United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2013 No. 98

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 10, 2013.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

END THE SEQUESTER

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, beginning this week, literally hundreds of thousands of civilian workers are being furloughed at defense installations in Maryland's Fifth District, across the State, and around the country. That means as of Monday, more than 650,000 hardworking, middle class defense employees are being forced to take a 20 percent pay cut for the remainder of the fiscal year.

It isn't because they are not doing their job well; they are.

It isn't because they don't have enough work; they do.

And it isn't because we don't need their talents, their experience, and their dedication to service; we need them more now than ever.

These employees are being furloughed because Congress has failed. Congress has failed to achieve deficit reduction in a balanced and responsible way. In fact, we passed a budget through the House of Representatives; the United States Senate has passed a budget. But the House of Representatives, Republican leadership, refuses to go to conference, refuses to follow regular order for which they've called so frequently, refuses to try to bring a compromise agreement back to this floor. This Congress has failed to achieve deficit reduction in a balanced and responsible way.

Instead, we now have the sequester—a senseless, stupid, irrational policy. It's a real shame, Mr. Speaker, that partisan politics is keeping some of our country's best and brightest from doing their jobs supporting our warfighters as they serve in Afghanistan and around the world.

Last Tuesday, I met with some of the outstanding men and women who work in civilian defense jobs at Pax River Naval Air Station in my district. When you go to Pax River, you often see uniformed and civilian personnel sitting side by side, working to accomplish the same mission, serving with the same dedication, partners in making our government stronger and making our defense stronger, each complementing the work of the other.

Now, as a result of these furloughs, one of them will get a 20 percent pay cut. One of them will be told to go home. One of them will be told you can't even volunteer to come back and get the job done. And the other will get one day a week of having to carry out the mission alone.

At that meeting, I heard from members of the Pax River community who are deeply concerned about the effects of these furloughs on our military readiness, our ongoing missions, on Department morale, and on the local economy. They were concerned about themselves, but they were mainly concerned about the job that was going to be left undone, finished late, undermining our security. One person scheduled to be furloughed this Friday told me:

> I have a strong work ethic, and I want to get the job done, whether it's late nights and weekends. And I'm worried someone will come to me on a Thursday and I'll have to say, I can't get the job done until Monday.

Because, Mr. Speaker, we are telling that person you can't come to work.

Another employee who was there last Tuesday emailed me afterward about the upcoming furlough writing:

> There are many people in this organization who stretch themselves day after day, happily, to get the work done that needs to get done to support the Department of Defense and the warfighter.

I will tell you, and so many Members on both sides of the aisle have met these folks, not these specific folks perhaps at Pax, but around this country who are dedicated, patriotic, hardworking, and want to make sure that their country is strong and that we serve our people.

This one constituent continues:

''I've already started to see some of these same people giving less of themselves because they feel our Congressmen,'' that's meaning all of us, ''and our country no longer put value in what they do.''

We are undermining the morale of the American workers. We are undermining the ability of the American Government to be as effective with respect to national defense as it needs to be.

Mr. Speaker, this sequester is harming morale and may lead skilled employees to leave for the private sector just when we need them most.

Printed on recycled paper.

The effects of the sequester extend beyond the gates of our installations and affect entire communities with local businesses standing to lose as a result of belt tightening by families experiencing furloughs.

At the Naval Surface Warfare Center at Indian Head, also in Maryland's Fifth Congressional District, 97 percent of civilian personnel will be furloughed. That's more than 1,870 people.

Mr. Speaker, there's no reason why our civilian defense workers should be kept from doing their job just because Congress hasn't done its job. As long as the sequester remains in effect, and as long as Republicans refuse to compromise on a balanced approach to deficits that can end it, I'll keep coming to this floor and remind them exactly what is at stake. And I continue to call on Speaker BOEHNER to end the unnecessary delay in appointing budget conferees, which would be a significant step toward beginning negotiations in earnest that could lead to a big and balanced compromise on deficits.

We need to bring deficits down. We need to get our country on a fiscally sustainable path, but we need to do so in a rational way which does not undermine our national security, does not undermine the services being rendered to the people who are relying on them, and that does not send a message to our employees and those whom we need to recruit in the future that we are a good employer, we're a caring employer, we're an effective employer, and you ought to work for us, you ought to work for your country, for your fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we need to go to conference. We need to get rid of the sequester. We need to put America on a rational path to fiscal responsibility and effectiveness.

BENGHAZI MATTERS

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, Benghazi matters, and the American people deserve answers.

On the evening of September 11, 2012, terrorist factions successfully attacked America in Benghazi, Libya, when they torched our consulate and killed four Americans. Early in the morning the following day, they attacked our annex.

Secretary Clinton's response to the American people was that these attacks were in response to a video posted on the Internet. The following Sunday, on September 16, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Susan Rice repeated Secretary Clinton's assertion on five separate television talk shows.

Today is July 10, 2013, and we now know that without question these attacks were strategically planned and had no relation to Secretary Clinton or Ambassador Rice's initial assertions. The investigation into our failure to protect those four Americans who were killed, our consulate, our annex, and the administration's abysmal explanation for informing the American public must continue.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Clinton appeared before a Senate hearing and was asked about certain facts surrounding the attack. She replied: What difference does it make?

I suggest that Secretary Clinton may want to consult with the survivors of the four Americans who were slain and ask them what difference does it make. I take umbrage with her response, and I think it was done in a rather uncaring and very impersonal way.

Investigating this scandal is our duty and obligation as representatives of the American people and protectors of the public trust. To date, congressional hearings have raised far more questions than answers. We have to look no further than the testimony of Mr. Gregory Hicks before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Mr. Hicks is the former Deputy Chief of Mission in Libya, and his testimony is replete with contradictions from what Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Rice and others have told the American public. The matter, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, smacks of a coverup. We must continue to pursue and develop answers and explanations as to what happened so we will ultimately know what really did occur on that fateful night and ensuing days.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, Benghazi matters, and we must continue thoroughly to examine this until the truth ultimately surfaces. It matters, and the American public, Americans taxpayers, here, there, and yonder, deserve a final resolution to this episode. I suggest that we continue to keep our eye on the ball, otherwise this is going to disappear into the wind and that would be inexcusable.

CALL TO ACTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's call to action on climate change is another reminder of the large and growing threat posed by the warming of our atmosphere. Yet instead of taking a leading role to address the problem, Congress has been held hostage by those who would deny the science altogether. Every day that we delay, we are losing ground in the race to develop new sources of energy that can protect the planet and break the grip of our dependence on fossil fuels.

This past year was one of the most extreme years for our Nation's weather. It was the warmest year on record for the U.S.; and droughts, wildfires, and floods were far more frequent and far more intense. In fact, nine of the 10 hottest years since 1880 have been in the past decade.

In 2012, 9.3 million acres of land across the country burned in wildfires, more than double the annual average, and the second highest ever. Rainfall was far below the average, and it was one of the driest years in memory. Droughts, heat waves, and wildfires are now the norm rather than the exception.

The extreme weather was also a significant drag on our economy: Superstorm Sandy cost $65 billion; western wildfires cost over $1 billion; and losses from drought cost $30 billion. Greenhouse gases emitted as a result of human activity are the biggest drivers of climate change. That is a fact that is accepted by virtually every scientist around the world.

We're only beginning to understand the impact of a global temperature rise on a nation's long-term environmental health and the health of the world; but with each new report by NASA, by the U.N., by universities here and overseas, we see that the threat grows and the possibility that we can avoid catastrophe and catastrophic consequences in the future recedes.

Some in this body have questioned the science, noting that droughts, floods, and climatic variations have been observed for centuries, often recalling Noah and his ark; but the speed and magnitude of the changes we are witnessing are consistent with scientific modeling of the effects of human activity on the climate. We must act now.

First, we have to diversify our energy sources. Instead of tax breaks for Big Oil, we should be investing in the development of new and renewable energy sources.

Second, we must work to reduce our emissions. Power plants are the single largest source of emissions in the U.S., accounting for roughly 40 percent of all domestic greenhouse gases, and the EPA must put in place Federal standards that will regulate both new and existing power plants.

Third, we must build a 21st-century transportation infrastructure and system that will support a growing economy and population. This means we need to invest in mass transit systems, and car makers must continue to improve fuel economy standards.

□ 1015

And fourth, we need to work with the international community, not against it, as many in this body have tried to do. America must take a leadership role. We need the cooperation of China and India, but we should not let their foot-dragging prevent us from taking actions that will protect our future.

President Obama took an important step in exerting American leadership on climate change when he called for action at the Federal level to curb carbon pollution, just as we limit our toxic chemicals, like mercury, sulfur, and arsenic. The President also wants to allow wind and solar energy companies to use government-owned land to generate more power.

These are good ideas, but a major effort on climate change depends on congressional action, and so far we have

allowed this important issue, one that will affect our children and grandchildren, to become a partisan wedge issue.

This country did not become great by ignoring problems or wishing them away. We did not become great by mocking scientists and those who would rely on cold, hard facts or, in this case, long, hot, endless summers. And we did not become great by ceding leadership in new technologies and new markets to our competitors, like China.

The time to address climate change is now.

IN DEFENSE OF LEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, America is a Nation of immigrants. We're all either immigrants ourselves or were the sons and daughters of immigrants. America's motto is ''E pluribus unum''—''From many, one.'' From many nations we've created one great Nation, the American Nation.

There's only one way to accomplish this remarkable feat, and that's through the process of assimilation. Unlike other nations, our immigration laws were not written to keep people out. They were written to assure that those who come here demonstrate a sincere desire to become Americans, to acquire a common language, a common culture, and a common appreciation of American constitutional principles and American legal traditions.

Illegal immigration undermines that process of legal immigration that makes our Nation of immigrants possible. If we allow illegal immigration, then legal immigration becomes pointless, the process of assimilation that our immigration laws assure breaks down, and the bonds of allegiance that hold a country like ours together begin to dissolve.

As a recent article by John Fonte of the National Review points out, earlier immigration bills included a provision calling for ''patriotic integration of prospective citizens into the American way of life by providing civics, history, and English . . . with a special emphasis on attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, the heroes of American history, and the meaning of the Oath of Allegiance.''

But the director of immigration policy for La Raza objected to this language, writing that ''while it doesn't overtly mention assimilation, it's very strong on the patriotism and traditional American values language in a way which is potentially dangerous to our communities.''

Well, that language is pointedly missing from the Senate measure, suggesting a purpose fundamentally different from past immigration laws. It raises the question of why groups supporting this bill find the mention of assimilation objectionable and consider patriotism and traditional American values not only disagreeable but, in their word, ''dangerous.''

Now, to those who say that we need a path to citizenship, I must point out we already have such a path that is followed by millions of legal immigrants who have obeyed all of our laws, who have respected our Nation's sovereignty, who've done everything our country's asked of them to do, including waiting patiently in line, and are now watching millions of illegal immigrants try and cut in line in front of them.

The 1986 Immigration Reform Act promised a balanced approach that combined legalization of the 3 million illegal immigrants then in the country with promises of employer sanctions and tougher border security. As we all know, legalization occurred instantly, but the promises of enforcement were first ignored and, later, actively resisted by the Presidents who followed.

The current administration, for all its rhetoric, has unlawfully suspended enforcement of our existing immigration laws and actively obstructed States from assisting in their enforcement. If this administration will not enforce our existing law, why should anyone believe its promises to enforce even stricter laws in the future?

