the meaning given the term in section 831(f)(3) of this title;

''(9) 'military forces of a state' means the armed forces of a state which are organized, trained, and equipped under its internal law for the primary purpose of national defense or security, and persons acting in support of those armed forces who are under their formal command, control, and responsibility;

''(10) 'national of the United States' has the meaning stated in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22));

''(11) 'Non-Proliferation Treaty' means the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow on 1 July 1968;

''(12) 'Non-Proliferation Treaty State Party' means any State Party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, to include Taiwan, which shall be considered to have the obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty of a party to that treaty other than a Nuclear Weapon State Party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty;

''(13) 'Nuclear Weapon State Party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty' means a State Party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty that is a nuclear-weapon State, as that term is defined in Article IX(3) of the Non-Proliferation Treaty;

''(14) 'place of public use' has the meaning given the term in section 2332f(e)(6) of this title;

''(15) 'precursor' has the meaning given the term in section 229F(6)(A) of this title;

''(16) 'public transport system' has the meaning given the term in section 2332f(e)(7) of this title;

''(17) 'serious injury or damage' means—

''(A) serious bodily injury,

''(B) extensive destruction of a place of public use, State or government facility, infrastructure facility, or public transportation system, resulting in major economic loss, or

''(C) substantial damage to the environment, including air, soil, water, fauna, or flora;

''(18) 'ship' means a vessel of any type whatsoever not permanently attached to the sea-bed, including dynamically supported craft, submersibles, or any other floating craft, but does not include a warship, a ship owned or operated by a government when being used as a naval auxiliary or for customs or police purposes, or a ship which has been withdrawn from navigation or laid up;

''(19) 'source material' has the meaning given that term in the International Atomic Energy Agency Statute, done at New York on 26 October 1956;

''(20) 'special fissionable material' has the meaning given that term in the International Atomic Energy Agency Statute, done at New York on 26 October 1956;

''(21) 'territorial sea of the United States' means all waters extending seaward to 12 nautical miles from the baselines of the United States determined in accordance with international law;

''(22) 'toxic chemical' has the meaning given the term in section 229F(8)(A) of this title;

''(23) 'transport' means to initiate, arrange or exercise effective control, including decisionmaking authority, over the movement of a person or item; and

''(24) 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and all territories and possessions of the United States.''; and

(5) by inserting after subsection (d) (as added by paragraph (4) of this section) the following:

''(e) EXCEPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to—

''(1) the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under the law of war, which are governed by that law; or

''(2) activities undertaken by military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties.

''(f) DELIVERY OF SUSPECTED OFFENDER.—The master of a covered ship flying the flag of the United States who has reasonable grounds to believe that there is on board that ship any person who has committed an offense under section 2280 or section 2280a

may deliver such person to the authorities of a country that is a party to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation. Before delivering such person to the authorities of another country, the master shall notify in an appropriate manner the Attorney General of the United States of the alleged offense and await instructions from the Attorney General as to what action to take. When delivering the person to a country which is a state party to the Convention, the master shall, whenever practicable, and if possible before entering the territorial sea of such country, notify the authorities of such country of the master's intention to deliver such person and the reasons therefor. If the master delivers such person, the master shall furnish to the authorities of such country the evidence in the master's possession that pertains to the alleged offense.

''(g)(1) CIVIL FORFEITURE.—Any real or personal property used or intended to be used to commit or to facilitate the commission of a violation of this section, the gross proceeds of such violation, and any real or personal property traceable to such property or proceeds, shall be subject to forfeiture.

''(2) APPLICABLE PROCEDURES.—Seizures and forfeitures under this section shall be governed by the provisions of chapter 46 of title 18, United States Code, relating to civil forfeitures, except that such duties as are imposed upon the Secretary of the Treasury under the customs laws described in section 981(d) shall be performed by such officers, agents, and other persons as may be designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, or the Secretary of Defense.''.

SEC. 102. NEW SECTION 2280a OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 111 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 2280 the following new section:

''§ 2280a. Violence against maritime navigation and maritime transport involving weapons of mass destruction

''(a) OFFENSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the exceptions in subsection (c), a person who unlawfully and intentionally—

''(A) when the purpose of the act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population, or to compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act—

''(i) uses against or on a ship or discharges from a ship any explosive or radioactive material, biological, chemical, or nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device in a manner that causes or is likely to cause death to any person or serious injury or damage;

''(ii) discharges from a ship oil, liquefied natural gas, or another hazardous or noxious substance that is not covered by clause (i), in such quantity or concentration that causes or is likely to cause death to any person or serious injury or damage; or

''(iii) uses a ship in a manner that causes death to any person or serious injury or damage;

''(B) transports on board a ship—

''(i) any explosive or radioactive material, knowing that it is intended to be used to cause, or in a threat to cause, death to any person or serious injury or damage for the purpose of intimidating a population, or compelling a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act;

''(ii) any biological, chemical, or nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device, knowing it to be a biological, chemical, or nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device;

''(iii) any source material, special fissionable material, or equipment or material especially designed or prepared for the processing, use, or production of special fissionable material, knowing that it is intended to be used in a nuclear explosive activity or in any other nuclear activity not under safeguards pursuant to an International Atomic Energy Agency comprehensive safeguards agreement, except where—

''(I) such item is transported to or from the territory of, or otherwise under the control of, a Non-Proliferation Treaty State Party; and

''(II) the resulting transfer or receipt (including internal to a country) is not contrary to the obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty of the Non-Proliferation Treaty State Party from which, to the territory of which, or otherwise under the control of which such item is transferred;

''(iv) any equipment, materials, or software or related technology that significantly contributes to the design or manufacture of a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device, with the intention that it will be used for such purpose, except where—

''(I) the country to the territory of which or under the control of which such item is transferred is a Nuclear Weapon State Party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty; and

''(II) the resulting transfer or receipt (including internal to a country) is not contrary to the obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty of a Non-Proliferation Treaty State Party from which, to the territory of which, or otherwise under the control of which such item is transferred;

''(v) any equipment, materials, or software or related technology that significantly contributes to the delivery of a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device, with the intention that it will be used for such purpose, except where—

''(I) such item is transported to or from the territory of, or otherwise under the control of, a Non-Proliferation Treaty State Party; and

''(II) such item is intended for the delivery system of a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device of a Nuclear Weapon State Party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty; or

''(vi) any equipment, materials, or software or related technology that significantly contributes to the design, manufacture, or delivery of a biological or chemical weapon, with the intention that it will be used for such purpose;

''(C) transports another person on board a ship knowing that the person has committed an act that constitutes an offense under section 2280 or subparagraphs (A), (B), (D), or (E) of this section or an offense set forth in an applicable treaty, as specified in section 2280(d)(1), and intending to assist that person to evade criminal prosecution;

''(D) injures or kills any person in connection with the commission or the attempted commission of any of the offenses set forth in subparagraphs (A) through (C), or subsection (a)(2), to the extent that the subsection (a)(2) offense pertains to subparagraph (A); or

''(E) attempts to do any act prohibited under subparagraphs (A), (B) or (D), or conspires to do any act prohibited by subparagraphs (A) through (E) or subsection (a)(2),

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both; and if the death of any person results from conduct prohibited by this paragraph, shall be imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

''(2) THREATS.—A person who threatens, with apparent determination and will to carry the threat into execution, to do any act prohibited under paragraph (1)(A) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) JURISDICTION.—There is jurisdiction over the activity prohibited in subsection (a)—

''(1) in the case of a covered ship, if—

''(A) such activity is committed—

''(i) against or on board a vessel of the United States or a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States (as defined in section 70502 of title 46) at the time the prohibited activity is committed;

''(ii) in the United States, including the territorial seas; or

''(iii) by a national of the United States, by a United States corporation or legal entity, or by a stateless person whose habitual residence is in the United States;

''(B) during the commission of such activity, a national of the United States is seized, threatened, injured, or killed; or

''(C) the offender is later found in the United States after such activity is committed;

''(2) in the case of a ship navigating or scheduled to navigate solely within the territorial sea or internal waters of a country other than the United States, if the offender is later found in the United States after such activity is committed; or

''(3) in the case of any vessel, if such activity is committed in an attempt to compel the United States to do or abstain from doing any act.

''(c) EXCEPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to—

''(1) the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under the law of war, which are governed by that law; or

''(2) activities undertaken by military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties.

''(d)(1) CIVIL FORFEITURE.—Any real or personal property used or intended to be used to commit or to facilitate the commission of a violation of this section, the gross proceeds of such violation, and any real or personal property traceable to such property or proceeds, shall be subject to forfeiture.

''(2) APPLICABLE PROCEDURES.—Seizures and forfeitures under this section shall be governed by the provisions of chapter 46 of title 18, United States Code, relating to civil forfeitures, except that such duties as are imposed upon the Secretary of the Treasury under the customs laws described in section 981(d) shall be performed by such officers, agents, and other persons as may be designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, or the Secretary of Defense.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 111 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2280 the following new item:

''2280a. Violence against maritime navigation and maritime transport involving weapons of mass destruction.''.

SEC. 103. AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 2281 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 2281 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 2(c)'' and inserting ''section 13(c)'';

(2) in subsection (d), by striking the definitions of ''national of the United States,'' ''territorial sea of the United States,'' and ''United States''; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) EXCEPTIONS.—This section does not apply to—

''(1) the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under the law of war, which are governed by that law; or

''(2) activities undertaken by military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties.''.

SEC. 104. NEW SECTION 2281a OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 111 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 2281 the following new section:

''§ 2281a. Additional offenses against maritime fixed platforms

''(a) OFFENSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A person who unlawfully and intentionally—

''(A) when the purpose of the act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population, or to compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act—

''(i) uses against or on a fixed platform or discharges from a fixed platform any explosive or radioactive material, biological, chemical, or nuclear weapon in a manner that causes or is likely to cause death or serious injury or damage; or

''(ii) discharges from a fixed platform oil, liquefied natural gas, or another hazardous or noxious substance that is not covered by clause (i), in such quantity or concentration that causes or is likely to cause death or serious injury or damage;

''(B) injures or kills any person in connection with the commission or the attempted commission of any of the offenses set forth in subparagraph (A); or

''(C) attempts or conspires to do anything prohibited under subparagraphs (A) or (B),

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both; and if death results to any person from conduct prohibited by this paragraph, shall be imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

''(2) THREAT TO SAFETY.—A person who threatens, with apparent determination and will to carry the threat into execution, to do any act prohibited under paragraph (1)(A), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) JURISDICTION.—There is jurisdiction over the activity prohibited in subsection (a) if—

''(1) such activity is committed against or on board a fixed platform—

''(A) that is located on the continental shelf of the United States;

''(B) that is located on the continental shelf of another country, by a national of the United States or by a stateless person whose habitual residence is in the United States; or

''(C) in an attempt to compel the United States to do or abstain from doing any act;

''(2) during the commission of such activity against or on board a fixed platform located on a continental shelf, a national of the United States is seized, threatened, injured, or killed; or

''(3) such activity is committed against or on board a fixed platform located outside the United States and beyond the continental shelf of the United States and the offender is later found in the United States.

''(c) EXCEPTIONS.—This section does not apply to—

''(1) the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under the law of war, which are governed by that law; or

''(2) activities undertaken by military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) 'continental shelf' means the sea-bed and subsoil of the submarine areas that extend beyond a country's territorial sea to the limits provided by customary international law as reflected in Article 76 of the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea; and

''(2) 'fixed platform' means an artificial island, installation, or structure permanently attached to the sea-bed for the purpose of exploration or exploitation of resources or for other economic purposes.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 111 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2281 the following new item:

''2281a. Additional offenses against maritime fixed platforms.''.

SEC. 105. ANCILLARY MEASURE.

Section 2332b(g)(5)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''2280a (relating to maritime safety),'' before ''2281'', and by striking ''2281'' and inserting ''2281 through 2281a''.

TITLE II—PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR TERRORISM

SEC. 201. NEW SECTION 2332i OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 2332h the following:

''§ 2332i. Acts of nuclear terrorism

''(a) OFFENSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever knowingly and unlawfully—

''(A) possesses radioactive material or makes or possesses a device—

''(i) with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury; or

''(ii) with the intent to cause substantial damage to property or the environment; or

''(B) uses in any way radioactive material or a device, or uses or damages or interferes with the operation of a nuclear facility in a manner that causes the release of or increases the risk of the release of radioactive material, or causes radioactive contamination or exposure to radiation—

''(i) with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury or with the knowledge that such act is likely to cause death or serious bodily injury;

''(ii) with the intent to cause substantial damage to property or the environment or with the knowledge that such act is likely to cause substantial damage to property or the environment; or

''(iii) with the intent to compel a person, an international organization or a country to do or refrain from doing an act,

shall be punished as prescribed in subsection (c).

''(2) THREATS.—Whoever, under circumstances in which the threat may reasonably be believed, threatens to commit an offense under paragraph (1) shall be punished as prescribed in subsection (c). Whoever demands possession of or access to radioactive material, a device or a nuclear facility by threat or by use of force shall be punished as prescribed in subsection (c).

''(3) ATTEMPTS AND CONSPIRACIES.—Whoever attempts to commit an offense under paragraph (1) or conspires to commit an offense under paragraphs (1) or (2) shall be punished as prescribed in subsection (c).

''(b) JURISDICTION.—Conduct prohibited by subsection (a) is within the jurisdiction of the United States if—

''(1) the prohibited conduct takes place in the United States or the special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States;

''(2) the prohibited conduct takes place outside of the United States and—

''(A) is committed by a national of the United States, a United States corporation or legal entity or a stateless person whose habitual residence is in the United States;

''(B) is committed on board a vessel of the United States or a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States (as defined in section 70502 of title 46) or on board an aircraft that is registered under United States law, at the time the offense is committed; or

''(C) is committed in an attempt to compel the United States to do or abstain from doing any act, or constitutes a threat directed at the United States;

''(3) the prohibited conduct takes place outside of the United States and a victim or an intended victim is a national of the United States or a United States corporation or legal entity, or the offense is committed against any state or government facility of the United States; or

''(4) a perpetrator of the prohibited conduct is found in the United States.