Now, a common tactic of those on the left is to blur the distinction between legal and illegal immigration and to paint those in opposition to amnesty as ''anti-immigrant.'' This is simply dishonest.

Legal immigration is the very essence of our country. It sets us apart from every other nation in the world, the fact that citizenship is open to all who evince a sincere desire to understand, adopt, and revere those uniquely American principles enshrined in our Declaration of Independence and animated by our American Constitution.

They do so by the thousands, every day, by obeying our immigration laws, renouncing foreign loyalties, and embracing American principles. By doing so, as Lincoln said, they become the ''blood of the blood and the flesh of the flesh of the men who wrote that Declaration.''

Illegal immigration destroys all of that, and any measure that encourages more of it, by granting special privileges to those who defy our immigration laws, is a direct affront to every legal immigrant who has become an American, and it is a direct challenge to the process of immigration that built our Nation.

To those illegal immigrants who seek citizenship out of a sincere desire to become Americans, I ask only that they respect our laws, and I invite them to begin the process of legal immigration that's already available to them and that's been followed by the millions who've come before them.

RURAL HUNGER IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, nearly every week that this House has been in session this year, I've come to the floor to talk about the need to end hunger now. Fourteen speeches later, I still hear from some of my colleagues who doubt that hunger is a problem in the 21st century here in this country, the richest, most prosperous Nation in the world.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that anyone who doubts that we have a hunger problem in America has a chance to read the article by Eli Saslow in Sunday's Washington Post, titled, ''Driving Away Hunger,'' subtitled, ''In Rural Tennessee, a New Way to Help Hungry Children, A Bus Turned Bread Truck.''

Mr. Speaker, this is a heartwrenching story of hunger, where children of all ages have trouble getting enough food in the summer months in rural Tennessee. It breaks your heart.

The article may focus on a small area in rural Tennessee, but it really tells the story about the 50 million hungry Americans in this country, and more specifically, the 17 million kids who are hungry in this country.

And the blame shouldn't be cast on these poor Americans who are doing their best to make ends meet. Consider the Laghren family portrayed in this article. Jennifer, a mother of five, works full-time as a cook at a nursing home. Yet her kids don't have enough to eat because Jennifer only makes $8 an hour.

SNAP helps during the school year when kids get to eat two meals a day at school. Combined, these five kids, ranging from 14 years old to 9 months old, ate a total of 40 free meals and snacks at school every week, but there's very little help during the summer months when school is out of session.

While the $593 food stamp allotment lasted throughout the month during the school year, Jennifer only had $73 in food stamps left, with 17 days to go in the month that she was interviewed for this article in The Washington Post.

And if that weren't enough to convince people about this ugly side of hunger, consider this heartbreaking paragraph from the article.

> Desperation had become their permanent state, defining each of their lives in different ways. For Courtney, it meant that she had stayed rail thin, with hand-me-down jeans that fell low on her hips. For Taylor, 14, it meant stockpiling calories whenever food was available, ingesting enough processed sugar and salt to bring on a doctor's lecture about obesity and the early onset of diabetes, the most common risks of a food stamp diet. For Anthony, 9, it meant moving out of the trailer and usually living at his grandparents' farm. For Hannah, 7, it meant her report card had been sent home with a handwritten note of the teacher's concerns, one of

which read, ''Easily distracted by other people eating.'' For Sarah, the 9-month-old baby, it meant sometimes being fed Mountain Dew out of the can after she finished her formula, a dose of caffeine that kept her up at night.

Mr. Speaker, this is all taking place in rural Tennessee. That's right, Mr. Speaker. Hunger doesn't just exist in urban areas. According to USDA statistics, rural areas are poorer than urban areas. And according to the latest USDA data, households in rural areas were more likely to be food insecure. While 14.9 percent of all households were food insecure in 2011, 15.4 percent of households in rural areas were food insecure.

And let's look at the SNAP statistics. While 16 percent of all Americans live in nonmetropolitan areas, 21 percent of SNAP beneficiaries live there. Ten percent of the rural population relies on SNAP, compared to 7 percent of the urban population. Children under 18 make up 25 percent of the rural population, but they are 40 percent of the rural population using SNAP.

These statistics show empirically that hunger is a problem in rural America. Sunday's article paints a terrible and disturbing picture about hunger in rural America. And together, they show why we must commit ourselves to end hunger now.

That's why it is so disturbing to me that so many of my Republican friends seem hell-bent on cutting huge amounts from the SNAP program, literally throwing millions of Americans off the program. It shows a stunning ignorance of current reality, and it shows a callousness that, quite frankly, is beneath this institution.

During the recent debate on the farm bill, I had heard a number of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle demean the poor in this country and diminish their struggle. I heard rhetoric from some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle characterizing these Americans who are struggling in poverty in inappropriate and demeaning ways. It was offensive, some of the rhetoric that was spouted here on this floor.

I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to reject any assault on the SNAP program.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to end hunger now, but we must take it. We need some leadership. We need leadership in this House, but we also need leadership from the White House in order to get this done. We need the White House to host a conference on food and nutrition. We need the President to bring the best and brightest minds from any and every corner of this Nation together, lock them in a room, and direct them to come up with a plan. It is not hard.

We need the political will to end hunger now. This issue needs to be more of a priority.

RISING STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID stated, ''If we do nothing, student loan rates go to 6.8 percent,'' as reported by Politico.

In case the Leader forgot, interest rates doubled to 6.8 percent last week. The House acted to prevent it. The Senate did not.

Today, The Washington Post Editorial Board writes:

> The Senate is set to consider on Wednesday the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act in what could be the Chamber's only reaction to the recent doubling of a low student loan interest rate . . . lawmakers should reject this pathetic nonsolution.

The editorial continues:

> With the President and the House in near alignment on the student loan issue, the Senate has no excuse to fail. Mr. Obama should press Democrats hard and work with Republicans to strike a deal, not to vote for dead-end policy.

Unfortunately, rather than solve problems, the Senate is wasting the American people's time and moving forward with another dead-end policy, what today's Post refers to as another ''campaign gimmick.''

The people deserve better. Our students deserve better in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has no excuse.

IT'S TIME TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE'S WASHINGTON FOOTBALL FRANCHISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, it's time that the National Football League and the NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell face the reality that the continued use of the word ''redskin'' is unacceptable. It is a racist, derogatory term and patently offensive to Native Americans.

The Native American community has spent millions of dollars over the past two decades trying earnestly to fight the racism that is perpetuated by this slur.

□ 1030

The fact that the NFL and Commissioner Goodell continue to deny this is a shameful testament of the mistreatment of Native Americans for so many years. It is quite obvious that once the American public understands why the word ''redskins'' is so offensive, they'll know that the word should never be used again.

The origin of the term ''redskins'' is commonly attributed to the historical practice of trading Native American Indian scalps and body parts as bounties and trophies. For example, in 1749, the British bounty on the Mi'kmaq Nation of what is now Maine and Nova Scotia was a straightforward ''10 Guineas for every Indian Mi'kmaq taken or killed, to be paid upon producing such savage taken or his scalp.''

Just as devastating was the Phips Proclamation, issued in 1755 by Spencer Phips, lieutenant governor and commander in chief of the Massachusetts Bay Province, who called for the wholesale extermination of the Penobscot Indian Nation. By vote of the General Court of the Province, settlers were paid out of the public treasury for killing and scalping the Penobscot people. The bounty for a male Penobscot Indian above the age of 12 years was 50 pounds, and his scalp was worth 40 pounds. The bounty for a female Penobscot Indian of any age and for the males under the age of 12 was 25 pounds, while their scalps were worth 20 pounds. These scalps, Mr. Speaker, were called ''redskins.''

The question is quite simple. Suppose that that redskin scalp that was bought for payment was the scalp of your mother, the scalp of your wife, the scalp of your daughter, the scalp of your father, the scalp of your husband, or of your son. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, Native Americans are human beings, not animals.

The current chairman and chief of the Penobscot Nation, Chief Kirk Francis, recently declared in a joint statement that ''redskins'' is ''not just a racial slur or derogatory term'' but a painful ''reminder of one of the most gruesome acts of ethnic cleansing ever committed against the Penobscot people.'' The hunting and killing of Penobscot Indians, as stated by Chief Francis, was ''a most despicable and disgraceful act of genocide.''

Recently, myself and nine Members of Congress explained the violent history and disparaging nature of the term ''redskins'' in a letter to Mr. Dan Snyder, owner of the Washington football franchise. Similar letters were sent to Mr. Frederick Smith, president and CEO of FedEx, a key sponsor of the franchise, and Mr. Roger Goodell, commissioner of the National Football League. As of today, Mr. Snyder has not yet responded. Mr. Smith ignored our letter as well, opting instead to have a staff member cite contractual obligations as FedEx's reason for its silence on the subject.

Mr. Goodell, however, in a dismissive manner, declared that the team's name ''is a unifying force that stands for strength, courage, pride, and respect.'' Give me a break, Mr. Speaker. In other words, the National Football League is telling everyone—Native Americans included—that they cannot be offended because the NFL means no offense. Essentially, Mr. Goodell attempts to wash away the stain from a history of persecution against Native American people by spreading twisted and false information concerning the use of the

word ''redskins'' by one of the NFL's richest franchises. It is absolute absurdity.

Mr. Goodell's response is indicative of the Washington football franchise's own racist and bigoted beginnings. The team's founder, George Preston Marshall, is identified by historians as the driving force behind the effort to prevent African Americans from playing in the NFL. And once African Americans were allowed to play in 1946, Marshall was the last club owner to field an African American player—a move he reluctantly made some 14 years later in 1962. It should be noted that Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy presented Marshall with an ultimatum—unless Marshall signed an African American player, the government would revoke his franchise's 30-year lease on the use of the D.C. Stadium.

Congressman TOM COLE, the Representative from Oklahoma, Co-Chair of the Congressional Native American Caucus, and a member of the Chickasaw Nation, states: ''This is the 21st century. This is the capital of political correctness on the planet. It is very, very, very offensive. This isn't like warriors or chiefs. It's not a term of respect, and it's needlessly offensive to a large part of our population. They just don't happen to live around Washington, DC.''

Congresswoman BETTY MCCOLLUM, the Representative from Minnesota and Co-Chair of the Congressional Native American Caucus, states that Mr. Goodell's letter ''is another attempt to justify a racial slur on behalf of [Mr.] Dan Snyder,'' owner of the Washington franchise, ''and other NFL owners who appear to be only concerned with earning ever larger profits, even if it means exploiting a racist stereotype of Native Americans. For the head of a multi-billion dollar sports league to embrace the twisted logic that '[r]edskin' actually 'stands for strength, courage, pride, and respect' is a statement of absurdity.''

Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the Representative from the District of Columbia, states that Mr. Snyder ''is a man who has shown sensibilities based on his own ethnic identity, [yet] who refuses to recognize the sensibilities of American Indians.''

Recently, in an interview with USA Today Newspaper, Mr. Snyder defiantly stated, ''We'll never change the name. It's that simple. NEVER—you can use caps.'' Mr. Snyder's statement is totally inconsistent with the NFL's diversity policy.

Let me be clear on this—I love and respect Mr. Snyder's people. They gave to mankind the Torah, the Bible, the Koran—the prophets like Adam, Methuselah, Enoch, Moses, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—and yes, and even our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

But I also want to remind Mr. Snyder that six million of his people were gassed, tortured, murdered, and even skinned by the Nazis to make lamp shades and other forms of horrifying experimentations. Time will not allow me to elaborate further. But let me be clear—I would be among the first to defend Mr. Snyder and his people against racial intolerance. All I ask is for Mr. Snyder to do the same for our Native Americans.

Despite the Native American community's best efforts before administrative agencies and the courts, the term ''redskins'' remains a federally registered trademark. It has been well over twenty years and this matter is still before the courts. This injustice is the result of negligence and a cavalier attitude demonstrated by a federal agency charged with the responsibility of not allowing racist or derogatory terms to be registered as trademarks. Since the Federal Government made the mistake in registering the disparaging trademark, it is now up to Congress to correct it.

REAL JUSTICE AND MILITARY JUSTICE

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

Ms. SPEIER. Today, I'd like to highlight two very important topics: real justice and military justice. As a recent case of sexual abuse illustrates, they are far from one in the same.

Last fall, Lieutenant Colonel James Wilkerson was convicted of sexual assault by a military jury. The assault took place in Wilkerson's own home, as his wife and child slept upstairs. The all-male jury—four colonels and one lieutenant colonel—was unanimous in their ruling: guilty. Wilkerson was sentenced to 1 year in prison, a less than honorable discharge, and a loss of benefits. Three months later, General Craig Franklin, a three-star general who had originally called for the court-martial, overturned the punishment. General Franklin has no legal training. Wilkerson was free and clear and reinstated on Active Duty.

Now, that's quite a reversal, you'd say. There must have been some ironclad, watertight, slam-dunk evidence for a general to negate a jury of five officers, right? Some silver-bullet testimony? Sorry, no. In this case, the reasoning for the general's stunning intervention was ''character.'' The general simply felt that Wilkerson was a ''doting father and husband.'' You know, a family man.

Okay, you say. Maybe the general considered solid evidence that calls the entire night into question. Sorry, no. It turns out General Franklin relied on evidence that was ruled inadmissible in court. Evidence like letters of support from Wilkerson's wingmen, who had his back. On the other hand, he ignored the results of a polygraph test that Wilkerson had failed.

Wait a minute, you say. Maybe this one terrible act was an isolated incident, horrible as it was. Sorry, no. Earlier this month, the Air Force acknowledged that Wilkerson had previously fathered a child through an extramarital affair. Adultery is a crime in the military, but only inside a 5-year statute of limitation. This crime from 8 years ago is no longer punishable. And it was kept quiet by the Air Force. Why? Because they say the Privacy Act prevented the disclosure of those actions without Wilkerson's permission. Can you believe that?

Those are the facts of the case. Currently, Wilkerson is slated to receive full military benefits, including a pension and health care, for life. And this is what military justice currently looks like. If the Uniform Code of Military Justice allows for such negligence and obstruction, then the Code is more than just outdated and ineffective; it's broken. It's damaging the military itself.

It's also obvious to any legal expert that General Franklin was out of his depth and overmatched in this situation. Is he a lawyer? No, he's not a lawyer. But you keep these proceedings in the chain of command and you get bias. You get a travesty. You get no justice at all.

Today, I'm demanding real justice. The Air Force needs to redeem itself. I call on the Air Force to convene an involuntary discharge board. For Wilkerson's gross misconduct, the Secretary of the Air Force should also do a grade determination and assess whether Wilkerson should be demoted to his rank at the time of his first offense. I've sent a letter to the Secretary demanding these actions. Twenty-five of my colleagues in the House have joined me and signed the letter.

We've heard repeatedly how bad this problem is. There are 26,000 cases of sexual assault a year. A tiny fraction of those are reported. It's rare that a case like the Wilkerson one ever gets to this stage. And when it does, look what happens. Zero tolerance evaporates and becomes zero accountability. Victims suffer all over again. The military continues to look inept, incompetent, arrogant, and unjust to everyone but to themselves.

In the meantime, we are left to describe this ongoing problem in any number of ways: a plague, a cancer, or simply a national embarrassment. Should we even consider this type of justice—this sham of military justice—worthy of our country and our values? I say ''no.'' I believe the American people would say a resounding ''no'' as well.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 38 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all to whom the authority of government is given. We pray that Your spirit of reconciliation and peace, of goodwill and understanding, will prevail on the hearts and in the lives of us all.

Encourage the Members of this House, O God, to use their abilities and talents in ways that bring righteousness to this Nation and to all people. Ever remind them of the needs of the poor, the homeless or forgotten, and those who live without freedom or liberty.

May Your spirit live with them and with each of us, and may Your grace surround us and those we love, that, in all things, we may be the people You would have us be in service to this great Nation.

May all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HOLDING. 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. 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. Will the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. GABBARD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today unable to understand why we stand by and watch as our country's future is threatened. It seems as though each week delivers a new disastrous element to the train wreck that is in ObamaCare.

Now that that implementation of ObamaCare's employer mandate has been delayed, more uncertainty has been created among business owners.

Mr. President, you cannot bargain with America's economy in hopes that your political philosophy succeeds.

I find it ironic that the President has now conveniently chosen to listen to the American people, when business owners like myself have been screaming for years. This administration is struggling to prove the merits of ObamaCare it initially advertised and now resorts to excuses. Delay after delay proves ObamaCare is unsustainable.

The bill was passed. We now finally know what's in the bill. Now it's time to repeal it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

STOP THE STUDENT LOAN RATE HIKE

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. My, my, my, Mr. Speaker.

Jade Andrushka is a Palm Beach State College student with big dreams and a small bank account. Her mother is a hospice social worker, has solely supported Jade while paying back her own student loans for over 20 years so that she and her daughter could have a better life.

Well, Mr. Speaker, July 1 has come and gone, and the Federal student loan rates have doubled, making college more expensive for millions of American families, including Jade and her mom, who now face two generations of loans.

Mr. Speaker, it takes a simple fix by Congress to do the right thing, reverse this excessive rate hike, and clear the path to one of the most important pathways to American prosperity—a college education.

My, my, my, Mr. Speaker. Can't we all work together to get this done?

GAS AND GROCERIES

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, when I go to the grocery store at home on Saturday mornings, I talk to Hoosier moms and dads concerned with high prices at the pump and the checkout line.

According to reports last month, gas prices in the five Midwestern States ranked in the top nine States nationally, with some folks in Indiana, motorists, paying $4 per gallon.

A Starke County constituent wrote to me on the Fourth of July and said he canceled his holiday plans because he needed to save money for a tank of gas. He wondered what is Congress doing about it.

How can we help hardworking Americans keep more money in their wallets and pay less for gas and groceries?

The House passed two bills to address high energy prices, to create more jobs, and move our country closer toward energy independence. I supported these commonsense measures for single parents, for families, college students, senior citizens struggling to make ends meet during these tough economic times.

I urge the Senate and the President to join the House and pass this legislation to open more offshore areas for the development of natural resources.

A trip to the grocery store or a stop at the gas station should not be breaking the bank of Americans. Let's show the American people Congress can work together on basic solutions to make their daily lives a bit easier.

SO MUCH LEFT UNDONE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, so much left undone.

Our students are crying out. Maybe they're saying, ''Mercy.''

To avoid this 6.8 percent increase in their rates, putting hundreds of thousands of dollars in debt on our college students, Congress must act immediately, and we must push and drive those who believe our students are not important.

Undone. The high unemployment of youth. In our meeting with the President yesterday, I mentioned the idea that we must construct a program that deals with underemployed or unemployed youth, particularly those high numbers in our minority community.

And then, of course, the prevention of youth violence, gun violence, that is a crucial issue for all of us. The Congressional Black Caucus will be working extensively with the President to help drive legislation that will pass reasonable gun violence prevention legislation but, more importantly as well, keep our young people alive, keep them

in school, and, yes, keep them studying, understanding and preventing gun violence from making them a victim.

This Congress must act now and end sequestration to make sure that America is treated well by this Nation.

OBAMACARE COSTS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the true cost of the Affordable Care Act is being revealed day by day. We knew from the beginning that the law was double counting more than $716 billion in cuts to Medicare to pay for the new entitlements. Another $115 billion in implementation costs were left off the books. Then we saw the $70 billion in projected revenues evaporate as the long-term care insurance plan was proven to be unsustainable and abandoned.

Now the President is telling us he needs more than double the anticipated amount to pay out the law's subsidies. Could this be because the administration will use the honor system to determine eligibility for subsidies, with no verification procedures in passing out subsidies?

Maybe we should use the honor system more often. We could trust that everyone paid their taxes. That would save us all money we spend on IRS agents.

We could trust that industries aren't polluting. That would save a lot of money we spend on the EPA.

Reagan used to say, ''Trust, but verify.'' The byword for this administration is ''Trust, and hope you aren't being defrauded.''

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, last month, the Senate passed historic comprehensive immigration reform, and now is the time for the House to act.

It is because of our family values that we cannot wait another year, another month, or another day to finally fix our broken immigration system. We must pass a bill that keeps families together, and we must do the right thing, the humane thing, and bring 11 million immigrants out of the shadows and into society. We must ensure that all who want to call this country home have a fair and reasonable road map to do so.

I urge the Republican leadership not to choose the partisan path. Instead, we should come together and pass bipartisan comprehensive legislation that will fix our immigration system and finally revitalize the American Dream.

The time to act is now.

CELEBRATING LUDINGTON PUMPED STORAGE PLANT'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate something. I'd like to take a moment to recognize a major milestone for the Ludington Pumped Storage unit that was built in Michigan's Second District four decades ago and continues to be a great success today.

Construction of the project, as the locals call it, began in 1969 and was completed in 1973 on the shores of Lake Michigan, south of Ludington. Today, employees back there are celebrating the plant's 40th anniversary.

The Ludington Pumped Storage Plant was the largest pumped storage hydroelectric facility in the world when it was constructed. It is 842 acres and is 2½ miles long and holds 27 billion gallons of water. There are six generating units at the plant that can produce enough electricity to power a city of 1.4 million residents.

This plant is an example of successful co-ownership between Consumers Energy and Detroit Edison, DTE Energy. By displacing higher costs, Ludington Pumped Storage Plant saves consumers and DTE customers millions of dollars each year.

What makes the plant's 40 employees most proud are the national awards that they've been earning for safe operation of the plant, however.

The future looks bright for the project. There is an $800 million investment that's being made on behalf of the customers from both utilities to overhaul and upgrade the plant to improve efficiency, and we just want to congratulate this plant today as it works to fit into our all-of-the-above energy plan.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, after President Obama's historic announcement of his climate action plan 2 weeks ago, we returned home to our congressional districts for a week, and some of us saw record-high temperatures and drought. Others witnessed unseasonably heavy rainfall and tidal flooding. And yet this week we return to a House that's heading in the wrong direction.

The Energy and Commerce Committee is debating a bill that would give the Department of Energy veto authority over EPA's public health rules. The Energy and Minerals Subcommittee spent yesterday in a hearing on the wonders of subsidized coal production.

Fighting climate change is the biggest imperative of our time. The stakes are high, and ignoring it will not make the problem go away.

President Obama's plan is a step in the right direction, and I'm encouraged that EPA is moving quickly on meaningful standards for power plants. Strong power plant standards are an imperative if we're going to avert the worst impacts of climate change.