''(c) PENALTIES.—Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than $2,000,000 and shall be imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

''(d) NONAPPLICABILITY.—This section does not apply to—

''(1) the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under the law of war, which are governed by that law; or

''(2) activities undertaken by military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section, the term—

''(1) 'armed conflict' has the meaning given that term in section 2332f(e)(11) of this title;

''(2) 'device' means:

''(A) any nuclear explosive device; or

''(B) any radioactive material dispersal or radiation-emitting device that may, owing to its radiological properties, cause death, serious bodily injury or substantial damage to property or the environment;

''(3) 'international organization' has the meaning given that term in section 831(f)(3) of this title;

''(4) 'military forces of a state' means the armed forces of a country that are organized, trained and equipped under its internal law for the primary purpose of national defense or security and persons acting in support of those armed forces who are under their formal command, control and responsibility;

''(5) 'national of the United States' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22));

''(6) 'nuclear facility' means:

''(A) any nuclear reactor, including reactors on vessels, vehicles, aircraft or space objects for use as an energy source in order to propel such vessels, vehicles, aircraft or space objects or for any other purpose;

''(B) any plant or conveyance being used for the production, storage, processing or transport of radioactive material; or

''(C) a facility (including associated buildings and equipment) in which nuclear material is produced, processed, used, handled, stored or disposed of, if damage to or interference with such facility could lead to the release of significant amounts of radiation or radioactive material;

''(7) 'nuclear material' has the meaning given that term in section 831(f)(1) of this title;

''(8) 'radioactive material' means nuclear material and other radioactive substances that contain nuclides that undergo spontaneous disintegration (a process accompanied by emission of one or more types of ionizing radiation, such as alpha-, beta-, neutron particles and gamma rays) and that may, owing to their radiological or fissile properties, cause death, serious bodily injury or substantial damage to property or to the environment;

''(9) 'serious bodily injury' has the meaning given that term in section 831(f)(4) of this title;

''(10) 'state' has the same meaning as that term has under international law, and includes all political subdivisions thereof;

''(11) 'state or government facility' has the meaning given that term in section 2332f(e)(3) of this title;

''(12) 'United States corporation or legal entity' means any corporation or other entity organized under the laws of the United States or any State, Commonwealth, territory, possession or district of the United States;

''(13) 'vessel' has the meaning given that term in section 1502(19) of title 33; and

''(14) 'vessel of the United States' has the meaning given that term in section 70502 of title 46.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2332h the following:

''2332i. Acts of nuclear terrorism.''.

(c) DISCLAIMER.—Nothing contained in this section is intended to affect the applicability of any other Federal or State law that might pertain to the underlying conduct.

(d) INCLUSION IN DEFINITION OF FEDERAL CRIMES OF TERRORISM.—Section 2332b(g)(5)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''2332i (relating to acts of nuclear terrorism),'' before ''2339 (relating to harboring terrorists)''.

SEC. 202. AMENDMENT TO SECTION 831 OF TITLE 18 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 831 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(a) in subsection (a)—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (8) as (4) through (9);

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) without lawful authority, intentionally carries, sends or moves nuclear material into or out of a country;'';

(3) in paragraph (8), as redesignated, by striking ''an offense under paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4)'' and inserting ''any act prohibited under paragraphs (1) through (5)''; and

(4) in paragraph (9), as redesignated, by striking ''an offense under paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4)'' and inserting ''any act prohibited under paragraphs (1) through (7)'';

(b) in subsection (b)—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''(7)'' and inserting ''(8)''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''(8)'' and inserting ''(9)'';

(c) in subsection (c)—

(1) in subparagraph (2)(A), by adding after ''United States'' the following: ''or a stateless person whose habitual residence is in the United States'';

(2) by striking paragraph (5);

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking ''or'' at the end; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (4), the following:

''(5) the offense is committed on board a vessel of the United States or a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States (as defined in section 70502 of title 46) or on board an aircraft that is registered under United States law, at the time the offense is committed;

''(6) the offense is committed outside the United States and against any state or government facility of the United States; or

''(7) the offense is committed in an attempt to compel the United States to do or abstain from doing any act, or constitutes a threat directed at the United States.'';

(d) by redesignating subsections (d) through (f) as (e) through (g), respectively;

(e) by inserting after subsection (c):

''(d) NONAPPLICABILITY.—This section does not apply to—

''(1) the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under the law of war, which are governed by that law; or

''(2) activities undertaken by military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties.''; and

(f) in subsection (g), as redesignated—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7), the following:

''(8) the term 'armed conflict' has the meaning given that term in section 2332f(e)(11) of this title;

''(9) the term 'military forces of a state' means the armed forces of a country that are organized, trained and equipped under its internal law for the primary purpose of national defense or security and persons acting in support of those armed forces who are under their formal command, control and responsibility;

''(10) the term 'state' has the same meaning as that term has under international law, and includes all political subdivisions thereof;

''(11) the term 'state or government facility' has the meaning given that term in section 2332f(e)(3) of this title; and

''(12) the term 'vessel of the United States' has the meaning given that term in section 70502 of title 46.''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. 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. 1073, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee and the bill's sponsor.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

I sponsored this legislation to improve the ability to protect the United States from terrorist attacks, including attacks using weapons of mass destruction or attacks involving ships and maritime platforms.

H.R. 1073 implements obligations of four multilateral counterterrorism treaties. Full ratification of the underlying treaties will not be achieved until Congress amends existing criminal provisions of the United States Code.

This legislation was prepared in full cooperation with our Democratic colleagues on the committee, following months of work by committee staff in consultation with the Departments of Justice and State.

The importance of this bipartisan legislation is evidenced by those who have joined me as original cosponsors: the gentleman from Virginia, Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE; Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS; and Crime Subcommittee Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT.

Two of these treaties concern nuclear and radiological materials, the sabotage of nuclear facilities, and the protection of nuclear facilities and materials used for peaceful purposes. The other two treaties relate to the use or targeting of ships or maritime platforms as a part of a terrorist attack, transporting of certain materials by ship for terrorist purposes, and the transport of terrorists by ship, among other things.

The International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism was signed by President Bush on behalf of the United States on September 14, 2005. It requires the U.S. to criminalize certain unlawful acts relating to the possession and use of radioactive material and radiological dispersal devices and damage to nuclear facilities.

□ 1720

An amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, which was adopted at a diplomatic conference on July 25, 2005, requires the U.S. to criminalize nuclear smuggling and sabotage of nuclear facilities. The 2005 Protocol to the 1988 Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation requires parties to criminalize the use or targeting of a ship or a fixed maritime platform in an act of terrorism. The Protocol forbids certain maritime terrorism acts and the maritime transport of biological, chemical, or nuclear weapons, or their components, delivery means, or materials under specified circumstances. It also forbids the maritime transport of terrorist fugitives. The 2005 Protocol to the 1988 Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf criminalizes terrorist acts involving a fixed maritime platform.

To combat these types of terrorist threats effectively, we need both a comprehensive domestic legal framework and a broad international legal framework to facilitate international cooperation. Existing law may cover certain obligations under these treaties, but in order to fully comply and ultimately ratify the treaties, parties to the agreements are required to criminalize certain conduct and to fulfill extradition requirements and other obligations relating to international cooperation.

Parties to the underlying treaties are required to criminalize certain acts committed by persons who possess or use radioactive material or a nuclear device. And parties are obligated to ''extradite or prosecute'' alleged offenders. As they relate to maritime terrorism, the underlying treaties treat vessels and fixed maritime platforms as a potential means of conducting terrorism activity and not just as objects of terrorist activity.

Both the Bush and Obama administrations support ratification of these agreements, which have already received Senate advice and consent. Advancing this legislation strengthens international cooperation and information-sharing, and will ensure that the United States stays at the forefront of global counterterrorism and counterproliferation efforts. These measures are consistent with our domestic efforts to improve homeland security and to promote better international cooperation.

It is my hope the Senate will act swiftly to pass this legislation so that these important multilateral agreements can finally be ratified. I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1073, the Nuclear Terrorism Conventions Implementation and Safety of Maritime Navigation Act. This bipartisan legislation, which was reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee in March, is nearly identical to legislation that the House passed by voice vote in the last Congress.

H.R. 1073 amends the Federal Criminal Code to conform our laws to our Nation's obligations under four international treaties that are part of an important effort to update international law for the post-September 11th era. Two of the treaties, the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism and the Convention for the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, require party nations to better protect nuclear materials and to punish acts of nuclear terrorism.

Two other treaties, amendments to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation and the Protocol for Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Fixed Platforms, address the use of ships and fixed platforms in terrorist attacks, as well as the transport of weapons, weapons delivery systems, and the transport of terrorist fugitives by sea.

The United States signed these treaties in 2005, and the Senate passed resolutions of advice and consent on all four in 2008. We cannot ratify these agreements, however, until Congress amends the Federal Criminal Code to bring it in line with our new obligations. H.R. 1073 does just that—and nothing more. It amends title 18 of the United States Code to explicitly prohibit acts of terrorism involving radioactive material, provide new security requirements for the use and storage of nuclear materials, and address the use of ships and offshore platforms in terrorist attacks.

With the cooperation of the Justice Department, this bill does not include previously proposed language that was outside the scope of the underlying treaties. For example, the original version proposed by the administration included an expansion of the scope of conduct subject to the death penalty, new wiretap predicates, and authorization for the President to conduct similar agreements in the future without congressional approval. There is no need to argue about these controversial provisions in order to implement the underlying treaties, and those unrelated initiatives have been removed in this version of the bill. So I'm grateful for the spirit of cooperation in which the bill before us has been drafted.

The resulting bipartisan proposal has the full support of the Obama administration. I'm pleased to join my colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chair of the Subcommittee on Crime, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, along with Ranking Member CONYERS and Chairman GOODLATTE.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1073. I have one additional speaker, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Let me thank the ranking member and let me thank the gentleman, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, who brought this bill before us. I rise in support of the bill, and I wanted to use this occasion to make some additional comments.

We recognize that the proliferation of nuclear weapons is the greatest threat that our country faces. I took a trip with Chairman YOUNG to visit the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, Austria, looking at the weapons development program in Iran. This is a big issue that the Congress has got to pay a lot of attention to.

But I also wanted to take a minute as a member of the Energy Appropriations Subcommittee to talk about the administration's request on both nonproliferation and modernization. The nonproliferation request is flatlined. The weapons modernization, which is important as relates to our obligations and agreements relative to the START treaty, is well funded. But we think there are some gaps in terms of the planning. And we need to understand more fully, in terms of both the B–61 and the W–76, where we're headed in terms of the long-term package.

So this bill is important because it deals with terrorism threats in terms of nuclear weapons. Part of dealing with that is to make sure that we continue the work of Senators Nunn and Lugar in nonproliferation. It's also important for our country to modernize our weapons, and to do that with a full understanding that we cannot do that on a year-to-year basis. We have to have a long-term plan and understand the entire package.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1073, the Nuclear Terrorism Conventions Implementation and Safety of Maritime Navigation Act of 2013, is bipartisan legislation to ratify certain counterterrorism treaty obligations. This legislation was reported by voice vote from the Judiciary Committee last month. Similar legislation was unanimously reported by the committee and passed the House by voice vote also last Congress.

Terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction do not recognize international boundaries. These treaties are important tools in the fight against terrorism. Each one builds on an existing treaty to which the United States is a party. The treaties and this legislation complement important U.S. priorities to prevent nuclear terrorism, counterproliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and counterterrorism initiatives. Enacting this legislation will reinforce the United States' leadership role in promoting these and other counterterrorism treaties and will likely prompt other countries to join.

□ 1730

In addition to bolstering broad security and proliferation-prevention goals, these protocols help to promote implementation of certain sanctions against rogue regimes that are hostile to U.S. interests.

I commend Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS, along with the sponsor of H.R. 1073, Crime Subcommittee Chairman SENSENBRENNER, and Ranking Member SCOTT for their commitment to this important legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 1073 today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1073.

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. COLLINS of Georgia. 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 31 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. WENSTRUP) 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 questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 258, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1073, by the yeas and nays;

Approval of the Journal, de novo.

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

STOLEN VALOR 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. 258) to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military declarations or medals, 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 Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 3, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—390

Aderholt
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
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
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
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.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
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 (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
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Amash
Broun (GA)
Massie

NOT VOTING—40

Alexander
Amodei
Benishek
Blackburn
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Cárdenas
Cassidy
Clyburn
Cole
Cramer
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Gallego
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Grijalva
Hartzler
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Johnson, Sam
Kingston
Lynch
Marchant
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McDermott
McKeon
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Pingree (ME)
Rohrabacher
Sanchez, Loretta
Schiff
Thompson (MS)
Waters
Young (AK)

□ 1857

Ms. BASS and Mr. COTTON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

The title was amended so as to read: ''An Act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military decorations or medals.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NUCLEAR TERRORISM CONVENTIONS IMPLEMENTATION AND SAFETY OF MARITIME NAVIGATION 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. 1073) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for protection of maritime navigation and prevention of nuclear terrorism, and for other purposes, 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 Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) 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 390, nays 3, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—390

Aderholt
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming

Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
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
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
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.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
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
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
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
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Amash
Massie
Stockman

NOT VOTING—40

Alexander
Amodei
Benishek
Blackburn
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Cárdenas
Cassidy
Clyburn
Cole
Cramer
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Gallego
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Grijalva
Hartzler
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Johnson, Sam
Kingston
Lynch
Marchant
Markey
McCaul
McDermott
McKeon
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Pingree (ME)
Rohrabacher
Sanchez, Loretta
Schiff
Thompson (MS)
Waters
Yoder
Young (AK)

□ 1905

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 262, nays 125, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

YEAS—262

Aderholt
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Grayson
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Petri
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Upton
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—125

Amash
Andrews
Barr
Bonner
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
DeSantis
Duckworth
Duffy
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hanna
Heck (NV)
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Langevin
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis
LoBiondo
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nugent
Pallone
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schock
Slaughter
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Visclosky
Walberg
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—45

Alexander	Gallego	McCaul
Amodei	Gingrey (GA)	McDermott
Benishek	Gohmert	McKeon
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Palazzo
Blackburn	Hartzler	Pastor (AZ)
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Pingree (ME)
Capuano	Hensarling	Rohrabacher
Cárdenas	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Cartwright	Huelskamp	Sanchez, Loretta
Cassidy	Johnson, Sam	Schiff
Clyburn	Kingston	Sires
Cole	Larsen (WA)	Thompson (MS)
Cramer	Lynch	Tsongas
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Waters
Doggett	Markey	Young (AK)

□ 1914

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 163 on approving the Journal, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yea" when I should have voted "no."