We've got a lot of work to do, Mr. Speaker, and it's time to get this House headed in the right direction on climate policy.

HONORING DUSTIN DEFORD

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dustin Deford, a 24-year-old Montana native who was among the 19 Hotshot firefighters who recently died while battling a wildfire in Arizona.

The son of Reverend Steve and Celeste Deford, Dustin grew up in the small town of Ekalaka, Montana, where he was well known for his joyful spirit as well as his deep faith in Christ.

Dustin also had a passion for community service at an early age. In fact, he volunteered for the Carter County Rural Fire Department as soon as he turned 18 and continued working as a county firefighter every summer from 2007 until this year, when he earned a position on the Granite Mountain Hotshots in Arizona.

Cindy and I join all the people of Montana in mourning the loss of Dustin and all the brave firefighters who lost their lives on June 30. We are keeping Dustin's family and loved ones in our thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

□ 1215

PRIDE MONTH

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize San Diego's LGBT Pride Parade and Festival that will take place this weekend.

Messages of diversity and inclusiveness are at the heart of the LGBT community. I'm proud to stand with San Diego's LGBT community and LGBT men and women across the country in commemorating their history and working for their future success. From that iconic night at Stonewall to Harvey Milk to the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell to the overturning of DOMA and Prop 8, we've experienced uneven but unmistakable progress toward equality.

As we recognize and celebrate our LGBT family and friends, we must also do the right thing and pass a trans-inclusive Employment Nondiscrimination Act so that all Americans are safe from the worry of being fired because their employers disagree with who they are and who they love.

This weekend, as San Diego celebrates Pride, I'm honored to stand with friends and colleagues to honor the contributions of LGBT Americans in San Diego and across the country.

TOO EXPENSIVE TO AFFORD

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we're learning an awful lot about ObamaCare these days, and it seems like every week is bringing something new. We have learned that this program is too expensive to afford. We have learned that it is too difficult to implement. We have learned that it is too burdensome for business. That is why the employer mandate is being delayed. Indeed, we're seeing these burdens on business lead to an under- and unemployed number, the U–6 number, 14.3 percent.

Where have the jobs gone? ObamaCare holds some of that answer.

We are also learning that there are too many mandates, too many rules, too many regulations. We're hearing it from our health care providers, we're hearing it from constituents, and we're hearing it from individuals who want to be able to make their health care decisions with their doctors, not a bureaucrat in Washington, D.C.

What my constituents are telling me is this: let's delay, let's defund, let's repeal, let's replace. This law is too cumbersome and too expensive to afford.

WORKING TOGETHER IN WESTERN NEW YORK

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, it's safe to say that Congress experiences more than its share of dysfunction. Too often, Members engage in behavior that serves to produce partisan gridlock and very little else. But this week, western New York's delegation has successfully bucked that trend.

Last night, my office worked closely with Congressman TOM REED to protect residents from leaking radioactive waste in West Valley, New York. Later today, Congressman CHRIS COLLINS will join in our efforts to protect Army Corps projects that will clean up western New York's waterways. Earlier this week, Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER and our State's Senators joined in our continued push for airline safety in the wake of the crash of Flight 3407 in western New York.

There is no disputing the fact that on some issues we have vastly divergent views. But when you respect the positions of your colleagues across the aisle and tone down the partisan rhetoric, you create room to work together for the communities you are bound to serve. I am honored to work with these western New York colleagues.

COMMONSENSE SOLUTIONS FOR JOBS

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, last week, America celebrated its 237th birthday. As I spoke with constituents at parades and other events, the number one concern I heard was about the need for better jobs. Twelve million Americans are out of work, Mr. Speaker, and 4.3 million have been out of work for 6 months or more. We're more than 4 years into President Obama's recovery; yet his misguided policies have produced almost 4 million fewer jobs than the average recovery. The American people deserve better. Our 237-year legacy proves that we can do better. Americans deserve a government that lets our economy grow and doesn't kill jobs with overreaching regulations and mindless bureaucratic kingdom-building.

Just last week, President Obama conceded that ObamaCare's employer mandate will hurt job growth. By delaying implementation of the mandate, he recognizes this policy is a failure. Now is the time for President Obama to show true leadership, put aside his failed policies, and work with Republicans on real commonsense solutions.

REPEAL THE EMPLOYER MANDATE IN OBAMACARE

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, just over a week ago, the administration announced a 1-year delay of the employer mandate in the Affordable Care Act. While a temporary delay is a good thing for businesses, a full repeal would be even better. Businesses in my district in Georgia have made very clear that the employer mandate would prevent them from expanding their businesses or hiring workers. One of the main reasons I voted against the law in the first place was because too many job creators in my district simply can't afford the costs of the employer mandate under the Affordable Care Act.

We can fix this, however. I'm proud to be leading the effort to fully repeal the employer mandate, along with two of my colleagues from across the aisle. We know this can be fixed, and we've got the bipartisan legislation to do it. I urge my colleagues to swiftly bring up the full repeal of the employer mandate and make this delay permanent so businesses across the country can get back to creating the jobs we need.

AMERICANS SHOULD BE ABLE TO TRUST GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, every coin and bill we use bears the phrase ''In God We Trust.'' Sadly, today, our trust tends to stop there. I don't recall hearing ''In Government We Trust'' very often.

President Reagan governed on the phrase ''Trust, but verify.'' This holds true to the Founders' original plan of three branches of government working to safeguard the people from overreach or abuse of power by any one. Current scandals fly in the face of the very principles and ethos we live our lives by and the values we were founded upon.

I can tell you that we in southern and southwest Ohio take pride not only in hard work but honest work. We now face an executive branch so vast that those who are in charge now claim that full accountability is impossible. They claim that government is too vast to be held accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I will not give up on the goodness of the American citizen and the possibility of responsibility and trust that we should be able to have in our government.

IMMIGRATION AND ECONOMICS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, after hosting a special screening of ''The Dream is Now'' at the Rose Marine Theater on the north side of Fort Worth, I can assure you that the hundreds of constituents who attended the event represent a microcosm of undocumented immigrants in the U.S. who need the U.S. to act now on comprehensive immigration reform.

The dream for 11 million to come out of the shadows and contribute to the only country they have ever known rests in our hands. In my home State of Texas alone, immigrants paid $1.6 billion in State and local taxes. The economic contributions of immigrants demand an immigration system that responds to the rapidly changing 21st century economy. We all agree that our current immigration system is broken. The Senate bipartisan bill was a start, and it is proof that a long-term, practical solution on immigration can be achieved.

I will continue to work with like-minded colleagues to ensure a practical and fair solution. We can no longer afford piecemeal solutions that are detrimental to our society and to our economy.

HONORING ARMY SERGEANT ZEKE CROZIER

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a truly remarkable

American—a Kansan—who came within inches of giving his life in the service of his country, but who has made an unthinkable yet not unbelievable recovery.

I first met Spring Hill native Army Sergeant Zeke Crozier 2 years ago. He was with the 158th Aviation Regiment out of Gardner, Kansas, and he was set to deploy to Afghanistan. After being in Afghanistan for only 41 days, the Chinook helicopter Sergeant Crozier was flying in crashed violently, and he suffered a severe traumatic brain injury.

Defying all odds, Sergeant Crozier has made a miraculous recovery, and even walked into my district office in Overland Park, Kansas, yesterday. Sergeant Crozier's recovery efforts are inspirational. They are also a reminder that we must always keep our commitment to our Nation's veterans. There are over 530,000 veterans benefit cases on backlog at the VA. This is unacceptable to me and to the men and women willing to serve our country bravely and honorably, especially those that now need our help in return.

To Sergeant Crozier and to all those who have served, a grateful Nation thanks you for your sacrifice.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATION ACT

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, in the coming days, we will soon be taking up H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, which is a long overdue reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I'm rising today to speak about the need to include in this reauthorization the Native Hawaiian Education Act. I've introduced H.R. 2287, which does just this. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure its passage.

Last week, when I was in Hawaii, I had the chance to meet with parents and educators in the Native Hawaiian Education community on the islands of Kauai, Maui, and Molokai. I heard from them about the firsthand successes of this program, which has been in place since 1988.

Education is, by far, the best investment that we can make in our economy and in our future. We are empowering and educating the next generation in communities that have largely been underserved, while at the same time preserving rich and unique culture, language, and values of our native people. The Native Hawaiian Education Act has been serving our kids for the last 25 years. It's critical that these innovative programs continue.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the NHEA and other programs that can enable and empower our underserved communities to thrive.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mrs. BEATTY. I rise today to address the recent doubling of interest rates on federally backed, needs-based student loans. Students deserve access, not obstacles, to higher education. These rate hikes will make college less affordable at a time when we should be encouraging, not discouraging, people to seek higher education opportunities to grow our economy and to create jobs. But due to House Republicans' failure to act, the interest rate on college loans has doubled from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent for some 7.4 million students.

In these tough economic times, Democrats understand we should be making every effort possible to increase access to higher education for all Americans. There is no time left. We need to act now to reverse the rate hike and keep student loan interest rates low so more Americans can have a fair shot at a college education.

MAJOR LEAGUE SPORTS TEAMS HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO THE PUBLIC

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, in 1995, former Washington Bullets owner Abe Pollin announced that he would be changing the name of the Washington Bullets to the Washington Wizards. The change did not happen overnight, nor was everyone happy about it. But Mr. Pollin knew it was the right thing to do. And he did it successfully. Given the high homicide and crime rate in the early 1990s in Washington, D.C., Mr. Pollin became increasingly concerned about the Bullets' association with violence. Finally, when Mr. Pollin's close friend, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, was assassinated in November 1995, he made the final decision.

Mr. Dan Snyder, owner of the Washington Redskins, may never come to the realization that is so evident to us all in the 21st century—that the term ''redskins'' is racist, demeaning, derogatory, and offensive to Native Americans. But I stand today, once again, to make this appeal to Mr. Snyder. I am thankful for Mr. Pollin's brave decision to change the Bullets' name, and I urge Mr. Snyder to have the courage to do the same. Change the name of your football franchise.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for this House to address comprehensive immigration reform. If the Senate can fashion a bipartisan bill, we can too.

Follow the money. Bringing 11 million people out of the shadows would increase our gross domestic product by $832 billion over 10 years. Follow the money. The CBO calculates that the Senate bill will cut the deficit by $197 billion over 10 years. What is not to like about that?

The plan that passed the Senate would strengthen our borders, crack down on employers who knowingly hire undocumented workers, and let those who want to earn their citizenship do just that.

Mr. Speaker, if the Senate can do it, we can do it too.

□ 1230

STUDENT LOANS

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that during this past district work week you were asked, as I was: ''What about the student loans?'' What people were asking was: ''What are you doing in Congress about the rates that are going to double on July 1?''

Let's review what we know, Mr. Speaker. We know that there are 7.4 million students that are affected. The rates are doubling from 3.4 to 6.8 percent, and this means $1,000 more in debt. We know that a college education can mean about $1 million more in future earnings over a lifetime. We know that we, as a country, need to build up our graduates to continue to be competitive. We also know that 45 percent of Americans hold student loan debt.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to act now for America's future.

STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to echo the sentiments of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle regarding the urgency to fix the student loan interest rate hike that took place last Monday.