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of a question of the privileges of the House pursuant to rule IX.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives shall not consider H.R. 3, the ''Northern Route Approval Act'' because: (1) it violates Rule XXI of the House, and (2) it affects the dignity and integrity of the proceedings of the House since it is unconstitutional.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the unnumbered resolution noticed by the gentleman from Florida will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

□ 1920

WE NEED THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, this Wednesday, the House will vote to approve the Keystone XL pipeline. This vote will come after more than 1,700 days since the application for the project was filed. Despite the outpouring of support from the American people, the President continues to delay the approval of the Keystone pipeline, which would directly create 20,000 jobs and lead to $7 billion in spending. The President keeps dragging his feet.

Business and labor organizations have joined together to support the Keystone project because it will bring jobs to American workers. West Virginians support the Keystone pipeline. The permitting delay that is standing in the way of the Keystone project demonstrates that this administration and its environmental agenda will put everything ahead of our Nation's economy and jobs for working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, an energy economy is a jobs economy, and I hope my colleagues will join me in fighting back against the administration's anti-energy agenda. Passing H.R. 3 would mean more American jobs and move us closer towards energy independence.

STUDENT LOANS

(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. Mr. Speaker, student loan debt in the United States now exceeds $1 trillion, higher than our country's total credit card debt; and unless Congress acts, on July 1, Federal student loans will double, rising from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. This increase in student loan rates would be unbearable for many undergraduate students and future students. It also will keep them out of the middle class.

The middle class as we know right now is shrinking. If you're in the middle class today, you're making approximately $5,000 less than you were 10 years ago, and you have nearly $25,000 more in personal debt. Access to education powers the innovation economy and will increase and grow our middle class. Unfortunately, H.R. 1911, the Republican student loan plan to come to the floor this week, will only make college more expensive. The Republican's Make College More Expensive Plan will make loan rates variable, going as high as 8.5 percent. Their plan essentially will build a great wall around our middle class.

We must deal with the student loan crisis now. Instead of increasing student loan rates for students, Congress should be helping students by keeping student loan rates low and increasing the student loan rate interest deduction. Let's tear down this wall that will keep our students from the middle class and not increase the student loan rate.

LOWER LEVEL OPERATIVES BLAMED

(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. Benghazi bungled—propagandacrats misled citizens—change talking points 12 times. People die. White House denies knowledge. Lower-level operatives blamed.

IRS intimidates, targets, and audits conservative opposition groups. White House denies knowledge. Lower-level operatives blamed.

Government snoopers secretly seize phone records of 100 journalists to locate their sources. White House denies knowledge. Lower-level operatives blamed.

AFT smuggles guns to Mexican drug lords. White House denies knowledge. Attorney General held in contempt of Congress for with ''holdering'' evidence. Lower-level operatives blamed.

Meanwhile, the President self-righteously proclaims citizens should trust his government. Americans distrust and fear government, especially the ''Infernal Revenue Service,'' because the President professes ignorance of actions of lower-level malcontents, then doesn't adequately hold them accountable. Heads need to roll. People need to be fired. Others need to go to the jailhouse. That's what Americans expect of the so-called most transparent administration in history. Then this administration that is incredible with words can earn credibility with its deeds.

And that's just the way it is.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, while the public is split 50–50 on whether the science of climate change is settled, there is overwhelming agreement—over 97 percent—among climate scientists that the human activity of this Earth is causing climate change.

Imagine if we compare that percentage to the medical field. If 97 percent of 100 doctors told you that you have cancer, would you refuse to take treatment?

Whether one believes that humans are contributing to climate change is in some ways irrelevant because we are certainly paying for its effect. The Federal Government spent $96 billion in 2012 to clean up after extreme weather events. That's nearly three times the amount paid by private insurers. That is more than we spend on transportation or education.

Though many have yet to embrace the facts that climate research has found, we must take action to mitigate these growing costs. As Ben Franklin once said: an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

SEVERE TORNADOES HIT OKLAHOMA

(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. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Oklahomans who even as we speak this evening are laboring to find and rescue all those affected by this afternoon's severe tornadoes in Moore and other areas in the great State of Oklahoma. At this time, we don't know the full extent of the damage and the potential human toll, but we are inspired. We're inspired by those who are sparing no effort to assist their neighbors and even many people they don't know.

Disasters like the Moore tornado bring out the best in the people of Oklahoma. I pray for each victim of these storms, for all of the emergency first responders and the ordinary citizens who are stepping forward to help in any way they can. We are grateful for everyone working to secure the affected area and to account for every man, woman, and child.

STANDING WITH ADVOCATES FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

(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, it has been 1 year since human rights activists Chen Guangcheng and his wife, Yuan Weijing, arrived in the United States of America. I recently had the honor of meeting both Chen and Yuan. They are heroes in the cause of human rights, and their story of fighting forced abortion and sterilization in the People's Republic of China has captivated and inspired all those who love freedom.

Their courageous stand has not come without a personal price. Chen and Yuan's extended family in China has been subject to continued harassment. It is time for this to stop. Respect for human life and freedom are universal aspirations, and Chen and Yuan serve as witnesses to these transcendent values.

I encourage Beijing to protect Chen Guangcheng's family and all those who serve as advocates for freedom and human rights.

RECOGNIZING OPPORTUNITY PARTNERS FOR 60 YEARS OF SERVING MINNESOTA

(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 to congratulate a long time Minnesota nonprofit organization, Opportunity Partners, for serving the needs of developmentally disabled adults for 60 years. The latest statistics reveal that only 33 percent of Americans aged 18 to 64 with disabilities are employed.

The founders of Opportunity Partners recognized the many challenges the disabled encounter when trying to integrate into the workforce, so they acted, creating an organization that gives ongoing support to people with disabilities, helping them lead independent and fulfilling lives.

In 1953, Opportunity Partners was serving 15 teens with disabilities. And now today, the organization is reaching over 1,700 people and equipping them with the work skills and the training these individuals need to gain successful employment.

I have toured this amazing operation myself. I have seen first hand the lives that are impacted and affected by Opportunity Partners. The staff and the volunteers are dedicated to empowering others through a simple, but powerful, mission—to help those with disabilities to live, learn, and work.

Mr. Speaker, I want to send my congratulations and a thank you to all those at Opportunity Partners for serving Minnesota.

□ 1930

LET'S BUILD THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE TODAY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, ''Job killers win, American workers lose'' is how the Laborers' International Union of North America, a rare critic of the administration, summed up the President's 2011 call to block the Keystone XL pipeline.

The move, they said, would ''inflict a potentially fatal delay to a project that is not just a pipeline, but is a lifeline for thousands of desperate working men and women.''

And what of America's energy needs or diplomatic priorities? By cutting access to North American oil, it is American consumers who will continue to suffer, not the Canadian company seeking to permit the Keystone pipeline.

TransCanada's chief executive noted ''If Keystone XL dies, Americans will still wake up the next morning and continue to import 10 million barrels of oil from repressive nations, without the benefit of thousands of jobs and long-term energy security.''

When jobs and affordable North American energy are at stake, Americans deserve better than groundless delays from the President. Let's build the pipeline today.

LET'S STAND UP AND BE OF HELP

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of our colleagues in the tornado corridor are not here today. I want to offer my deepest concern and prayers as the recovery begins, and pray for those who've lost their lives, some, of course, in north Texas, and of course now in the area in Oklahoma.

This is a devastating time with these enormous tornados, as evidenced by a quote by Bill Bunting of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Storm Prediction Center, who told CNN, our worst fears are becoming realized this afternoon.

I hope that we will be able to find all of those who have been harmed safely, and all of those who are missing.

But, Mr. Speaker, the most important part is that the Nation needs to stand up and be of help. This is time, frankly, for bipartisanship to take the highest level, and partisanship to end. It's time to end this sequester. There's too much need in this country.

And I hope that we will be able to serve all of those who are now suffering from across America because that is what this Congress needs to do.

IT'S TIME TO FISH OR CUT BAIT

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I rise in support of the Keystone pipeline. The Keystone pipeline represents 40,000 American jobs. It's been under study for 1,700 days—5 years.

It is a project that could drive down the cost of energy, cut our imports from our enemies in half. It could invigorate our economy, and yet, we continue to study and study. We could study this program for decades, and we'll never resolve all the issues.

It's time to move forward. We're the greatest country on Earth. Nobody can beat us if we stand toe-to-toe, but we've got a noose of regulation around our own necks, and we're strangling ourselves.

It's time to fish or cut bait. Let's make a decision. Let's move forward with this very valuable project.

NO LABELS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RIBBLE. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud and honored to lead this discussion on the House floor this evening. I organized this special order to show the American people that there are Members of Congress who can have a civilized conversation and who actually want to solve problems.

Everyone here tonight is a member of the organization No Labels. As you can

see, we're all wearing orange pins as a symbol of our solidarity. These problem-solver pins represent a lot about who we are and who we want to be as legislators. Instead of wasting time fighting, we're committed to fixing what's broken here in Washington.

Being identified as either a Republican or Democrat says a lot about each of our values and our ideologies, but it's not the sum total of who we are. I am proud to be a Republican and have a conservative voting record, and that supports my beliefs.

But just because there's an R or D after someone's name should not automatically make them enemies. It's possible to find ways to work together, and all of us are here tonight as proof of that.

I recently introduced a biennial budgeting bill that has both Democrat and Republican cosponsors. This is just one of many examples that show that both sides of the aisle can get behind legislation that will help better our economy.

Unfortunately, Congress has come to a point where problems are not getting solved because too many are yelling and not enough are listening. I was taught that the best way to attack a problem is putting all possible solutions on the table and having a conversation about the pros and cons of each.

Nowadays in Washington, the meaning of solution has become a euphemism for undercutting the other party. Sound bites have replaced conversations, which has made attacking others easier and more widespread.

It seems like every time you turn on the television or open a newspaper, there's some headline about Republicans and Democrats spewing vitriol at each other, or playing another round of the never-ending blame game.

This type of behavior and unwillingness to work on solving problems must end in order for our country to move forward, and that's why we're all here tonight, to show that Washington doesn't have to function this way.

All of us came to Congress because we wanted to do our part to make our country better and to help our constituents back home. And coming together on the House floor is a small way to reaffirm our dedication to the American people and let them know that we'll work for their best interest.

This evening you'll hear from both Democrats and Republicans who are committed to problem-solving. I'm proud to say that these people are not just my colleagues but they're my friends. And while we don't see eye to eye on everything, we have all made it a point to put a stop to the spiteful tone that has become the norm here in Washington, and to actually have a real conversation with one another. And tonight the American people watching get to be a part of that.

With that, I'd like to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank my good friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to stand here tonight as a member of this Problem Solvers Coalition. The coalition offers a common ground for lawmakers to make government work better and to negotiate solutions without the blinders of partisan talking points.

Our country has a history, during difficult times, times more difficult than these, times of great political strife, of coming together, rank-and-file Americans and legislators alike.

During the early days of our Republic, Thomas Jefferson wrote a letter to his friend, Edward Rutledge, and he said this:

> You and I have seen warm debate and high political passions. But gentlemen of different politics would then speak to each other. It is not so now. Men who have been intimate all their lives cross the street to avoid meeting, and turn their heads the other way lest they should be obliged to tip their hat.

Well, we, as Americans, made it through those difficult times, and eventually this hall was populated by people who were prepared to tip their hat.

During this time in our history, we too need to be hat tippers. We need more hat tippers in the U.S. Congress. We need more statesmen, more men and women who are prepared to root out waste, to improve the performance of our largest programs of government, to modulate our discourse.

We need to recognize that our public disagreements aren't always about ends; sometimes they're merely about means.

So I invite my colleagues to join this coalition of problem solvers. Let's work together, Republican and Democrat. Let's work together for the common good for the future of this country.

□ 1940

Mr. RIBBLE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Thank you for being here tonight.

I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress on a pledge of bipartisanship. I ran on behalf of citizens who were disappointed in their leaders in Washington who focus on partisan bickering rather than problem solving.

In my first days in Congress, I was also disappointed in Washington. I was disappointed that everything in D.C. was separated by party affiliation. This is why one of my first actions as a freshman was to join the No Labels Problem Solvers group, of which I am now proudly a cochair.

Mr. Speaker, No Labels has offered a way for Members of both parties to get to know each other. Simply put, it's easier to solve problems when you know the person you're working with. However, No Labels does more than break down barriers. It helps build trust between Members that is necessary to solve problems.

Many of the fiscal problems we face today developed over many decades. Fixing these problems will take steady, committed work. No, we won't agree on everything, but I am optimistic. I'm optimistic because more and more leaders are focusing on problem solving rather than partisanship. I've already seen more bipartisanship and substantive action in this Congress than many in recent memory. In fact, I've seen an overwhelming amount of bills introduced by No Labels members, with both Republicans and Democrats as lead sponsors.

We must urge and support our leaders to go big to solve the fiscal issues we face. We must push for a grand bargain. We need long-term solutions, not short-term political gimmicks.

Unfortunately, a number of scandals have contributed to one of the biggest problems our country faces: a lack of trust in government. The public sees their leaders focusing on beltway intrigue rather than pragmatic solutions. Mr. Speaker, that is why I invite more of my colleagues to join me in this group to work together to solve problems and to restore the trust of the American people. There is no ideological litmus test to join this group. What is required is a willingness to respect one another and resolve to work together to solve problems. No Labels is doing just that—fix, not fight.

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

I now yield to a very good friend of mine, the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. KURT SCHRADER.

Mr. SCHRADER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

We've collaborated on a number of endeavors, most recently in the Ag Committee. There was great bipartisan debate in the Agriculture Committee. I commend to those late-night insomniacs for their 11-hour viewing enjoyment, come watch how a real committee should work in the Congress of the United States, where there's give-and-take, people hold strong positions, but at the end of the day the process moves forward.

I would like to echo my friend and colleague's comments here. The Problem Solvers caucus, of which we're all members, is an outgrowth of the No Labels movement that's been going on for several years. Late last year, No Labels approached a number of us in Congress about getting together and were we truly interested in solving problems.

I think the thing that got all of our attention is it wasn't giving up who you were, it wasn't giving up your philosophy. We have extreme right members, we have extreme left members, and we've got some of our centrists, or as my colleagues like to call it, squishy people, in the middle. And that's not a bad thing, necessarily.

But what we are all about is solving problems, not dealing with the minutia, the differences that we have, dealing with all these one-off issues that our constituents don't send us to Congress to deal with, but we are trying to

deal with bigger issues. The GAO, or General Accounting Office, sends us information every year about things that should be fixed in Congress—nonpartisan, bipartisan issues that we should be addressing. The No Labels group is starting to pick those things up.

As the gentleman from Florida talked about, there's a plethora of issues upon which we can agree. The mark of a true statesman, I think, is not focusing on what you disagree on with your colleagues but what you can agree on. I think that, and some of the bigger issues that, hopefully, we'll go forward on and the No Labels group will be attacking, you'll see us also start to look at some of the reforms of the process.

I alluded to the Ag Committee the other day. There are ways to make this process work here and make America proud and, as we've heard so far, restore faith in your government once again.

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the gentleman.

When I first came here it was interesting how few places there were where both parties could get together and talk about issues. It just didn't really exist. And those of us that have decided to get together and talk, we've never asked anyone to lay down their own personal beliefs or ideologies, but we did ask for them to stand up and defend them and to speak about them and to encourage others and to, most importantly, listen to each other and to try to learn why we believe what we believe.

I'd like to now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues today to affirm our collective effort to put aside partisanship wherever possible and seek the solutions our country needs.

As I meet with constituents across Colorado's Sixth Congressional District, I constantly hear the refrain, What is Congress doing to help our country? The people of Aurora, Colorado, and the surrounding communities in my district want to know what is being done to fix the economy, to generate jobs, to care for our veterans, and to defend our Nation. They don't ask about the current beltway infighting. They want to know what is being done about our debt and to help with their children's schools.

I'm glad to stand here today and repeat the message that Members of Congress need to put aside partisan agendas and seek solutions together.

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the gentleman.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. I want to join my colleagues in commending the terrific work of the No Labels group.

I, like others, came to Congress not to fight but to fix problems. And I've always thought there's so much work to do, if we just start working on the things we agree about, we'll all be tired at the end of the day and we won't have time to fight. And it's in that spirit that we've approached our work, many of us that are new to Congress, and I think we're seeing results.

The last Congress was content to have an argument about a farm bill. And as my colleague noted, we're working in a bipartisan way to bring one to the floor and to get results for the American people. The last Congress was content to give us the sequester, but a bunch of us working across the aisle in this Congress are more interested in implementing the nonpartisan recommendations of the GAO to help us cut government waste that we can all agree shouldn't be there. We've agreed on things like no budget, no pay. We've agreed on things in a bipartisan way like the Violence Against Women Act. These are delivering real results for real families.

I represent the Hudson Valley of New York, and I'm proud to say that we've got one of the largest chapters of the No Labels group in Westchester. I didn't come here to be part of the red team or the blue team. I didn't come here to fight. I came here to find solutions and to get results for my constituents and the people who pay the bills, the taxpayers. And I'm encouraged and delighted that there are so many friends across the aisle in the Republican Party who want to do the same thing. I think if we can get more of our colleagues to join us, we can create a real movement in this Congress and we can start a new day.

It may be too soon to say that we've turned the corner, but I believe we've made an important start. I'm committed to continuing to work across the aisle to get results.

Mr. RIBBLE. That's encouraging to all of us. I appreciate your comments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo what my friend, Congressman REID RIBBLE, said a moment ago. The people of southeastern Michigan sent me here to solve the problems affecting our great Nation. The Problem Solvers coalition offers a chance to break the partisan gridlock by bringing Democrats and Republicans together to focus on good governance. Our coalition meets regularly to find commonsense solutions because Washington's inability to work together has put the future of our children and grandchildren in jeopardy.

More than two centuries, Members of the first Congress were summoned to uphold and defend the Constitution. The proudest boast then in the civilized world was, ''I am an American.'' Today, we must ensure that being an American makes you the envy of the world.

□ 1950

I recognize that we all have different viewpoints. I understand that this is a contentious time in Congress—different viewpoints clash, sometimes rightfully so. However, I do think that there is one goal that everyone here has—to hand the next generation a country that is in better condition than when we found it. We must strive valiantly, and we must dare greatly to solve problems here in Washington by working together to find common ground.

We all have been sent here to serve the people, and I urge my colleagues to join the Problem Solvers Coalition and to start doing the work of the people. Thank you, and God bless you.

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the gentleman for your comments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. I thank my colleague for yielding.

It's a pleasure to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to discuss No Labels.

You know, I think one thing that hasn't been mentioned tonight is the fact that it's about ''no labels.'' We're going to get away from Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative. This is about bringing people together to try to reach consensus and solve problems. Because when you really think about it, our political dialogue in this country has been reduced too often to this notion where there are only two points of view, only two ways to look at an issue: all Democrats think one way; all Republicans think the other. There's no other way to look at an issue.

Well, as we all know, life generally is not that simple; and it's important for us to constructively come together in a way where we act as Representatives, because our system of government is not a parliamentary system where just two points of view are to be discussed. Our system of government is a representative system of government. We have 435 people in the House of Representatives who all can bring a point of view to the table to try to solve problems and make progress. That's why I'm pleased to be associated and participating with the No Labels group.

I'm pleased that across the country people are signing up to join ad citizen activists for No Labels as well. It tells you where the country wants us to go as an institution—no more bickering, no more playing the blame game. Let's sit down and let's try to work together to get things done.

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank my friend for yielding.

You know, the one thing that I hear more than anything else when I travel back home to Pennsylvania is the frustration with Washington and the massive divide that they see that prevents us from solving real problems, from solving American problems. And as I've heard from my colleagues here tonight, that feeling is not limited to my communities of Bucks County and Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

It doesn't take much to see that our Nation is facing some pretty serious problems. It's long been clear to me that we need lawmakers to come together and put aside politics and do what we were elected to do, which is to solve problems.

When I served as a local official back home in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, on a bipartisan board, it didn't take long to figure out that there was no Republican way or Democratic way to fix a bridge or to care for an abused or abandoned or neglected child. It was just the right way to do it.

So now, as a member of the No Labels Problem Solvers, I'm proud to be part of the solution and to enthusiastically subscribe to our motto, which is ''Stop Fighting and Start Fixing.'' Once we cross the so-called ''political divide'' and talk to each other, we readily find common ground, balance, and ultimately solutions.

I was proud to be an early proponent of the No Labels initiative No Budget No Pay, which passed the House recently and yielded real results—the first budget resolution from the Senate in 4 years.

Recently, I wrote an editorial piece with my colleague, Representative CHERI BUSTOS, that highlighted the importance of bipartisan problem-solving to address wasteful government spending and advance commonsense legislation that we can all agree upon.

We must restore faith in our elected leaders. The public's trust has been shaken—and rightly so. As we've seen lately, partisan politics tarnishes everything from national security to tax enforcement. We can no longer afford partisan politics as usual, so we're here to be problem-solvers, going forward to get something done for the good of the people, and there's no time to waste.

Mr. RIBBLE. Indeed, there's no time to waste.

I yield to the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Far too often, people tend to focus on our differences instead of what brings us together. Despite what we all may hear, common ground does exist among lawmakers from opposing sides.

Although the group we call No Labels is made up of Democrats and Republicans, what unites the 68 of us making up this group is the idea that work can and should get done in Washington.

The people of each of our regions in the United States sent us to the Nation's Capital not to position and posture, but to use common sense and compromise to move our country forward. That is why I joined the bipartisan No Labels group and have been identified as a ''congressional problem solver.''

No Labels is the only bipartisan, bicameral group in Congress and is made up of liberals, moderates, conservatives. Yes, the left, the right, and the middle coming together. While we surely don't agree on every issue, there are plenty of areas that we can find to achieve results for the people who we represent.

Let me just share a recent example. I'm a member of the House Ag Committee, and last week we completed an exercise in bipartisanship by working together to pass, by a large margin, a 5-year farm bill. The Republican chairman, FRANK LUCAS, and the Democratic ranking member, COLLIN PETERSON, and the entire committee were civil, accommodating, and worked well together. It was refreshing. In fact, nine of my fellow congressional problem solvers on both Democratic and Republican sides are on the Ag Committee with me.

Although we didn't agree on every aspect of the bill and I believe there still is room for improvements, we all come from different regions of the country where people expect their elected officials to put politics aside and do their job. Period.

Last year, Congress wasn't able to get its act together and pass a 5-year farm bill, so instead had to resort to a short-term extension that expires in a matter of months. I am hopeful that this year will be different.

The family farmers I talk with back home in Illinois want the security and stability that come with a 5-year farm bill so they can plan for future growth and investments and continue to provide the food our Nation—and the world also—depends on.

If we approached more issues on a bipartisan basis like we did on the Ag Committee and like we do in No Labels, Congress would be more productive and the American people would be better off. I'm committed to working with my No Labels colleagues to achieve this goal of bipartisanship and urge all Members of Congress to join us in this pursuit.

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the gentlelady.

I'd like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman, and I thank the Speaker for allowing me to address the House tonight regarding the Problem Solvers group. I, too, am a proud member of this group—a group of Republicans and Democrats who I think have really one thing in common more than anything else; it's a group of Members of Congress who believe we have an affirmative obligation to govern. That is, we're trying to find a way to get to ''yes'' on some of the big issues of the day because the problems are huge.

Clearly, when the country sees a lot of the mindless bickering and fighting that goes on here, it does not inspire confidence, and it certainly does contribute to greater uncertainty. And while nobody here is checking their ideologies or their philosophies at the door, people understand that we must be practical and pragmatic at times to try to find a solution to a common problem. That doesn't mean we'll always get to a solution; sometimes we will and sometimes we won't. But you know what, it's important that we try. I think that's what this group is about, trying to find solutions to the big problems of the day—not running away from them, not hiding, not each side running to their safe camp and then ignoring the problem and hoping that somebody else at a later date will deal with it.

What I'm most proud about with this group is that many of these Members have demonstrated political courage on both sides of the aisle and have stood up time and again to try to do the right thing for the good of the country.

Like everybody else here, too, I hear from my constituents. My constituents are very much alarmed by what they're seeing happening in Washington. They think that we're in warring camps; no one likes each other and no one gets along, but worst of all, no one is trying, no one is trying to solve the great problems of the day.

I'm really pleased, as has been mentioned previously, that this Problem Solvers group, the first issue out of the box for us was No Budget No Pay—an idea that originated with this organization. And sure enough, within fairly short order, it became law. It's a step. It's an important step. I'm proud that this group was part of it. I know over time, in the near future, this organization will be coming up with more ideas that we can present to the American people in a way that I think they will find very helpful and very useful.

So again, I just want to commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, many of whom I call friends. We're all friends who are really trying to do the right thing. So I just wanted to say thank you, and I commend the efforts. We need more of this, not less of it.

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the gentleman.

It is now a privilege of mine to yield to my friend from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

□ 2000

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for the time, but more importantly I thank him for the leadership he is showing in this common endeavor.

I want to echo what my good friend, Congressman DENT, just said, but I want to make an additional point. The folks in Georgia sent me to Washington to help get things done, not get caught up in scoring political points. They are fed up with the hyperpartisanship in Congress, and that's why I've joined this group.

The scandals at the IRS and the Justice Department contribute to one of the biggest problems in our country right now. Americans don't trust their government to do the right thing. The goal of this group is to strengthen the faith that folks have in government.

The Problem Solvers coalition offers a chance to break the gridlock by getting Democrats and Republicans focused on actually getting things done in Congress. Unlike some folks, we don't think ''compromise'' is a dirty word.

Washington's refusal to respect and work with one another means we are failing this generation and the next generation. No Labels offers a common ground for lawmakers to make government work better and negotiate solutions without the blinders of partisan talking points.

We have real problems that are crying out for compromise right now, and we all just can't sit here arguing just to get us through the next election. If we continue with that approach, we won't be doing this country and the folks we represent any good down the road.

Mr. Speaker, my Bible says:

A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favor more than silver or gold.

I believe that both parties have a great deal to contribute to this country's past, have a great deal to be proud of in their path, and they have a lot to contribute to our country's future. But the label, the name, the good name that folks are looking for is ''problem solver.'' That is the name that brings us together. That is the name that describes our function. That is why I'm proud to support this group and its work.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, with that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, my friend, for yielding, and want to really echo the comments of my friend from Georgia, Mr. BARROW.

I first came to Washington to serve in the House a little more than 2 years ago after spending 8 years as mayor of the city of Province. When you're a mayor of a city or town, you are a problem solver. You have lots of issues that come before you, lots of decisions to make, but most importantly, you have to get things done. You don't have a Republican pothole or a Democratic tree that needs to be cut. You just have things that need to be done and action that needs to be taken.