The inability of Congress to come together and compromise on behalf of America's students is embarrassing. Doubling interest rates makes college less affordable, and the increased debt burden threatens the middle class and harms our economy.

Recent graduates who should be putting away money for their first home or saving up to start their own business are instead spending upwards of $500 per month paying back loans for their college education. Recent Florida graduates left college with student loan debt equal to 54 percent of their annual income.

Just this Monday, I heard the concerns of students in my district on how this debt will impact their future. Some students are even considering dropping out of college.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. I once again urge the House of Representatives to set politics aside and immediately take up legislation to right this wrong.

STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, it's time that the Congress get to work and stop this doubling of the interest rates on our student loans.

I'd like to take this moment to remind my colleagues here in the House that our generation was able to graduate from universities and enjoy great success for the most part debt free because college costs were less and we were able to get a combination of grants and scholarships.

What we're doing to today's generation is unforgivable; it's unconscionable. They're expected to graduate with $30,000 in debt, on average. We were able to start building families and homes and businesses and buy cars. Our generation that we're handing over to is expected to pay loans. We just simply cannot allow this to happen. It's not right.

We all have an obligation to pay forward. This country has been so good to our generation; it's time for us to pay back. Let's step up, get to work, and stop this increase from taking place.

And last, but not least, let's put it in perspective. For what we spent on the war in Iraq, $1 trillion, we could have sent an entire generation of young men and women through college and let them graduate debt free.

Let's get our priorities in order, Mr. Speaker.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 further consideration of H.R. 2609, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2609.

Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) kindly take the chair.

□ 1235

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. HOLDING (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 9, 2013, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 60, line 12.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(1)(B)) with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, in this House, in 2007, a bill was passed called the Energy Independence and Security Act. One of the features of this bill was to take away consumer choice when deciding which light bulbs our constituents could use in their own homes. Since that time, I have heard from literally tens of thousands of people on the inequities of this provision. Mr. Chairman, they're right.

While the government has passed energy-efficiency standards in other realms over the years, they have never moved so far and lowered standards so drastically to a point where at this date, over 5 years, the technology is still years off in making light bulbs that are compliant with the 2007 law and at a price point that the average American can afford.

Last year, light bulb companies talked about their new 2007 law-compliant bulbs that are available now, but they're available at price points of $20, $30, $40, and $50 each bulb.

Opponents to my amendment will claim that the 2007 language does not ban the incandescent bulb. This is true. It bans the sale of the 100-watt, the 60-watt, and the 45-watt bulbs. The replacement bulbs are far from economically efficient, even if they are energy efficient. A family living paycheck to paycheck can't afford to replace every bulb in their house at $25 a bulb, even if those bulbs will last 20 years.

This Congress should be on the side of the consumer and on the side of consumer choice. If the new energy-efficient light bulbs save money and if they're better for the environment, we should trust our constituents to make the choice on their own toward these bulbs. Let the market decide. We should not be forcing these light bulbs on the American people. The bottom line is the Federal Government has no business taking away the freedom of choice from Americans as to what type of light bulbs to use in their homes.

The columnist, George Will, speaking on a television program back in December of 2007, describing the efforts of the then-110th Congress, was fairly disparaging. He pointed out that Congress had not done much work in the calendar year 2007. He went on to say that the sole functions of the Federal Government are to defend the borders and deliver the mail, but all the Congress had managed to do was ban the incandescent bulb.

This exact amendment was passed the past 2 years by voice vote and both times was included in the legislation signed into law by President Obama. It allows consumers to continue to have a choice and a say as to what they put in their homes. It's common sense. Let's give some relief to American families at least until replacement light bulbs can be marketed at prices that don't break the bank.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the very distinguished Member's amendment—Dr. BURGESS—and simply say that his amendment would prohibit the Department of Energy from promulgating light bulb efficiency standards.

It is a common misunderstanding that there is some type of ban on the incandescent light bulb that effectively requires people to have the limited choice of only a compact fluorescent bulb. This is simply not true. Regulations require only that bulbs be more efficient.

So this debate really isn't about choice—or energy efficiency for that matter. It's about endangering American jobs, specifically American manufacturing jobs. Given that American manufacturers have committed to following the law regardless of whether or not it is enforced, the only benefit of this ill-informed rider is to allow foreign manufacturers who may not feel a similar obligation to import noncompliant light bulbs that will not only harm the investments made by U.S. companies, but place at risk the U.S. manufacturing jobs associated with making compliant bulbs.

Further, it is the equivalent of a $100 tax on every American family—that's $16 billion across our Nation—through increased energy costs.

The performance standards for light bulbs were established in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. At that time, the bill enjoyed strong

bipartisan support of both Republicans and Democrats. Ninety-five House Republicans voted for final passage, and the bill was signed into law by President Bush.

As far as I'm aware, the issues that inspired this standard have not changed and, I would argue, have gotten worse. Families are struggling every day to meet rising energy bills, and there are real savings to be had by moving to more efficient light bulbs.

Further, while claiming that the incandescent bulb is dead makes for a great sound bite, it just doesn't reflect reality. As a result of the 2007 law, manufacturers already are making a variety of new energy-saving bulbs for homes, including more efficient incandescent bulbs. These bulbs look like and turn on like the bulbs we have been using for decades, but are upwards of 28 to 33 percent more efficient. And that's good for everyone. This is amazing progress in a very short time, considering that previously the basic technology of incandescent bulbs had not changed substantially since they were first introduced over 125 years ago.

Philips, GE, and Sylvania are among those currently manufacturing efficient incandescent bulbs. One is making them entirely within the United States, and the others are manufacturing the key components in their U.S. factories.

So I would urge my colleagues to please see the light and oppose this amendment. And my dear colleague, Dr. BURGESS, knows that, despite the fact that we disagree on this issue, I have the highest respect for his service in this Congress to the people of Texas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. BASS

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce, with respect to hydraulic fracturing operations in the Inglewood Oil Field—

(1) the exclusion in section 1421(d)(1)(B) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300h(d)(1)(B));

(2) section 261.4(b)(5) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(3) the limitation in section 402(l)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(l)(2)).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to introduce a straightforward and narrow amendment that restricts Federal resources from supporting hydraulic fracturing in the Baldwin Hills/Inglewood Oil Field, the largest urban oilfield in the United States.

The urban location of the Inglewood Oil Field, as well as the area's susceptibility to earthquakes, requires unique health and safety considerations and precautions. The Inglewood Oil Field is nearly 90 years old, a 1,000-acre oilfield with over 350 oil wells in the center of Los Angeles. It is surrounded by thousands of homes, schools, and parks. In fact, 300,000 residents of Los Angeles, Baldwin Hills, Ladera Heights, Culver City, and Inglewood live and work directly around the field. Additionally, the oilfield borders the Kenny Hahn State Recreation Area, a park that welcomes thousands of families and visitors each year. Not only is the area around the Inglewood Oil Field densely populated; it also sits on the Newport-Inglewood fault, making it very vulnerable to severe earthquakes.

Clearly, the urban landscape and history of seismic activity in this area necessitates stringent health and safety reviews prior to any new oil and gas extraction. However, hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, is occurring in the Inglewood Oil Field without proper regulation or even a comprehensive study of its safety and impact.

During my time in the California State Assembly, and since coming to Congress, I have heard numerous times directly from my constituents that they are fearful about the environmental health and seismic effects of fracturing in the Inglewood Oil Field and the impact it will have on their families and communities. They have discussed with me several concerns about fracking in the oilfield, like the impact on ground and drinking water safety, toxic chemical dispersion into the soil and air, and disruption of the Newport-Inglewood fault, which could lead to major earthquakes or landslides.

In fact, environmental conservation and health community leaders, like Lark Galloway Gilliam, Jim Lamm, and Mary Anne Greene, a member of the Community Advisory Council, have continually advocated for increased assessment and regulation of fracking in the Inglewood Oil Field.

□ 1245

In addition, Tom Camarella from Culver City has also expressed these concerns, and I believe these concerns are justified.

The people of Los Angeles and Culver City are entitled to an extensive long-term and transparent assessment of fracking operations at the oilfields. Ensuring the health and safety of our constituents should be a top priority.

That is why I rise today to offer this amendment, which will ensure that no Federal funds in this bill will be used to implement, administer, or enforce fracking in the Inglewood Oil Field for the coming fiscal year. This is a small step in the greater fracking debate, but I am proud to amplify the concerns of my community with this amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

The amendment would prohibit, as she said, hydraulic fracking operations or fracking within the Inglewood Oil Field in Los Angeles.

I appreciate my colleague's passion for this particular issue and obviously her desire to protect her constituents, but the Energy and Water appropriations bill is not the proper place for such a unique prohibition on fracking.

Inglewood Oil Field is not Federal land nor does the Department of Energy's Office of Fossil Energy have any current projects that involve Inglewood in its natural gas portfolio. Furthermore, fracking activities are currently regulated both locally and by her own State of California.

This is a complex authorizing issue, but we are still waiting to hear from the Department's lawyers on what effect, if any, this language would actually have in the fiscal year 2014. Therefore, I must oppose her amendment and urge other Members to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of individuals appointed to their current position through, or to otherwise carry out, paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 5503(a) of title 5, United States Code.

Mr. MEADOWS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a simple and straightforward amendment. It prohibits the use of funds for the payment of salaries to Presidential recess appointees until they are formally confirmed by the Senate.

In 1863, a law was passed that barred unconfirmed recess appointees from being paid. That law stayed on the books until 1940. However, over time, a number of broad exceptions were made that gradually eliminated the original intent of that law and rendered the prohibition useless. This amendment reapplies the original intent of that law to further reassert the Senate's authority in the confirmation process and prevent taxpayers from having to pay salaries of unconfirmed Presidential appointees.

Recent decades have seen a constant erosion of congressional powers in deference to the executive. The Senate is required to confirm Presidential appointments for a reason. It is a check on the executive powers. This amendment is an opportunity to reempower that check by disincentivizing recess appointments except in cases where they are truly needed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that will help stop Congress from taking the Corps of Engineers back to the 1980s.

In 2007, Congress passed legislation requiring the Army Corps of Engineers to update its principles and guidelines, the P&G. These are used by the Corps in formulating, evaluating, and implementing water resource projects. This is something I've been involved with since I first came to Congress 17 years ago. I served on the Water Resources Subcommittee, and discovered that the Corps was trapped in time.

This update was critical in that these have not been updated since 1983. If you understand how the Federal Government operates, for something that was approved in 1983, they were probably in the works in the early seventies.

Earlier this year, the Council on Environmental Quality finally released an updated P&G that lays out broad principles to guide water investment as well as draft interagency guidelines for implementing the principles and requirements. These new P&G were developed over the last 6 years by Federal agencies and they incorporated extensive comments from the public, as well as the National Academy of Sciences.

The modernized P&G will help accelerate project approval, reduce costs, and support water infrastructure projects with the greatest economic and community benefits. They will allow for better consideration of long-term benefits, provide more flexibility for local communities, and promote more transparency in the Federal decisionmaking process.

Unfortunately, there appears to be language in the committee report accompanying this legislation that would prevent the Corps from implementing them. The report states:

The Corps shall continue to use the document dated March 10, 1983, and entitled, ''Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies,'' during the fiscal year period covered by the Energy and Water Development Act for 2014.

Does it make any sense at all to take work that has been in the process for years and tell an agency, You can't update your planning documents, prevent you from using updated resources?

During the floor debate on this issue in 2007, I indicated that I was embarrassed that the Corps was operating under guidance from a quarter century ago; now they are 30 years old. These principles and guidelines are older than most of our staff.

In 1983, Ronald Reagan was in his first term, Michael Jackson moonwalked for the first time, and Microsoft Word was first released. Think about the advancements in science, economics, and flood management, not to mention our environmental consciousness, all that have happened since 1983. That's what led the National Academy of Sciences, in the year 2000, to conclude that these needed to be ''revised to better reflect contemporary management paradigms; analytical methods; legislative directives; and social, economic, and political realities.'' It is even more true today than it was 13 years ago.

This issue is not just about a bureaucratic process for economists and scientists. These projects have significant impact on the ground.

In 2007, I highlighted the problems from an organization called Levees.org, a nonpartisan grassroots group founded after Katrina. The group's mission was to help educate the people of New Orleans about what happened in Katrina and how to move forward. They supported the amendment at that time because they know this issue is a matter of life and death, to be able to have the Corps use the best information, the best technology, and do the best job. Relying on principles and guidelines that are a quarter century old is not our very best. Over a third of a century is not our very best.

I can comprehend no reason why Congress would require the Corps to continue to rely on outdated documents and not take advantage of the work, the research, and the progress that's been made by people in the administration, in the Corps of Engineers, and the scientific community.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to offer the amendment because I truly believe that we ought to be able to understand with the committee what's going on, understand the benefits that led Congress to embed this in the law in the first place. I would look forward to having a conversation with my good friend, the chair of the subcommittee, and the ranking member to see if we can't resolve this for the benefit of the public.

Thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used within the borders of the State of Louisiana by the Mississippi Valley Division or the Southwestern Division of the Army Corps of Engineers or any district of the Corps within such divisions to implement or enforce the mitigation methodology, referred to as the ''Modified Charleston Method''.

Mr. SCALISE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to present this amendment that deals with the Corps of Engineers' new program that was put in place 2 years ago, specifically in the New Orleans district, called the Modified Charleston Method.

The Corps changed the usual and normal method for mitigation. On any kind of mitigation that's done on wetlands throughout the country, you have to mitigate if you are going to do development. Everybody understands that. Everybody has worked with that over the years.

Two years ago, the Corps changed, specifically for the New Orleans district, that process and literally put in place a process that has made it very unworkable to do a lot of our flood protection projects and economic development projects.

This amendment, by the way, is identical to language that we passed in the same appropriations bill last year, so the House has already gone on record saying that this is an unworkable plan by the Corps of Engineers. This new MCM method, as it is being referred to, has literally shut down many flood protection projects and economic development projects in south Louisiana.

What we have been saying to the Corps of Engineers is let's work together on putting reasonable rules in place. This rule is unworkable, so much so that the Corps didn't even use these rules when they were doing their own projects. Americans understand that when government tries to impose rules on the people and yet doesn't even follow those same rules themselves, it shows there is a problem. Yet that's what is happening in this case.

All we are saying is everybody understands we need to do mitigation, but

when the Corps comes out with these new rules that triple, in many cases, the amount of mitigation that needs to be done to a point where it is unworkable—as an example, just last year, Corps permit applications for development projects were down by 33 percent because they literally took off the table the ability to do any kind of development in many areas of south Louisiana—that's not how rules and regulations are supposed to work. You ought to be working with local communities and not saying you can't even protect yourself from flooding. Literally, if you look at the wetlands rules, they are preventing us from restoring wetlands with these rules on wetlands. It doesn't make sense. It is something that's unworkable.

This amendment addresses this problem and says, if the Corps can't move forward with the Modified Charleston Method, then let's go back to the table and put some rules in place that actually make sense, put some commonsense rules in place.

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support my colleague from Louisiana's amendment.

Not to belabor the point, but just in the last 11 months, mitigation costs in the New Orleans district for the Corps of Engineers and projects related to this have increased right at $11 million.

□ 1300

It affects all types of projects, and I'll just give you a few examples:

One is a pipeline because we're responding to an increased need for natural gas transportation as our Louisiana oil refineries expand. One is a grocery store that provides fresh food, especially in our food deserts. Another one is the expansion of a 100-acre commercial park in St. Tammany Parish to create jobs and new office space. The last is a St. Tammany Parish drainage project, which would help Louisiana with its flood protection and protect our community.

So this is a matter that is of vital importance. We are not diminishing the need for mitigation or underestimating its importance. What we are trying to say is that it should be reasonable and that the method that we had before we moved to the Modified Charleston Method was a good method, but we need to make sure that the Modified Charleston does not hamper our growth in Louisiana and prohibit us from protecting our citizens and our residents from future damage caused by storms or prohibit us from prospering from economic development at the same time.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition to these very able gentlemen's amendment. While I have some sympathy for this issue—and it's not a new one to this bill—I believe that more consistency should be brought to the way we evaluate wetland impacts, not less, as this amendment would ensure.

The Charleston Method has been utilized for over two decades in various Corps districts, and it is a quick and inexpensive and consistent methodology for use by the regulated public and the Corps. In 2006 and 2007, the New Orleans district worked with its Federal and State partners to modify the Charleston Method so that it better reflected the unique conditions found in south Louisiana, resulting in the Modified Charleston Method that our colleagues have suggested.

The use of this method is a longstanding one in many Corps districts. Many regulatory customers use the tool to assess their potential mitigation requirements for their impacts as well as credits required at mitigation banks. This transparency in Corps mitigation requirements has helped the applicant prepare a complete application package and determine mitigation costs up front—importantly, costs up front—costs often that are borne by the Federal taxpayer.

The suspension of the use of the Charleston Method in Corps districts would require that any pending permit application, under section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and pending mitigation banks, would need to be reevaluated using a different assessment tool or methodology, or, in the absence of such a methodology, use the best professional judgment to determine appropriate mitigation requirements for impacts and for available credits in mitigation banks. All approved mitigation banks with available credits that were determined by the process would be temporarily closed until a new methodology could be developed and the banks' credits converted to the credit system of the new methodology.

These banks were established utilizing the credit system of the Charleston Method, and until a similar credit system can be determined for proposed impact sites, it would not be possible to correlate the new requirements in the old credit system.

So we are into the weeds on this one, and we know that the difficulty at the edges—where the water meets the land, where we have very severe coastal conditions that occur as a result of weather changes and so forth—do require us to be more land planning conscious. I've seen the work that the Corps has done in Louisiana, and I appreciate the gentlemen's concern about their home State. I think to try to change this in this bill is probably not wise policy, and we know the costs of these damaged areas to the taxpayers of the United States. With coastal storms being what they are, we anticipate greater coastal activity, and I think that wiser planning is better than moving to a process that, I think, is less rigorous.

So, on those bases, I oppose the gentlemen's amendment, but I do thank them very much for their deep service to their State, to their region, which has been so impacted by changes in our environment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development'', and increasing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Department of the Army—Corps of Engineers-Civil—Construction'', by $20,000,000.

Mr. LYNCH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. First of all, I want to thank the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, and also Ms. KAPTUR from Ohio, the ranking member, for the great work they've done.

In spite of the fact that many Members are coming up with refining amendments, I do want to acknowledge the great work they've done, for example, on the manufacturing piece that's in this bill as well as the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, which has been amply funded and is so important to a lot of the coastal communities. Myself representing the Port of Boston and a large swath of the South Shore of Massachusetts—some beautiful cities and towns—I do appreciate the work that they've done. However, there does appear to be a gap in funding with respect to the Army Corps of Engineers.

The purpose of my amendment would be to increase funding to the Construction account for the Army Corps of Engineers by $20 million. This increase would, of course, be offset by decreasing the Fossil Fuel Research account by a corresponding amount.

I am fortunate to represent a district that relies heavily and benefits greatly from the proximity to the coast, and I have wonderful, historic, beautiful towns and cities, like Quincy, Weymouth, Hull, Cohasset, Hingham, and Scituate, that, as I say, are benefiting

greatly because they're on the coast. They house commercial fishing fleets and host wonderful beaches and marinas, and they are vital components of our Statewide economy and regional economy. But while these benefits are there, they are also exposed to the most recent violent coastal storms that have become increasingly devastating in recent years.

Like many of my colleagues, I have seen firsthand the devastating effects that these much more intense storms have had on our communities—beaches erode, and roadways and bridges get washed away. In our case, we have not been hit as hard as places like the district of the gentleman from Louisiana or New Jersey or New York with the Superstorm Sandy effects, but much of our seawall infrastructure and protection for our beaches have been damaged considerably. We've benefited from prior Congresses that have made sure that the funding and the maintenance have been there to preserve that protection, and we are at that point again.

It seems like we are having 100-year storms every 3 or 4 years now in my district, and I'm sure it's like that in a lot of places across the country. I think it's entirely appropriate that we balance this out, that we rebalance the priorities here, by putting $20 million into the Construction account for the Army Corps of Engineers while we are removing a corresponding amount from the Fossil Fuel Research account. I think that most of us realize that the impacts of climate change are at least increasing the intensity of the storms that we've seen in recent years, and we need to provide the Army Corps of Engineers in our communities with the resources they need to protect against these natural disasters. I believe my offset does that in a fitting way.

Like President Obama, I think we need an all-of-the-above energy policy. I'm not here today to debate the cause of global warming or of climate change, but temperatures and sea levels are rising, and fossil fuel consumption is a contributing factor. So, as long as we are forced to rely on fossil fuels, we need to also deal with the fallout from our own energy policies. We need to protect our coastal communities from future devastation.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I share the gentleman's support for smart investments in our Nation's water resources infrastructure, though. In fact, the Army Corps of Engineers has always been one of the top priorities in our Energy and Water bill.

Total program level funding is $50 million above the budget request and almost $150 million above the post-sequester level. There is very strong Member interest in the harbor maintenance activities, and most of these additional funds were included in the Operation and Maintenance account. Even so, construction funding is less than 1 percent below the President's budget.

On the other hand, the bill already reduces funding for fossil energy by $84 million below the fiscal year 2013 level. That's a 16 percent reduction. Fossil fuels, such as coal, oil, and natural gas, provide for 82 percent of our Nation's energy needs, and we will need to continue to use these valuable energy resources for generations to come. Research conducted within this program ensures we use our Nation's fossil fuel resources well and as cleanly as possible. In fact, if we increased the efficiency of our fossil energy plants by just 1 percent, we could power an additional 2 million households without using a single additional pound of fuel from the ground.

We simply cannot take a further reduction to this account, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Congressman LYNCH, I think, has really thought through this proposal very well. His is a modest amendment. Actually, the bill that we are considering is $29,425,000 above the budget request of the administration, so he is merely conforming his amendment to the initial request.

For the record, we anticipate that the Department will with this change spend approximately $420 million this year for fossil energy research and development.

I agree with my esteemed colleague from New Jersey about the importance of natural gas, as Ohio is a State that has benefited deeply from that. A lot of that technology is going very well, and the companies are making significant profits. They can invest some of that in their own advanced development now. Then with the additional drilling for oil on public lands and so forth, we are producing more than we have in modern history over the last several years.

So I think it's worthy to transfer some of these dollars to the Corps. We have over $60 billion worth of Corps projects that are backed up, and in terms of job creation, that just rings home across this country because those Corps dollars will be put to work in projects that have been backed up from coast to coast.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I appreciate her gracious remarks.