The men and women and families of Rhode Island's First Congressional District didn't send me to Congress to score political points or engage in political games. They sent me here to get things done, to confront the challenges facing our country and my State.

I'm very proud to be a founding member of the Problem Solvers of No Labels, a coalition that's offering a venue for Republicans and Democrats to come together, to work together, to find solutions to, most importantly, govern our Nation.

And really importantly, as my friend from Wisconsin said, we have people in No Labels who come from a whole range of different ideologies, who feel very passionately about issues that are important to them and to their constituents and make the case in very, very spirited discussions. But we come to it with a willingness to listen to each other, to consider each other's views, to engage in civil discourse and, most importantly, come to it with a commitment to try to solve problems, to work together to grow our economy, responsibly cut the deficit, protect critical programs like Social Security and Medicare.

There's no question that in the last few years Washington has stopped working the way it should. Republicans and Democrats have grown more concerned with 30-second ads than serving our constituents. Washington has failed to do its job.

There are real problems facing our country. We need to start working together again in the spirit of bipartisanship that has defined our Nation over the years through global conflict, economic depression, and even fierce internal political debates.

We have always come together to get things done and to act in the best interest of our country. I know that's what No Labels is committed to, that's what we're committed to on both sides of the aisle as part of Problem Solvers, and I urge all my colleagues to join us in this effort.

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

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD).

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his leadership in the No Label Problem Solving group, and I really enjoy working with you.

I came to Congress after serving in the Maine Legislature for 22 years—a place where Democrats, Independents, and Republicans did work together to get things done.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee also works on a bipartisan basis, and I'm proud to serve on the committee. Chairman MILLER and myself work very well together, along with our committee members, to try to find solutions to the problems that our veterans are facing today. We are doing it in a nonpartisan way, and that's how things should work.

However, I do remain concerned about Congress, and Washington as a whole. There is too much division, gamesmanship, and too little cooperation. But the group that you see here tonight on this floor that I'm speaking of is a group that actually gives me hope, a group of individuals, Republicans, Democrats, from all different facets of life, from different parts of the country, that are willing to sit down and work together to get things done.

I'm very proud to join my fellow Problem Solvers because it's long past time to work together and get things done for the American people.

Mr. RIBBLE. I remember very clearly, Mr. Speaker, I had been in Congress only a few days—the President of the United States came into this Chamber for the State of the Union address—and my good friend from Maine invited me to sit with him. We began a relationship there and continued to work together throughout these last few years.

Thank you very much for coming to the floor tonight.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, as I travel around my district, I've witnessed firsthand many of the problems my constituents face on a daily basis—water shortages, difficulty pursuing a higher education, and high unemployment. While there are many ways to address each of these issues—and we may not always agree on the best course of action—one thing is clear: Americans are sick of the gridlock in Washington.

Congress cannot continue to be sidetracked by political games and at the same time expect real progress to be made. We must put aside our political differences and, as leaders, come together to do what's best for our constituents—the American people.

That's why I joined the Problem Solvers coalition. The group is made up of both Republicans and Democrats, alike, who are committed to focusing on policy, not politics. We meet on a regular basis to discuss, debate, and find common ground on the most pressing issues of our day. It is only through a mutual understanding and respect that we will begin to address the serious issues our Nation faces and move forward together.

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

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Thank you, Mr. RIBBLE, and thank you for conducting this hour this evening.

As I travel around my district in upstate New York, which forms the convergence of Vermont, Quebec, and New York, I hear a couple of questions from my constituents. The first is about jobs, and the second is why can't you fellows work together?

No Labels is a big part of that answer. We must work at the process of discussing issues, of gathering facts—and I want to repeat that, of gathering facts—then discussing those facts, and then reaching compromise. That is what the American people sent us here to do. That is why I came to Congress 3½ years ago.

We all recognize that no one—no party, no group—has a monopoly on good ideas, nor on the facts. I urge all of my colleagues in Congress to work with us so that we will develop the kind of relationships, the kind of action, the kind of motivation that allows us to work for our friends and neighbors at home, those whom we call constituents.

□ 2010

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

With that, I'd like to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

Mr. BERA of California. Thank you to my colleague from Wisconsin for organizing this, and thank you to my colleague from New York.

I am honored to be here with colleagues from both sides of the aisle. As you've heard us talking about the Problem Solvers, that's what we're elected to do—to solve problems. One of the first organizations I joined when I got here was the No Labels organization. One of the first bills that I had the honor of cosponsoring was the No Budget, No Pay legislation. What a novel idea—putting together a budget. That was a bill that was an idea that came out of the Problem Solvers. We sponsored that bill, we put it forth, and lo and behold, the House of Representatives has a budget, the Senate has a budget, and the President has a budget.

We've got to continue moving forward, and that is exactly what this organization allows us to do. It brings Democrats and Republicans together to have a conversation, to listen to one another and to solve problems. We're not going to agree on everything. In fact, in divided government, it isn't necessary that we agree on everything. You want to have all the ideas, but we're not asking anyone to give up their convictions. What we are asking, though, is for us to listen to one another, to hear the ideas that are being put out there and then to find common ground so we can start working together on that common ground, moving forward and addressing the challenges that our Nation faces.

We don't have to look too far back in our history to see how this works. The great Speaker, Tip O'Neill, was able to work together with President Ronald Reagan to not only address some of our debt and deficit but to also strengthen Social Security. President Bill Clinton was able to work with Speaker Newt Gingrich to not only balance our budget but to create budget surpluses.

Now, the American people expect us to start working together. I grew up in a country that always talked about what we could do, that focused on the challenge of the day. It is time that we start coming together as Democrats and Republicans, and it's time we start solving problems. That's why I'm so glad to be here and to be a member of the Problem Solvers and a cochair of the Problem Solvers.

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the gentleman.

I would now like to yield to the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. I would like to thank my colleague from Wisconsin for leading this effort and for his leadership in bringing together Members from all parts of the country that represent many diverse viewpoints.

I know, for me, one thing that I often hear every time I go home is a sense of frustration from constituents, from people within my community, who ask: Why can't Congress get anything done? What are you doing to take action for the American people? Is there hope, is there any way to fix this mess that we seem to be in?

I was talking with some of my Republican colleagues, new Members, and I found that the answer that we were giving people when they expressed their frustrations was the same. And that was, the hope that we see every day as we do our work here lies in the fact that, collectively, we recognize that we have a mandate from those in our communities to work together, to do the people's work and to remember every single day that the most important thing we share in common is that we serve at the pleasure of our constituents as Representatives, as voices for the people.

To me, that's really what this Problem Solvers Caucus is all about. It's about Democrats and Republicans coming together, finding these practical, real solutions that will allow us to make true progress in the spirit of service. As my colleagues know, I often talk about how this is what we in Hawaii call the spirit of aloha: when you can have a conversation with someone with whom you may disagree on some issues but whom you can respect, whom you can listen to sincerely and have a true conversation with to come up with the best idea and the best solution on how we can serve the people.

Earlier today, I had the opportunity to go with some of my colleagues, a bipartisan group of us new Members, to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. We laid a wreath there at the tomb, as we head into Memorial Day, and we had an opportunity to reflect on the great sacrifices that have been made in the history of our country, and it personally gave me the opportunity to remember some of the sacrifices that my friends and battle buddies have made. It reminded me of what our responsibility is, which is to honor them, and it reminded me that there are no labels when you're in a foxhole, that there are no labels when you're walking on a patrol, and that, when these great heroes are out serving our country, there is no label identifying their party affiliations, their religious practices, the communities that they come from, because they understand it's about one team, one fight, serving one awesome Nation.

That's our responsibility here—to serve in that same spirit and recognize we have many problems that need to be solved now, not next month or next year or after the next election cycle, but that we have to stand up, honor them and work together to find our common ground and pursue these commonsense solutions. If we do that, then we will truly honor them, and we will embrace the trust that has been placed with us.

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the gentlelady, and I thank her for mentioning our veterans.

My own father left the mainland in 1945, and the first place he went was to Pearl Harbor on the Island of Oahu, in your home State, before he went into the Pacific Theater. I can't help but think that he would have wanted this very thing to have happened here in that we would actually come here and spend our time honoring the sacrifices that those men and women made and finding solutions for the American people, making the American Nation a better place to live and work, to study and grow up and excel, and to become the type of people we can become.

So thank you very much for your comments today.

Now I would like to yield to a good friend of mine from Illinois, a Chicago Bears fan himself, Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I want to thank Mr. REID RIBBLE for yielding, and I want to stand here on the Republican side of the well to just express how important it is that we stand here together.

As Mr. RIBBLE just mentioned in talking about our veterans, yesterday I was at an early Memorial Day commemoration. The people there weren't talking about Democrats and Republicans. We were talking about those men and women who had given their lives for our country—standing together, fighting together to maintain our freedom.

Today, we see too much division here in Washington. Now, my background is in engineering. Engineers are problem solvers, so I came to Congress 8-plus years ago determined to solve problems. As our Nation's problems have gotten bigger, Congress has gotten smaller, not smaller in size and certainly not smaller in ego, but smaller in the capacity to get things done. My constituents certainly see this. What they want to see is Washington working together to help with job creation, to work on reducing our debt and to work on solving the many other problems that we face. Instead, they see fighting in Washington.

Now, where I come from on the southwest side of Chicago, in the bungalow belt, we know that when we are sent to do a job there is a bottom line—get the job done. Businesses, families, organizations know, if they're going to survive, they must solve problems. It's time for Washington to get this because we must come together to face these big issues, and that's what Problem Solvers and No Labels are all about—coming together. Not to lose the fact that we are Democrats and Republicans, liberals or conservatives, but to work to solve problems.

We must do this. If we do not, we will be failing the American people—failing our constituents, those who have sent us here. If we do come together, we can work to solve some of these problems and make sure that America's brightest and best days are still ahead of us. The American people are counting on us.

So I am glad to stand here with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and I thank Mr. RIBBLE for leading us here tonight to say we are united to solve problems. We are no labels. We're not going to solve the problems overnight, but this is where we need to start to let the American people know

that there are Members of Congress, there are people in Washington who want to work together and solve these problems. I pledge my support to my colleagues here, and we are going to work together as America's brightest days are yet to come.

□ 2020

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the gentleman for his comments. And I just have to say if a Green Bay Packer fan like myself, Mr. Speaker, and a Chicago Bear fan like Representative LIPINSKI can get together and talk about things—if we can talk about that, we can talk about anything.

In fact, around Christmastime 2009, is when I became convinced about possibly running for Congress for the first time. I'm in my second term, Mr. Speaker. I came here to this Chamber not just to represent the citizens of northeast Wisconsin, but I came here because I believe that the fabric of trust between the American people and this government has been torn. But fabric torn can be mended. It can be mended by common thread that binds us together not as Republicans and Democrats, men and women, but common thread that binds us together as Americans.

Common thread can only be used if it's found; common thread can only be found if you seek it.

One of the reasons that I feel we sometimes can't repair this torn fabric is because it's so difficult to find the common ground. But common ground, indeed, can be found when representatives are willing to seek it out.

Mr. Speaker, our Founders established a representative Republic and instructed us. They said that if we can find agreement, do those things. But if we couldn't find agreement, they warned us as well. They said, Where you can't find agreement, it might be best for you not to do those things until you can, in fact, find agreement.

So we have to go out and we have to look for it, and I could talk to my Republican colleagues every single day. In many respects, it's like preaching to the choir, and I think that preaching to the choir is a fine thing. I mean, you often preach to the choir because you want them to sing. The fact of the matter is I have agreement with my Republican colleagues on most things—not everything, but most things. So therefore I must go and talk to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The fastest way to mend that torn fabric is by meeting people, by building trust, by taking the time to understand them and then seeking the areas of common ground, to find the common thread that binds us together, and when we find that, we can begin to repair the torn fabric between the American people and its government. It's really what we've been sent here to do.

We've been sent here to find and solve problems, not to fight about them. Disagreement will happen. In fact, you can look historically into this Chamber, and there's been a lot of disagreement. It dates back to the beginning of our Nation's founding. There's also been a lot of agreement.

Think about the differences from 1787 to today. Think about the America that exists today. Much of it exists because the men and women who were sent by the citizens of their districts to lead came here, and through statesman-like qualities, were willing to lead. They had the courage to make tough decisions and then lead this country to the place that it is today.

I am filled with hope about America. I'm filled with hope because of the colleagues that I work with here. I'm filled with hope, Mr. Speaker, because of men like you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

CBC HOUR: HIGHER EDUCATION

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to once again have this opportunity to anchor the CBC Special Order along with my very distinguished colleague, my good friend from the Silver State, Representative STEVEN HORSFORD, where for the next 60 minutes during this hour of power, members of the Congressional Black Caucus will have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people about the issues facing higher education here in America.

We are at a crisis moment as it relates to our capacity to make sure that we can provide an affordable college education to as many Americans as possible. The problem that we in this country confront is twofold. First, the cost of a college education keeps going up, but the amount of financial aid available to younger Americans keeps coming down. As a result, higher education is increasingly out of reach, particularly for low-income Americans or working families or the sons and daughters of the middle class.

A college education is a pathway to the American Dream. The fact that it's increasingly out of reach is incredibly problematic for this great country. Compounding that fact secondarily is the reality that the amount of student loan debt for younger Americans has increased exponentially. If the Congress does not act in advance of July 1, then the interest rate for federally subsidized student loans will double in its amount. It will increase from its current rate of 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. This increase will impact more than 7 million younger Americans. It's a crisis that we must confront.

The CBC today will lay out a vision for how we can deal with the immediate crisis that we confront that's approaching as we march toward July 1, as well as ideas for tackling the broader issue of college affordability. Many of our members will also lay out the problems with the GOP approach as represented in H.R. 1911, which will only make the problem worse—not better.

We're pleased that so many of my distinguished colleagues have joined us today to participate in this Special Order. To get us started is our eloquent and dynamic leader, the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, Representative MARCIA FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank my colleagues, Congressman JEFFRIES and Congressman HORSFORD, for once again leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order. I cannot think of a more timely topic for today's Special Order as once again our youth are facing a student loan crisis.

Mr. Speaker, George Washington Carver once said, ''Education is the key to unlock the golden door of freedom.'' Nowhere is this truer in this country, where we know for a fact that access to a quality education is the ladder to a better and richer tomorrow. Providing access to education is in America's very DNA, and it goes back to when two of our Founding Fathers, Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, established State universities.

This tradition continued in 1862 when President Lincoln signed the Morrill Land-Grant Acts to create land-grant colleges, an effort to promote higher education for working class citizens. Nearly 100 years later, President Lyndon Johnson signed the Higher Education Act of 1965, and thus the Pell Grant was created.

Today, an affordable college education is more important than ever in this country's history. In the next decade, 63 percent of all jobs will require at least some post-secondary education. And in order to compete for jobs in the future, our children must be equipped and not saddled with debt. Congress has a duty to ensure that Federal education assistance is both affordable and accessible.

On July 1, if Congress does not act, rates for college students taking out subsidized Department of Education loans are scheduled to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this week the House, the place affectionately referred to as the ''people's House''—believe it or not—will consider a bill that would do more harm than good.

□ 2030

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will bring the so-called

Smarter Solutions for Students Act to the House floor. This bill is not a smart solution. In fact, it is not a solution at all. It actually makes it more expensive for students and parents than if Congress did nothing and let the interest rates just double.

To be clear, I want to ensure Americans know exactly what Republicans are proposing. The Congressional Budget Office found that this bill will cost students and parents $3.7 billion in additional student loan interest, and those charges will be over a 10-year period. So why propose such a bill? Why would Members of Congress in the people's House claim this is a good bill? Believe it or not, this legislation is an attempt to move closer to a balanced budget on the backs of college students. The true purpose of this legislation is to squeeze out revenue to pay down the Federal debt.

Yes, we will vote on a bill this week that seeks to decrease the Federal deficit on the backs of a generation already being called ''generation jobless.'' Yet, still no jobs bill. This legislation totally ignores the fact that student loan delinquency and default rates are already exceedingly high. Due to the recession and unemployment, nearly 20 percent of student loan borrowers were 90 days or more behind in payments at the end of 2012. So why increase it more?

In addition to the student loan crisis, I have to mention the Department of Education PLUS loan crisis, another crisis that is breathing down the backs of college students. Over the last few years, thousands of students have been sent home from college because their PLUS loans were denied after the student year commenced. HBCUs have lost millions in revenue.

The CBC recently met with Secretary Duncan and requested that the Department reverse course to stop the bleeding. As a result, the Department is sending out notifications in an effort to get students back into school, and hearings will be held around the country this month and next month.

College presidents, students, and parents must speak up and demand a change. The CBC will continue to push back and speak out as the future of student loan programs are debated. We will not stand by and watch Congress or the Department of Education hurt our students' chances at a better tomorrow. Not on our watch.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank you, Chairwoman FUDGE, for so eloquently laying out both the history in this great country of investing in higher education, whether it is the private school context or in the public school context, but making sure consistently that our young people are prepared for the challenges of the modern day economy, which will increasingly require a college degree, if not a graduate degree and significant training. That is why we at the CBC feel it is important to make sure that we make college more affordable, not less affordable, as the GOP proposal would do.

We have also been joined by a very distinguished colleague from the Lone Star State who has been a tremendous champion on this issue and on many others in the Congress, and so I now yield to Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE from the great city of Houston.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Allow me to thank both of my very good friends, the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Nevada, for really answering the call of the First Amendment. The First Amendment guarantees the freedom of speech, but I think the most important part of speech is information. Thank you for the opportunity to share with our colleagues and share with America the pending crisis.

If I might just quote from an article in the Houston Chronicle by a writer in the early part of February, Mike Tolson, that said:

> Like a hurricane churning across the Gulf of Mexico, the looming Federal sequestration threatens everything in its path. If the deep and automatic Federal budget cuts actually take place, there will be damage somewhere—perhaps a lot of somewheres.

So today we're standing on the floor of the House embracing some of the historic comments as relates to the African American community and other minority communities about the value of education. How many of us have been told by our parents that it was the door, the key, to opportunities? How many of us recognized it by listening to the words of Dr. Benjamin Mays, who was a leading voice at Morehouse and an educator, who always spoke of the slaves rising from the ashes, to be educated, to do good? And the debate between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois. It was a question of The Talented Tenth, but it was also a question of those who could pull their buckets up where they stand, to be artisans, carpenters, painters, and others. But it was to learn something, to be educated.

Today I stand sadly on this floor, Mr. JEFFRIES, and acknowledge that as I speak, one of my boards is having a meeting. They are a school district, not higher education as we talk about tonight, but it plays into this because there is a siege upon education in America. That board and that community, the North Forest Independent School District, is fighting with every breath in their body to keep from closing after they've succeeded in reaching all of the goals that were given to them by the Texas education agency. But our Governor, Governor Rick Perry, is opposed to their survival. Our commissioner, Commissioner Michael Williams, is opposed to their survival. And as well, what a contrast, when just a few days ago he saved another school district, not African American, with the same proposal North Forest has.

So I stand on the floor today to join you and acknowledge: is the siege continuing? It seems to be, because right now our friends, our Republican friends, this House, refuses to have a conference on the budget. A conference on the budget might put us in a better position than what we will be doing today, H.R. 1911. It might put us in a better position than what the Department of Education, unfortunately, has had to do with the reconfiguration on the parent PLUS loans.

I ask why the budget conference has not been called? Why are we on the backs of people who are suffering and who want to get an education? Why are we on the backs of those, like in north Texas, who are suffering from tornadoes or the disaster today, where we don't know how many lives have been lost? Why are we suffering? Why don't we have a budget conference? Why are we suffering when we recognize how much education provides? I thank you, Mr. HORSFORD, for this initiative to show what it means to get an education. This is what our parents told us.

Less than a high school diploma, weekly earnings $451; high school diploma or GED—and I spoke to a group that got a GED, $638, congratulations to them. A bachelor's degree, $1,053. And a professional degree, $1,655.

This is a 2012 document, and I just want to call out these numbers of unemployment. They're higher when you don't have a high school education, almost 15 percent and growing; 10 percent for a high school education; and of course the numbers go down.

So it is of great concern that we now are facing legislation that is going to take the fat—oh, let me just stop and say that. Somebody says fat, they say: Oh, yeah, we want to take the fat out. That is going to go to the bone of individuals who are simply trying to get an education.

Sequestration is cutting NASA. It is cutting education programs. I just met some people on an airplane who said that all my programs from Rice University in science have been wiped out because of sequestration. Now my friends want to bring H.R. 1911, rather than listening to what we can do here today.

I introduced H.R. 900 with JOHN CONYERS and a number of other Members who said, let's end sequestration. If we end sequestration, we wouldn't have to bring up H.R. 1911.

Let me just say these few words as I discuss these boards very quickly. Right now it is noted that student borrowing is widespread, and more than $100 billion in Federal education loans are distributed every year. What that means is that is the debt we are putting on the children of America. A historically black college like Texas Southern University in Houston, 81 percent of the students receive some form of student assistance. They received $85 million in student financial aid. In terms of student loan debt, 92 percent of those students are African Americans; 85 percent are Hispanic students—this is overall—and 85 percent are Native Americans students; 82 percent are multiracial students; and 77 percent are white students.

□ 2040

Last year I introduced the College Literacy Finance and Economics Act of 2011 to help our students manage their debt; but now we find ourselves facing an uphill battle, and that is the introduction of this legislation that I believe is probably the worst that we could ever have. Let me explain it to you and see what H.R. 1911 does.

We're right now at 3.4 percent. That looks like it's reasonable. If this bill passes this week, by July 1, we will be up to 6.8 percent—excuse me. By July 1, if we don't do anything, we'll be 6.8 percent, $8,880 in interest to be paid. But if we pass H.R. 1911, we'll be at $10,109 in interest. Isn't this a disgrace, a shame on a Nation that encourages our young people, whether they go in business or not, to get an education?

And then as Mr. JEFFRIES mentioned, the Congressional Black Caucus has taken on the burden of a horrific burden that has been put on our parents, something called Parent Plus. In fact, I was looking at the numbers from Texas Southern University, who said they lost 450 students—and they don't know if they've got all the numbers—because the Parent Plus loan program caused students to drop out by the thousands across America. By the thousands.

I want to thank the Congressional Black Caucus and our chairwoman, Chairwoman FUDGE, for waking up this issue, along with our members on the Education Committee from the Congressional Black Caucus, because this is what is happening under the Parent Plus program.

Already bad under current law, in terms of the interest paid, $27,956. But look what will happen under H.R. 1911. It would force parents to pay 28 percent more on their loan, $35,848.

A debt on parents is a debt on the children. If the parents got ill, if the parents lost their jobs, if the parents had other children to take care of, and that one student that they invested in and they loved, trying to get the others to come up behind them, parents meaning well, doing well, and you're going to burden them with this burden on top of that, the student that is trying to increase their income.

So I would simply say that we're facing tragedy in our country with bad weather, but we're facing a tsunami of disaster on the floor of the House with the lack of a budget, with a sequester that is now getting into the seams of our life by causing enormous debt and legislative initiatives that are unwise and devastating.

And so I'd ask today that we move on the budget conference. And I ask the Speaker to bring up H.R. 900, a simple sentence. It says: to remove the sequestration from the 2011 Budget Act and go back to regular order.

Many of us are looking at amendments offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), whose legislation we supported last year. But we want anything but this devastating bill that is going to snatch the opportunity and the dignity of education from those who are trying.

I close on the remarks of President Obama as he spoke to the historic Morehouse College this past Sunday, thank him for visiting with those young men. And he talked about a young man who had a rough upbringing, a difficult upbringing, and he congratulated that young man because that young man had now graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Morehouse College and is going on to Harvard Law School.

I can assure you that that young man had his own sticktoitiveness, but also that the young men in those colleges like Morehouse have loans and depend upon financial aid, generally speaking.

And so what Mr. Obama conveyed to those young men, that the sky is the limit, that there should be no obstacles in front of you; don't blame anyone else; keep climbing up the ladder.

And we stand here on the floor this week to snatch the very promise of education out of the hands of those students, no matter what race they are, snatch it out of their hands with a devastating, crafty, expensive, trickery such as H.R. 1911.

I pray, as I go to my seat, I pray that wisdom will take charge, and that Members of Congress will come together and defeat H.R. 1911 and put on the floor of the House the legislation that has been offered by many on this side of the aisle, to be able to ensure that those individuals, parents and children, continue to claim the American Dream no matter where you walk from, no matter what story you have to tell, no matter what your racial or ethnic background is.

I'm glad that the CBC is standing here today to tell our story and to speak for America. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from the great State of Texas for laying out in very clear terms the two different visions that exist here in the House of Representatives as it relates to how to deal with access to higher education. The CBC vision is a clear one. We want to increase opportunity to a college degree because we recognize that it's a great way to the American Dream. The other side, unfortunately, has put forth a plan that will help snatch that opportunity away, make it more expensive, increase the debt burden.

And unfortunately, this one particular issue, as it relates to the student loan dynamic, fits within a broader dichotomy as to how we approach dealing with the problems in America. We believe in a balanced approach that invests in America and education and prepares our young people for the challenges of the 21st century economy. But the other side seems to have taken the approach that they're going to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable here in America, and that includes young people who are trying to pursue a college education.

That's what their budget proposal says. Take away $168 billion in higher education funding, and then, at the same time, when, on July 1, student loan rates may double, put forth a bill that has been articulated to have made the problem worse if, in fact, it is ever enacted into law.

We're pleased that we've been joined, once again by my distinguished coanchor, STEVEN HORSFORD, who represents the great State of Nevada, and so I now yield to my good friend, Congressman HORSFORD.

Mr. HORSFORD. To the coanchor, to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York, Representative JEFFRIES, I appreciate your leadership and the leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus in focusing this hour on such an important issue as the cost, the increasing cost of attending higher education in this country.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this week, graduations are being held across the country. Families are celebrating the achievement of students who have worked hard for the last 4 years or more to earn their degree. So I find it ironic that on this week when Americans are celebrating the achievement of students who have worked so hard that my colleagues on the other side would propose such a hypocritical piece of legislation as H.R. 1911.

H.R. 1911 is nothing but a bait-and-switch scheme that makes attending college more expensive. Can you imagine that? Proposing a piece of legislation that costs the American people more to go to college? People are already struggling to go to college as it is.

According to the CBO estimates, Federal student interest rates will be higher than current fixed rates for millions of borrowers. That means that if you're financing your college now, it's likely you will be paying more once you graduate under the Republican plan than you would today.

H.R. 1911 makes student loan interest rates change year to year, based on the 10-year Treasury note marked up by 2.5 percent to 4.5 percent. So to be plain, when next year's freshmen graduate and start having to repay their loans in 2017, their interest rate on that loan taken out in their freshman year is projected to be 7.4 percent, more than double today's current 3.4 percent rate for subsidized Stafford loans.

□ 2050

For a freshman starting college this fall who borrows the maximum annual loan under the Department of Education, their subsidized and unsubsidized loan programs, they will pay about $2,000 more in interest under H.R. 1911.

Now, why is this so appalling? We recently learned that this year alone the Department of Education is expected to make $51 billion in profit off students financing their education. Some of you may ask, How is it that the Department of Education is making a $51 billion profit when American families and students are struggling to even pay

the tuition costs that they have? We teach our children that it's important to save, to be responsible with their money, and to get a good education. But with the system set up the way it is right now, those goals are mutually exclusive.