I do want to point out, though, that, since 2010, we've cut $688 million from this account. Now, we all have great respect and admiration for the Army Corps of Engineers, but having cut $688 million since 2010 has been reducing their ability to prioritize those projects around the country that need to be worked on. Some of those are Democratic districts, and some of those are Republican districts. That's not what this is about. This is about our infrastructure. So a $688 million cut since 2010 is a serious obstruction for them to do their job, and that's all I'm asking here.

I'm asking that we recognize our responsibility and our stewardship of protecting seawalls and ports and marinas, whether they're on the Great Lakes or whether they're on the Atlantic or Pacific coast. I am just asking that we step up and meet our responsibility in a meaningful way.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman, and I, evidently, very strongly support his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

□ 1315

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Standards Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits'' and identified by regulation identification number 1904–AC87.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, as I begin to talk about this amendment that Mr. ROKITA and I have worked on and bring to you today, I want to pause and take just a moment and commend our appropriators and the chairman. He is accustomed to seeing me come down and try to cut 1 percent, 5 percent more out of the budget, but the appropriators this year have done that work for us.

This bill before us today totals $30.426 billion, which is $2.9 billion below last year's level, $700 billion below the sequester level, and $4 billion below the President's request. Indeed, it's below the pre-Pelosi budget, which was $31.5 billion.

As my former colleague in the Tennessee State Senate used to say—Tim Burchett, now mayor of Knoxville—he would quote Tennessee author Alex

Haley, who said ''find the good, and praise it.'' So I praise them for doing these cuts on the front end, and I focus my attention on the issue we have with ceiling fans and this administration's interest in overregulating ceiling fans.

As many of my colleagues know, ceiling fans and ceiling fan light kits already face existing regulations set in place by the Energy Policy Act of 2005. These provisions burden ceiling fan manufacturers with ineffective mandates. However, despite the current mandates, the Department of Energy is looking to require additional mandates that will impact everything such as the angle of the blade, shape, airflow, light kits. They are determined to redesign the American fan and have issued a 101-page rulemaking framework document which evaluates the potential energy savings that new regulations would supposedly provide.

We've already seen the Federal Government stretch their regulatory tentacles into our homes and determine what kind of light bulbs we have to use. Now they're coming after our ceiling fans. It is a sad state of affairs when even our ceiling fans aren't safe from this administration. Enough is enough.

These new regulations being considered by DOE will significantly impair the ability of ceiling fan manufacturers like Hunter Fans in Memphis to produce reasonably priced, highly decorative fans. They will also force our constituents to use less energy-efficient mechanisms to cool their homes, using more energy. It is imperative that we join together and prohibit any funding in this bill from being used by DOE to finalize, implement, or enforce new regulations on ceiling fans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by my friend, the gentlelady from Tennessee. Like her, I also want to thank the appropriators.

As a member of the Budget Committee, our responsibility is to issue top-line numbers that we stay within in order to bring down the deficit and ultimately address the towering debt that we're facing as a country not only today, but the even worse debt we're going to be facing given the current trend that we're on in the future.

Mr. Chair, remember when we were told to keep our tires properly inflated and to get a regular tune-up to save fuel? Some people snickered and commented, ''Is this an energy policy?'' At least those ideas actually saved energy and actually saved cost, albeit a drop in the bucket. But now, in one of its latest efforts, along comes the Department of Energy and proposes a regulation to impose destructive and unnecessary energy-efficiency standards for ceiling fans. And like much of their agenda, it is completely counterproductive. It's another example of Big Government run amok. It's an example of the complete disregard bureaucrats have for the practical implications of the regulations that they issue.

The Department of Energy contends that a certain amount of energy would be saved by requiring greater efficiency from ceiling fans, as the gentlelady mentioned and explained. Of course, that ignores the fact that ceiling fans are already far more energy efficient than other cooling devices like air-conditioners. Recently, General Electric published an article stating that an average electric central air-conditioner consumes 5,000 watts of electricity during operation. By contrast, a ceiling fan consumes as little as just 30 watts when operating under similar conditions. That's over 165 times less electricity than consumed by your typical central air-conditioning system.

The proposed ceiling fan regulations would increase the cost of ceiling fans and reduce the manufacturer's ability to produce aesthetically pleasing devices marketable to people like us, the consumers. As a result, energy savings from these efficiency standards would not outweigh the increased costs of energy consumption brought about by the consumers foregoing ceiling fans and shifting to high-energy consumption devices and increased usage of existing devices.

The Department of Energy's proposed regulations on ceiling fans are absolutely counterproductive. They will encourage more energy consumption, they will reduce consumer choice and they have the potential to destroy jobs, including in Indiana.

Americans need an energy policy to unleash our economy, not economically destructive dictates from Washington bureaucrats. This is yet another example of this administration double-dipping in the pockets of Americans, using taxpayer dollars to raise prices on consumers.

As such, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition to the gentlelady's amendment and wish to point out to our colleagues that this amendment will prohibit any funds made available by the act from being used by the Department of Energy to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled, ''Standards, Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits'' and identified by regulation identification number 1904–AC87.

The Department of Energy is initiating the rulemaking and data collection process to consider amending the energy conservation standards for ceiling fans and ceiling fan light kits. Making ceiling fans more efficient would potentially reduce carbon output by 22 million metric tons. This amendment would erode the Department of Energy's effort to curb carbon emissions and save consumers money on their electric bills. The Department estimates that the higher standards for ceiling fans will result in $4.3 billion in undiscounted energy bill savings through 2030.

Also, I would be remiss if I did not point out that these amendments seek to undercut the administration's rulemaking authority given to it by Congress. Speaker after speaker on the other side of the aisle criticized this administration for not undertaking rulemaking on other issues and instead issuing guidance. Now we have rulemaking that allows for public comment, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are still not satisfied.

The Department is following its responsibility under the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to regulate ceiling fan energy usage. And you know what? It's not a bad idea. We actually own ceiling fans in our family. What's interesting about them is, if you have two or three speeds on them, the first speed, which is supposed to be the low speed, is more than we want, and it's very hard to get these fans demonstrated in the showroom sometimes. If you want to be a responsible consumer, I think it would be really helpful to the buying public to have standards, to be able to have labeling, to know what you're buying.

This is an important market. I would guess it's one that's growing in our economy. But I think it's really important to have this kind of effort. The industry will be able to comment. That's what rulemaking is all about. We can work with consumers. Consumers like us can write in. We can make our comments. Overall, we get a better product and we get one that's more energy efficient.

I know that there's a Hunter Fan Company located in Memphis, Tennessee, so I imagine the gentlelady may be speaking on their behalf. That's okay. That's what we're all here for. But the consumers out there also have a right to try to buy the most energy-efficient product.

The fan that we bought, the light is too bright in the ceiling. And I don't know if you've ever tried to install one of those things. It's not so easy to get that off and to put the different bulbs in and all. As I think it's an industry that is growing and improving, I would think they could use a little bit of help.

This amendment is anti-consumer. I think it should be defeated, but I admire the gentlelady for bringing it to the floor and the gentleman who supported her. I think working together we can all make it a little bit better for the environment, for consumers, and for the company. They will sell more fans, and people will have more confidence in their product.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to relocate or consolidate general and administrative functions, personnel, or resources of the Buffalo and Chicago Districts of the Corps of Engineers Great Lakes and Ohio River Division.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment seeks to stop a flawed plan that would endanger crucial Army Corps projects in the Great Lakes region.

The Army Corps of Engineers' Great Lakes and Ohio River Division is attempting to move key functions performed in Buffalo and Chicago regions out of their respective States.

This is unacceptable.

When it comes to protecting the safety, health, and future of our waterways, there is no substitute for having a team of qualified people on the ground. Taking key staff out of western New York will only hinder the delivery of high-impact projects already in progress. And any plan to turn the Buffalo and Chicago districts into mere satellite offices is a wrongheaded decision to divest in our Great Lakes.

In my community alone, the Army Corps is overseeing a $44 million restoration of the Buffalo River and $359 million restoration of the former Linde site in Tonawanda, among dozens of other projects.

The Buffalo district overseas 38,000 square miles from Massena, New York, to Toledo, Ohio—planning, constructing, and operating water projects to reduce floods, maintain navigation, protect the shoreline, and support water quality efforts. Failure to see these projects through to completion would not only harm western New York, but delays and cost overruns would impact the bottom line of the Army Corps.

Mr. Chairman, the Great Lakes system moves more than 160 million tons of cargo a year, supports 227,000 jobs, and contributes $33.5 billion to the economy annually. As an engine of economic activity and valuable natural resources, we should be committing more resources to the Great Lakes, not less.

A similar amendment was offered by Senator KIRK and Senator DURBIN and was adopted by the Senate Appropriations Committee last week.

I thank my colleagues, especially Mr. COLLINS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for their support of this bipartisan amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will support the amendment, but I do have some concerns.

Of course we want the Corps to take a look at the cost of their operation across the Nation to see where they can make savings.

We are seeking from the Corps information before we make any final decisions, but I'm supportive of their objectives. We just need to take a closer look at the financial justification for what they're doing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. HIGGINS from New York, for putting forth this amendment.

He and I stood together in Buffalo to talk about the adverse effects this proposal by the Army Corps of Engineers would have on the growth and maintenance of the Great Lakes, one of our Nation's greatest resources. But this issue is not specific to just western New York and it's not partisan. It's about preserving our Great Lakes.

Many of us don't know, but there are 4,500 miles of U.S. coastline along the Great Lakes, making it larger than both the Atlantic and Pacific coast combined. And among this huge length of coastline, there are many hundreds of projects. Many harbors that are critical to commercial navigation and recreation are in serious disrepair.

By moving contracting officers, those who are on the ground and require face-to-face contact with the companies doing the actual work, these projects will only fall further into disrepair. It won't save a dollar to move these employees to an office far from the site of a project. If you move these workers to Detroit or Louisville, some of them working on Buffalo or Chicago-area projects will have to be flown in and stay at local hotels at government expense. How can this possibly save money? Common sense tells me it's going to be more costly.

□ 1330

This amendment is simple, as it will prevent funds in this bill from being used for this proposal. It will help maintain the Great Lakes, which are a key economic driver to our national economy.

I hope my colleagues will support this bipartisan amendment that will ensure the Army Corps of Engineers will provide timely delivery on projects that reduce flooding, protect the shoreline, maintain navigation, and support water-quality efforts all along the Great Lakes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. First, I want to express my thanks to the chairman for saying that he would accept this bipartisan amendment, and to my colleagues who have spoken about it.

The decision to eliminate many of the functions from the Chicago and the Buffalo offices were done without consultation with the local communities and without seeking the approval of the Congress, which is what they are supposed to do.

The downsizing just in Chicago could cause as many as 200 jobs lost in our area, and it certainly could affect the health and safety of our waterways. Chicago is the point of entry from the Mississippi River to the Great Lakes, and its harbors are of major economic importance not just to Chicago, but to the entire Great Lakes region. As my colleague pointed out, it's a shoreline greater than either the Pacific or the Atlantic Coast. Actually, I just learned that from you today. Thank you for that important information.

Its harbors are of major economic importance to all of us, and it assists in the rehabilitation of the Chicago shoreline. It also, from the Chicago district office, leads the fight against the spread of the Asian carp into Lake Michigan.