How are students supposed to save? When will they be able to pay off a record $1.1 trillion in debt that they are saddled with now? It was just reported that there is more debt on student loans than there are credit card payments in America. How do they begin to consider to plan their lives, to prepare to buy a home, when they're trapped under a mountain of debt?

I have students that come to me when we have Congress on our college campuses and they express great fear and trepidation about their future. They're working so hard. I have single parents who are literally taking every dollar from the two jobs that they work to be able to afford their college tuition. I cannot go back to them and tell them that my colleagues on the other side propose a bill that makes the college costs for their loans double. It's unacceptable. It's unacceptable when companies like JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, Citigroup, and Wells Fargo reported a combined profit of $51.9 billion and the Department of Education has the same amount of profit as those four companies combined.

And so, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, I have got to say that we've got to tackle H.R. 1911. We have to figure out a way to come up with amendments to keep the interest rates on college loans at 3.4 percent, as they are now, or to ensure that they're capped at a level that is predictable for students. But we also have to address this other underlying issue. It is not fair to American students that they are working harder and harder, that their families are struggling; and yet there's a billion-dollar profit that's going to the Department of Education. There's a $51 billion profit that comes back and goes to the Treasury to pay down the debt, and yet corporations continue to get tax incentives and corporate subsidies.

Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. Enough is enough. When are we going to require major corporations to do their part? Enough is enough. College students in America have worked too hard. Families have struggled for too long. The hope of a college education that so many people strive for is costing more and more, and now my colleagues on the other side want it to cost even more. And so we're here tonight to say, no, that is not going to happen. Not on our watch. And we're going to fight and work hard until it does not.

I've got two questions to my colleague, and then I'm going to yield back. I tweeted out #CBCTalks and I asked constituents to send in a question or two that I could respond to. I was asked by a constituent, David Webb, a counselor, Wouldn't increasing the student loan interest rate discourage minorities' ability to go to college? Absolutely. The answer to that is yes. If the cost to attend college and take out loans for college will double—it's already too high now—too many students are foregoing their chance to get a college education because they can't afford it. This will just make it worse.

I was also asked by a constituent, Troy Amaro, if H.R. 1330 is passed by using the 10–10 scenario, what happens to the rest of the debt that is unpaid? I want to thank him for his question. I know we are working on the Student Loan Fairness Act, which offers a 10–10 repayment plan that would require borrowers to make 10 years of payment on their Federal student loans at a 10 percent rate of their discretionary income. And then once that period is done, the loan would be forgiven.

Those are the types of solutions that we need to be working on so that college can be more affordable for the American student and the American family. And to my coanchor and to the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, I'm hopeful that we will continue to raise our voice on this issue and to make it clear that the proposal by our colleagues on the other side, H.R. 1991, is not a solution. It is costing the American people more for college at a time when they can least afford it.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman for raising some very eloquent points and doing it in such a thoughtful and passionate way. These are solutions, Mr. Speaker, that we really should be discussing in the context of a conference committee to come to some resolution around the budget.

For about 4 years, Members of the other side of the aisle were complaining about the absence of regular order, but this year we passed a budget in the House of Representatives in March. The Senate then passed their budget plan in the same month. The President came back in April, after we got back from recess, and presented his budget. The next step in regular order, which the House GOP has been asking for for 4 years, would be to appoint conferees so the Senate and the House can sit down and work it out and discuss some of the solutions that Representative HORSFORD and other Representatives of the American people have put forth to deal with our economic situation, make higher education more affordable, and provide businesses with the certainty that they need.

And so the question is, What is the House GOP afraid of? Why haven't you appointed conferees so we can sit down and have a discussion to work out the issues and the problems that are confronting the American people?

We've been joined by another distinguished member of the freshman class, one of the newest Members of the House of Representatives, Representative ROBIN KELLY from the great State of Illinois.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you for your leadership, Congressman JEFFRIES.

This weekend, three students very close to me celebrated their college graduations: Brace Clement at the University of Wisconsin, Amelia Lumpkin at Davidson College, and Whitney Horn at the Illinois Institute of Technology. These three young people represent the best and brightest this country has to offer.

□ 2100

Congratulations Brace, Amelia, and Whitney. I am extremely proud of you. They are just three of the thousands of students across the country who celebrated their college graduations this weekend. It's a joyous time, but for some it's also a nervous time because more students than ever are walking across the stage weighed down by student loan debt.

The cost of a college degree has increased by more than 1,000 percent in the last 30 years, according to a report by the Center for American Progress. Two-thirds of students who earn 4-year degrees graduate with an average student loan debt of more than $25,000, according to the report. Today, 37 million students are facing student loan debt, and the total student loan debt burden tops $1.1 trillion.

The mounting student debt is stunting the growth of a generation of graduates who are facing a tough job market and high student loan payments, or putting off key milestones, such as buying a house or starting a family, which further stifles the country's economic recovery.

The problem is most acute among students of color, with 81 percent of African American students graduating in debt compared to 64 percent of White students. And not only are more Black students graduating with debt, they are graduating with higher levels of debt. According to the report, 27 percent of Black bachelor degree recipients have more than $30,000 in debt, compared to 16 percent of their White counterparts. It is against this backdrop that student loan rates are set to double on July 1.

A Republican bill being considered this week would have student loan interest rates change year to year, based on a 10-year Treasury note, a move that could push rates as high as 7.4 percent. This is unacceptable.

Raising interest rates on student loans will be pricing our students out of the American Dream. At a time when a college degree is more vital than ever to national and global competitiveness, we will be putting the goals of attaining a degree further out of reach of our young people, particularly young people of color.

Our students, many of whom have graduated to find themselves unemployed or underemployed, are already struggling to pay back loans at the current rate level and are facing years—and, in some cases, decades—of

loan payments ahead. Raising the rates on students who are already struggling to make ends meet is just wrong, counterproductive, and will have a chilling effect on future generations of students who will be forced to forego an education due to skyrocketing costs. We should be opening more avenues to a college education for young people, not slamming the door shut in their faces.

I agree with my colleagues that a two-step approach is needed to address the student loan crisis. We should first freeze the current rate, 3.4 percent, on subsidized Stafford loans for the next 2 years and keep other educational loan rates steady to remove the immediate fear of students and their families of the impending rate increase. We should then investigate longer-term solutions to the student loan problem as part of a comprehensive approach to addressing our Nation's mounting student debt, escalating college costs, and broken financial aid system as a whole.

In investigating options for increasing college affordability, I agree with the notion that we should, at the very least, be open to giving our students the same interest rates we extend to banks. Our young people deserve the same backing and support. It is not only the right thing to do, but the investment in our students will net a much bigger payoff for our Nation for generations to come.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the gentlelady for her very insightful comments.

You know, it's interesting, as Representative KELLY pointed out, when the economy collapsed in 2008, it created a situation where many younger Americans entered into the job market and confronted increased difficulty in securing employment in their area of study or in any other area of study. So it doesn't make a lot of sense to many of us that, as we still continue to deal with a fragile economic recovery, why in the world would we shoulder these young Americans with an increased student loan debt burden in the face of an already difficult job market? That's a question that our friends on the other side of the aisle are going to have to answer this week, and I don't think that the American people will like what they have to say in that regard.

We're pleased that we've been joined by the very distinguished gentleman from the great State of Virginia, someone who has spearheaded the CBC effort as it relates to our compassionate and strong and responsible budget. I'm pleased to yield to Representative BOBBY SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding time, and I thank him for holding this important Special Order as we talk about college education and making it affordable.

We know that a college education is extremely important to young people. It can transform their entire lives and open opportunities that are not available to those without a college education.

We know that the good jobs require education. Ninety percent of the good-paying jobs in the future will require education past the high school level—and not necessarily a 4-year college, but some education and training past the high school level. Of course, that would include college. There's an old adage that the more you learn, the more you earn; the more education you get, the more likely you are to have a much higher income.

Now, we know that the benefits of a decent education not only accrue to the individual, but also to the community; because those communities that have a well-educated constituency are much less likely to have to suffer as much crime or pay as much for social services as those communities that do not invest in education.

And our national economic competitiveness depends on an educated workforce. We're not going to be able to compete, for example, on low wages if people around the world will work for much lower wages. You don't have to be near your customers or even near your coworkers anymore. We've got delivery. You can deliver things all over the world. And if you can work across the hall from your coworkers, you can work across the globe from your coworkers with a computer and a modem and the Internet and everything else.

The reason that businesses want to locate in the United States is because they know they can get a well-educated, well-trained workforce. And if we allow people to fail to reach their full potential, we will not be achieving our full economic competitiveness.

So we know the benefits of education, particularly a college education. And we know that some young people are looking at the high interest rates and the cost of education and are calculating that it's not worth it. There can be nothing worse for our Nation than to have young people fail to achieve their full potential because they cannot afford a college education.

Several years ago, in 2007, Congress passed a cut in the interest rate on student loans to make college more affordable, cutting the interest rate in half, from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent, for 5 years. At the end of 5 years, last year, we extended it for another year; but on July 1, in just a few weeks, that interest rate will double back to 6.8 percent if we don't do anything.

Last week, the Education and Workforce Committee considered legislation to deal with the interest rate. Unfortunately, the bill recommended by the Republican side of the aisle was actually so bad that, according to the Congressional Research Service, students would actually be better off if we just did nothing and let the interest rate double to 6.8 percent rather than take that variable interest rate that they had, with the extra fees and everything else along with it. We would be better off if we just let the interest rate double.

You're asking young people to sign up for a variable interest rate. When they sign up, they have no idea what the interest rate will be later on; but the Congressional Research Service said, based on projections, that they would be better off with the 6.8 percent rate than what they're going to end up with under the Republican bill.

What we should do is protect the present 3.4 percent interest rate for students. It's reasonable, and it makes college much more affordable. Or, if you're going to have a variable interest rate, have it at a low rate similar to what we're charging businesses and what they're able to borrow money at, with the protection against increases so you're no worse off with the legislation than you are today.

We can help students afford college, but not with the bill that the Education and Workforce Committee considered because that's actually worse than just letting the interest rate double.

We owe it to our young people, we owe it to our next generation, and we owe it to our Nation to make sure that our students get the best education that they can, and making college affordable is part of that challenge. We need to make college affordable, and we need to make sure we defeat the bill that was reported by the Education and Workforce Committee because that's actually worse than doing nothing.

Again, I thank you for holding the Special Order and doing what we can to make college affordable.

□ 2110

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you so much, Representative SCOTT, certainly for your eloquent and thoughtful observations, and for pointing out what really is a very interesting fact as it relates to what we're doing here in Washington, D.C., this week. If we just simply did nothing, if we all went back to our districts and didn't act in advance of the student loan rate doubling on July 1, that we would actually be better off going back home and doing nothing than if we acted upon the GOP proposal, H.R. 1911, which independently and objectively has been proven to show that it would make the situation, which is bad, now worse for millions and millions and millions of American students. That's why so many of our constituents are cynical about a lot of the things that happen down here in Washington, D.C.

We've been joined by another distinguished member of the freshman class, someone who herself had a very prominent career prior to arriving here in the House of Representatives in higher education, as well as a leader in the Ohio legislature.

I'm pleased to yield now to the distinguished gentlelady from Ohio, Representative JOYCE BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, let me also join my colleagues in thanking Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. HORSFORD for leading the Congressional Black Caucus' important discussion about rising burdens of student loans on our families and on our economy.

Higher education is a major part of the American Dream. I know as a college graduate and I know as a senior administrator at a university, access to higher education must continue to be an option for the American Dream to continue to be a reality.

The increasing financial burden higher education is placing on students, families, and the economy is unsustainable and threatens our country's economic progress. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, almost 13 percent of student loan borrowers of all ages owe more than $50,000, and nearly 4 percent owe more than $100,000. These debts are often beyond the students' ability to repay, which is demonstrated by the fact that delinquency and default rates are soaring.

This week, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act, H.R. 1911, will come to the floor. Unfortunately, it is partisan legislation and is not a sufficient solution to address our Nation's student loan crisis; and it is certainly worth repeating, as you have heard and you will repeatedly hear. In fact, it makes students worse off than if nothing is done to stop the increasing variable interest rates.

This bill actually would increase the cost of student loans for borrowers, discourage the use of Federal loans, and exacerbate the country's troubling student debt problem. Under this bill, interest rates for student loans will balloon over the next 10 years, costing students and their parents almost $4 billion in additional loan interest charges.

As a former college administrator with numerous colleges in my district, I believe pursuing higher education is one of the best personal and professional investments one can make in your future. With the tens of thousands of students within my district, the impact of the student loan crisis is monumental for my community.

That is why I have cosponsored several pieces of legislation that will work to decrease the fiscal strain higher education can place on students. I've cosponsored the Student Loan Fairness Act, sponsored by Representative BASS, which is legislation designed to lend a helping hand to those struggling under massive amounts of student loans. This legislation actually caps interest rates for Federal loans and improves and expands public service loan forgiveness and creates a 10–10 loan repayment plan.

We must—we must keep our education loan rates stable, responsible, and affordable. We must find a solution that will allow college students to benefit from the 3.4 percent interest rates on subsidized Stafford loans. We must advance legislation that includes student loan reform in a way that provides realistic opportunities for our students to secure good jobs and pay off their student loans without falling into financial crisis.

I will continue to advocate for better ways to lessen the financial burden of higher education for all students in this country. Our Nation's students and families deserve an affordable education.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from Ohio for her great leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to let us know how many minutes are remaining in today's Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We've been joined now by another dynamic member of the freshman class, who arrived a couple of months earlier than the rest of us. He has gotten off to a tremendous start. I now yield to my distinguished colleague from the Garden State, the always nattily dressed Representative DONALD PAYNE, Jr.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for anchoring tonight's CBC Special Order on student loans and thank Congressman JEFFRIES for that kind observation.

Access to quality education is the basis the American Dream. In 1965, the Higher Education Act was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Lyndon Baines Johnson, a former rural schoolhouse teacher, who fully understood that education is the greatest equalizer.

Since then, student aid in this country has been a springboard that gives hardworking students with low- to moderate-income the opportunity to realize their goals and transcend economic status. The Federal Pell Grant program helps more than 9 million students get to and through college. Unfortunately, while Pell Grants cover a significant portion of tuition, currently it pays for less than one-third of a student's tuition at most 4-year public colleges.

Given rising tuition costs and the decline in family incomes, the importance of financial aid has only increased with time. The cost of college tuition in the U.S. has increased by more than 1,000 percent—yes, 1,000 percent—since the 1980s. This is more than the growth in the consumer price index. At the same time, the Federal Pell Grant is covering an even smaller percentage of the overall college cost.

As a result, the success of our graduates is being hampered by mounting debt. Two-thirds of college seniors who graduated in 2011 accumulated more than $26,000 in student loan debt. And I am increasingly concerned about New Jersey's graduates, who hold the 10th highest debt among college students in our Nation.

And while the cost of an education rises and the amount of the student debt skyrockets, young people struggle to find work. They've done everything we've asked them to do. They've worked hard, they've gotten an education, but unemployment for young college graduates remains at 8.8 percent.

So our graduates' dreams of making it on their own are stifled. They are forced to put their lives on hold, move back home with their parents, and pinch pennies to pay off their mounting debt. Not only does this debt negatively impact the quality of life for our young people, but it weakens our economy and our workforce as well. Financial constraints caused by student loan debt discourage recent graduates from pursuing public service jobs in medical fields that serve our seniors in low-income communities.

Yet knowing all of this, my Republican colleagues have been working overtime to exacerbate the problem and make college even less affordable.

□ 2120

The 2014 budget eliminates mandating funding for Pell Grants and freezes the maximum grant for 10 years while also cutting eligibility; and as of July 1, Federal student loan rates are set to double. Instead of adopting efforts to keep interest rates low for young people in a volatile economic environment, my Republican colleagues have introduced a bill—and are voting on it this week—that can increase rates far beyond this July increase. As I like to call it, it's the Making College More Expensive Act.

Mr. Speaker, I beg your patience as I go through a little rudimentary arithmetic.

Right now, student loan interest rates are fixed at 3.4 percent, meaning a student pays about $4,000 in interest payments on a 5-year loan. If we do nothing and let the interest rate expire this July, rates will double to 6.8 percent, and a student will pay nearly $9,000—more than the double—on the same 5-year loan. Now, if we do what the Republicans want us to do and pass their bill this week, student loan interest rates will skyrocket to an estimated 7.4 percent, and the same student would pay $10,000 in interest. In other words, if we do absolutely nothing—nothing at all—it would be better than if we pass the Republicans' proposed bill in the House.

Now, I'm not suggesting that we do nothing—this body must act—but it is a sad reality when doing nothing is better than going along with what the Republicans are pushing. Rather than invest in our future leaders and entrepreneurs of America, they propose to balance the budget on the backs of low- to moderate-income students. I fear that, by ignoring a generation buried under debt, we will cripple this country's future.

This great Nation is supposed to be a land of opportunity for all regardless of what you look like or where you come from. Throughout our history, the opportunities afforded to people of various backgrounds have built this Nation, creating a large and thriving middle class. Access to education has been the catalyst to this growth. As we look to our future, it is critical that we place education at the forefront of the plans for our success. We can start by stopping the doubling of student loan

interest rates and by once again making a college education affordable for all of those who want one.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

As we close, this chart really illustrates the magnitude of the collective problem confronting younger Americans in the United States of America. The student loan debt burden has now exceeded $1 trillion. Now, in this Chamber, we hear a lot about the debt crisis facing America, but we have a student loan debt crisis that must be addressed.

I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Nevada, STEVEN HORSFORD, for his thoughts on this matter.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you, Representative JEFFRIES.

This chart and this number should alarm every American family. As you just indicated, in this body there are those on the other side of the aisle who talk about not burdening the next generation with a debt that they cannot afford to pay. It is for us, as leaders, to do our job now so that they don't have to bear that burden in the next generation. This is why this issue is so fundamental and why we must get this policy right, so that we don't burden the next generation of students.

We have increasing numbers who are low-income and who now have that opportunity for the first time ever to go to college. We have increasing numbers who are minority students, first-generation students who need to pursue their educations without the burden of a $1 trillion debt from taking out student loans. The Huffington Post reported recently that the spread between what the government pays to borrow and what it charges students creates a profit this fiscal year of more than 36 cents off every dollar lent to borrowers.

So the question is: Why are our colleagues on the other side proposing a measure to increase interest rates on students and families?

That money does not go to the Department of Education, Mr. Speaker. That money goes to the Treasury, which goes to pay down the Federal debt. So the proposal on the other side actually charges students, an increasing number of low-income and minority students, more money in order to pay down the Federal debt so that the other side can keep corporate tax breaks for Big Oil, big banks, and millionaires. That's what this fundamentally comes down to. It's why every American should be concerned with this policy, and why we're coming up with a Democratic alternative worthy of support.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

We will continue to do all that we can to make college affordable for every single American.

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, once again, we have been pushed to a political standoff over an important issue that affects the future of our nation. On July 1, college students will see the interest rates on their federal loans double. College is becoming less and less affordable each day, and the bill the majority has offered for a vote this week, H.R. 1911 the Smarter Solutions for Students Act, provides no reprieve for college students. In fact, if this bill becomes law, it would make college more expensive for students and their parents than if Congress did nothing and let the interest rates double. It shouldn't be titled the Smarter Solutions Act, but rather, the Making College More Expensive Act.

It is not simply rhetoric or a baseless claim to state that the Republican bill will increase the cost of college. The Congressional Research Service looked at different scenarios where a student or their parent would use a federal loan in order to pay for college and how much that loan would cost under the Republican plan if rates were frozen at 3.4 percent, and if rates were allowed to double to 6.8 percent. Based on projected interest rates, CRS found that the Republican-led H.R. 1911 would increase interest payments under each scenario. If we look at one particular scenario, a student who borrowed the maximum amount of subsidized and unsubsidized loans for five years would see their interest payments increase over the lifetime of the loan by 14.5 percent, compared to allowing fares to double. The Republican plan would cost an astounding 45 percent more than if we froze current interest rates at 3.4 percent.

The Congressional Budget Office also looked at the total cost of H.R. 1911 for families looking to send their sons and daughters to college. They found that over 10 years, H.R. 1911 would cost working families an additional $3.7 billion in interest payments. The federal government should not be in the business of profiting off of the backs of students and their parents. We should be helping them pursue a higher education, not squeezing them for every penny they have.

Let's work together on a common sense proposal that makes federal loans affordable and allows young people to obtain a degree without burdening them with insurmountable student debt. We need real solutions that will help young Americans succeed and make our country stronger.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of an urgent personal family matter.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 743. An act to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 21, 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:

1534. A letter from the PRAB Branch Chief, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program: Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Grant Program (RIN: 0584-AE07) received April 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1535. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting FY 2014 Budget Amendments for the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, the Interior, Justice, State, and Transportation, as well as Other International Programs, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Federal Trade Commission; (H. Doc. No. 113-31); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1536. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 12 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1537. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Report on the Recruiter Incentive Pay Pilot Program, pursuant to Section 681 of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2006; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1538. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report presenting the specific amount of staff-years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense Federally Funded Research and Development Center during fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1539. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Ethiopian Airlines Enterprise, SC of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1540. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Air China Limited (Air China), Beijing, China pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1541. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Contractor Legal Management Requirements; Acquisition Regulations (RIN: 1990-AA37) received May 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1542. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commissions final rule — Connect America Fund; Developing an Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime; Joint Petition of Price Cap Holding Companies for Conversation of Average schedule Affiliates to Price

Cap Regulation and for Limited Waiver Relief; Consolidated Communications Companies Tariff F.C.C. No. 2; Frontier Telephone Companies Tariff F.C.C. No. 10; Windstream Telephone System Tariff F.C.C. No. 7 [WC Docket No.: 10-90] [CC Docket No.: 01-92] [WC Docket No.: 12-63] [Transmittal No.: 41] [Transmittal No.: 28] [Transmittal No.: 57] received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1543. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules [WP Docket No.: 07-100] received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1544. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commissions final rule — Final License Renewal Interim Staff Guidance: Wall Thinning Due to Erosion Mechanisms [LR-ISG-2012-01] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1545. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-28, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1546. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the heading ''Loan Guarantees to Israel'' in Chapter 5 of Title I of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Pub. L. 108-11); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1547. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-70, ''Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development Limited Grant-Making Authority Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1548. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-68, ''Department of Health Grant-Making Authority Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1549. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-69, ''Health Benefit Exchange Authority Establishment Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1550. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting FY 2012 Annual Performance Report and FY 2014 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1551. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1552. A letter from the Librarian, Library of Congress, transmitting the Annual Report of the Library of Congress, for the fiscal year 2012, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 139; to the Committee on House Administration.

1553. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Disclosure of Returns and Return Information to Designee of Taxpayer [TD 9618] (RIN: 1545-BJ19) received May 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1554. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Annual Price Inflation Adjustment for Contribution Limitations Made to a Health Savings Account Pursuant to Section 223 of the Internal Revenue Code (Rev. Proc. 2013-25) received May 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1555. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Services final rule — Updating of Employer Identification Numbers (RIN: 1545-BK02) [TD 9617] received May 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1556. A letter from the Assistant Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — IIR-Electric Generation Assets Units of Property (Rev. Proc. 2013-24) received May 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1557. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revised Exhibit: Acknowledgement Letter Voluntary Correction Program (VCP) Submissions (Announcement 2013-21) received May 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1911. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013; with an amendment (Rept. 113–82, Pt. 1). Referred to the committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1949. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level; with an amendment (Rept. 113–83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 258. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military declarations or medals (Rept. 113–84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1073. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for protection of maritime navigation and prevention of nuclear terrorism, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 271. A bill to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1417. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy to gain and maintain operational control of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1911 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. TERRY (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia):

H.R. 2052. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report to Congress on ways to increase the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia):

H.R. 2053. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to apply budget neutrality on a State-specific basis in the calculation of the Medicare hospital wage index floor for non-rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 2054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the avoidance of tax by insurance companies through reinsurance with non-taxed affiliates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2055. A bill to establish a prize program to award a prize and contract for the development of a fully-integrated electronic health records program for use by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BERA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENYART, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JONES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.R. 2056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit to certain recently discharged

veterans, to improve the coordination of veteran job training services between the Department of Labor, the Department of Veteran Affairs, and the Department of Defense, to require transparency for Executive departments in meeting the Government-wide goals for contracting with small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Armed Services, Small Business, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 2057. A bill to remove from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System the areas comprising Bay County Unit P-31P in Florida; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MORAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2058. A bill to improve and enhance research and programs on childhood cancer survivorship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RUNYAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 2059. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure the issuance of regulations applicable to the Coast Guard regarding consideration of a request for a permanent change of station or unit transfer submitted by a member of the Coast Guard who is the victim of a sexual assault; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 2060. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to restore for the remainder of fiscal year 2013 budgetary resources sequestered on March 1, 2013, for that fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Agriculture, 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. GRAYSON:

H. Res. 225. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H. Res. 226. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the fourth week in April as ''Every Kid Healthy Week''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. GRIMM):

H. Res. 227. A resolution calling on the President to work toward equitable, constructive, stable, and durable Armenian-Turkish relations based upon the Republic of Turkey's full acknowledgment of the facts and ongoing consequences of the Armenian Genocide, and a fair, just, and comprehensive international resolution of this crime against humanity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENTS

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. TERRY:

H.R. 2052.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2053.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 2054.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 2055.

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

The Constitutional Authority for this bill derives from Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 2056.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 2057.

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

Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill. 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 Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2058.

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

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 2059.

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

Military Regulation: Article I, Section 8, Clauses 14 and 18

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation and naval Forces; and

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

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 2060.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 & 18; and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 148: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 155: Mr. ENYART, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 164: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 184: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 207: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 241: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 258: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 262: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 292: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 341: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 362: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 363: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 366: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 451: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 460: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 499: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 556: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 569: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 574: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 612: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 664: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 679: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 685: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 688: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 698: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 755: Mr. ENYART and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 769: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 778: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 787: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 799: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 850: Mr. HOLT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 855: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 871: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 872: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POLIS and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 873: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 875: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 888: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 920: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 940: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SALMON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BARR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 948: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 961: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 975: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 983: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 986: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1020: Mr. REED, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1024: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RADEL, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1040: Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 1091: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1150: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1151: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1154: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1174: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1176: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1213: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 1214: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1252: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1286: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1290: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1303: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1340: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1344: Mr. KILMER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 1346: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1380: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1389: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1438: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1492: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1518: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1520: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1527: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1572: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1577: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1632: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1696: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1701: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 1717: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COBLE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. NUGENT, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1729: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1733: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1734: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. MENG, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1735: Mr. LONG, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1737: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1772: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 1795: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1797: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1805: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. KILMER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 1809: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 1814: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KINGSTON, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN.
H.R. 1825: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 1827: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1838: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1840: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1845: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1847: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1848: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1852: Mr. POLIS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. AMASH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BARTON, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BARR, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 1867: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1870: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1874: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 1882: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 1891: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 1908: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1911: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1916: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 1962: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CHU, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1963: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1971: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1979: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1982: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2000: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 2009: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BARR, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. COLE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2010: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2016: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2020: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HANNA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLAY, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2022: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2036: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2044: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.J. Res. 20: Mr. CONYERS.
H.J. Res. 21: Mr. CONYERS.
H. Res. 109: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. MORAN.
H. Res. 112: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COSTA, and Ms. CLARKE.
H. Res. 156: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. Res. 167: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. DUFFY.
H. Res. 190: Mr. HIMES.
H. Res. 206: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 211: Mr. FARR.
H. Res. 212: Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 213: Mr. NEAL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 214: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H. Res. 218: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.