I have very serious concern about the downsizing of the Chicago district and the impacts it would have on those efforts. Like the chairman, I understand the Corps' efforts to reduce costs and our interest in doing that; but the minimization of the Chicago and Buffalo areas would trade short-term savings with much more significant and lasting long-term costs.

As my colleague pointed out, Senator KIRK and Senator DURBIN passed a similar amendment in the Senate. I urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting us in this important bipartisan amendment to prevent the Army Corps from reducing its Chicago and Buffalo offices.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Congressman HIGGINS for offering this important amendment, and Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY for her leadership on lakes issues, and also Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his openness to those of us who happen to live in the Great Lakes region.

Obviously, I rise in support of the amendment. Also, I just wanted to say on the record to the Corps, it would be wonderful if somebody over at the Corps had a map and they took all of the watersheds of the Great Lakes and they put them all together and then the staff for the Great Lakes would be located somewhere in those watersheds, because right now, that isn't the case. And it causes us all kinds of bloody problems up in our part of the world where we do adjoin Canada up there. You know, there's another country north of us. It has been so hard to

get them to recognize the coastline that you described. And so this is my moment to vent a little bit on the floor and say: Hello, Corps. We're out there.

I happen to represent the largest watershed in the Great Lakes, and we really need the Corps' focus on the most important freshwater system that exists on the face of the Earth. Twenty percent of the freshwater on the globe, surface freshwater, is up in our region. And it always seems like it's never together. It's never together. So the gentleman's amendment helps to focus a little bit on this, but the challenge goes beyond just this amendment.

I know the Corps will hear us, and I know as they talk about restructuring, meeting budget realities, they will view us as a system that is important to think of as a whole, not just in little pieces and dangling particles and things that happen out there, but rather as an extraordinarily important water system for our continent and for our world.

So I wanted the opportunity to say that on the record, and I thank Congressman HIGGINS for his leadership, and I thank the chairman for his understanding. We in the Great Lakes region face our own set of issues, and we need the Corps' full cooperation. I ask my colleagues to support the Higgins amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 801 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17281).

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. My amendment prohibits the use of funds to be used to carry out section 801 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, which creates a national media campaign to promote alternative green energies. The 2007 energy law directs the Department of Energy to run a national media campaign to promote alternative energies, encourage energy efficiency, and discourage the use of fossil fuels, authorizing $5 million a year.

Promoting green-energy technology is really not the role of the Federal Government apart from an all-of-the-above energy plan, and it certainly is not part of the core mission of the Department of Energy. The American people don't need more government bureaucrats to tell them what energy sources they should use. The government needs to get out of the business of picking winners and losers in the energy market and certainly shouldn't be funding advertising campaigns on behalf of private green-energy firms, which is normally a losing proposition to the taxpayer.

This amendment is more than fair. It was included in the last Congress' attempt at this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it and to defund this taxpayer media campaign.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am in support of the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals:

(A) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(B) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in subsection (A); or

(C) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAYSON. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, expands the list of contractors who are forbidden from contracting with the Federal Government, to include such contractors as those who have been convicted of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, et cetera. This amendment is identical to language that was inserted in the Military Construction, Veterans Administration, and the Homeland Security appropriations bills by voice vote.

Since brevity is sometimes an underappreciated virtue, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We accept the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into a colloquy.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant for many years was the only plant operating in America in which uranium was enriched. This facility has met the national security needs of the United States since 1952, producing enriched uranium for nuclear weapons and commercial nuclear reactors.

On May 24, 2013, it was announced that the facilities of the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant would be transitioned back to the Department of Energy, resulting in 1,200 lost jobs and a vast need to start cleanup of the area.

Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Secretary of Energy now has full responsibility for decontamination and decommissioning cleanup work at the Paducah site and for reindustrialization of the materials and facilities at that site. I was pleased that Secretary Moniz recently announced on July 3 Request for Offers to utilize the assets, land, and facilities at the Paducah Department of Energy site.

As we move forward to finish the legacy cleanup of this plant and, most important, to reindustrialize that site to create new jobs, we are going to need to work with the chairman's committee on a very close basis. I hope that we can work with you in the coming years to ensure that we provide the Department the necessary support to accelerate reindustrialization through the Request for Offers process and also expedite the cleanup.

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey personally for his commitment in working with us on this, for the job that you have done on the 2014 Energy and Water appropriations bill, and I just hope that you will continue working with us.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I look forward to working with my friend from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), who is a strong advocate on behalf of Kentucky, for jobs for Kentucky and the Paducah

plant. We do appreciate the work that the Department is doing to reindustrialize the Paducah site. We also recognize that the cleanup on the site must get done in a timely fashion, and we hope to work with the various stakeholders and with Congressman WHITFIELD to ensure that happens.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. BARROW OF GEORGIA

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any authority, in any preceding provision of this Act, to use funds for the purchase or hire of motor vehicles.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this week marks the beginning of sequestration-related furloughs in my district. As a result, 3,200 employees at Fort Gordon near Augusta, Georgia, will be doing without 20 percent of their pay for the next few months.

Also, like many in this House, my district is home to projects caught in the Corps of Engineers' construction backlog. In particular, the New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam near Augusta has been waiting for repairs by the Corps of Engineers for 13 years, when Congress first authorized them.

This bill includes language to allow the Federal Government to purchase more cars on top of the 700,000 vehicles it already owns. My amendment would simply prohibit the expenditure of funds to purchase more vehicles. I believe there are better ways to spend that money.

I am serious about cutting unnecessary and wasteful spending. I also believe that cutting spending shouldn't be an end unto itself. It's an opportunity to reduce our deficit, but it's also an opportunity to make our government work better.

This amendment represents a relatively small change to the bill, but I believe it speaks to a larger principle. It would be an inappropriate use of taxpayer money to purchase more cars when so many folks across the country are being forced out of work and so many critical projects sit untouched. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the gentleman from Georgia's amendment. His amendment is overly broad and would prevent the Department of Energy, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the National Nuclear Security Agency, all agencies covered under our bill, from leasing or purchasing any new vehicles.

I understand my colleague's concern with the size of vehicle fleet within some of these agencies; and, in fact, I share some of those very concerns. That's why our bill actually carries a reporting requirement within the Department of Energy to report on its vehicle fleet.

□ 1345

However, this amendment would have serious unintended consequences, ranging from maintenance of Corps sites to science at our national labs, such of which are tied to the nuclear stockpile that are involved in protecting our nuclear sites.

Therefore, I must oppose the amendment. I certainly understand his reasons for doing it. I'm supportive in theory, but there are some potentially unintended consequences, so I must oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Department Administration'', and increasing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Department of the Army—Corps of Engineers—Construction'', by $2,000,000.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan amendment that reestablishes priorities here. It's similar to an amendment we passed overwhelmingly last year on this same piece of legislation, the Energy and Water appropriations bill.

What this amendment does is it transfers $2 million out of the Department of Energy's Administrative account and moves that money into the Corps of Engineers construction budget. And the reason we're doing this is to move more projects forward, to actually get some of that backlog that the Corps of Engineers have moved forward and open up the door for projects all across the country that are vital to not only our Nation's waterways, our economy, our ability to export, but in Louisiana, for example, it would provide opportunity to move forward on the Louisiana Coastal Area plan, which is a coastal restoration plan that's a major flood protection project.

So what we're talking about is, literally, one penny, one penny coming out of administration, of bureaucracy in Washington, to move that money into actual construction projects.

And I think when you talk to taxpayers across the country, they are less concerned about having bureaucracy in Washington. They want to actually see government get things done. They want to see this backlog get cleared out, and they want to see other projects that are important to our Nation's economy move forward. And that's what this amendment does. It's a bipartisan amendment.

I want to thank my colleagues—Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CASSIDY—who have also helped work on this. But again, this deals with projects all across the country that are in a backlog that could help move our economy forward rather than spending that money on administration in Washington.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If I may ask a question of Mr. SCALISE, are you seeking money for the overall account or are you seeking a certain amount of money for a project in your neck of the woods in Louisiana?

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The way that this amendment is drafted actually would apply nationwide. This would move $2 million out of that administrative account in the Department of Energy, move it into the overall Corps construction budget, so it would be available to the Corps of Engineers for construction projects across the Nation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do rise in opposition to the amendment.

And let me say, I appreciate the gentleman's passion for coastal restoration. I know it's a high priority for his district and others around the Nation.

The bill before us includes over $5 million to continue studies, engineering and design work and various components of the program. That's nearly 6 percent of the entire Investigations account dedicated to continuing work in coastal restoration in Louisiana.

The committee had to make some tough choices in the bill. While the Army Corps was a high priority, it was not completely spared. The Construction account, specifically, is slightly below the President's budget request, and almost 20 percent below the fiscal year 2013 appropriations.

The Corps has numerous projects already under construction that were not included in the President's budget and, so, aren't likely to be funded in fiscal year 2014.

While construction funding is trending downward, I believe it is most prudent to prioritize funding for ongoing projects so they can be completed and the Federal Government can realize the public safety, economic and other benefits from previous spending,

rather than starting new projects. It's unclear to me whether this is a new project, but I take the gentleman at his word that this is not a new project.

I do oppose the amendment. The reduction would substantially work against our purposes of trying to balance the Federal budget and lower the Federal deficit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHMOND. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I would urge everyone to support the bipartisan amendment that's being offered by my colleague, Mr. SCALISE, from Louisiana.

And just in response to the last comment about reducing the budget and getting our fiscal house in order, there are two ways to do it, and one way to do that is to make wise investments that give you a return on your dollar.

This investment, alone, would secure the coastal area of Louisiana, which would prevent the Federal Government from spending money in future years because of effects of hurricanes or surge or coastal erosion. The dollar we spend today, I'm sure, and I feel very comfortable in saying, we will recoup multiple dollars because of that.

If you just look at Louisiana and what we've contributed to the Nation's economy and to the Federal Government since 1950–2006, the Federal Government, the Federal Treasury has received over $150 billion from Louisiana. And we do that in a number of ways.

But if you think about Louisiana, you think about the coast that we're talking about. We're talking about 33 percent of the Nation's seafood comes from the coast of Louisiana. We're talking about almost a quarter of the Nation's domestic energy, and you look at it's home to the country's largest port system.

So when we talk about what we're protecting and the $2 million that we would spend today and the amount of money that we would recoup, I would just say that it's probably the prudent thing to do is to spend this money so that we can continue to protect Louisiana and the investment it makes in the country so that we continue to do it.

And I would also add that the bipartisan amendment simply builds on President Obama's 2014 budget request, and the administration called this a high-priority construction project.

So I would just urge everyone to support this bipartisan amendment and to look at it not as just spending or construction, but as truly an investment in the future of the country in terms of making sure that our energy production, our seafood, that the people in south Louisiana continue to have comfort and some protection.

And I would just tell you that either we spend it today or we're going to spend it tomorrow in an exponential number, because restoring the coast of Louisiana is a national priority and it's a national need. And if you look at the coast of Louisiana, every hour we still lose a football field of land, and at some point, we're going to pay for it. My preference would be to pay for it when we're not spending as much.

So it's almost like that leaking roof. You can pay for it now and just replace some shingles, or you can wait a couple of years and replace not only the shingles, but the roof, the ceiling, the carpet, and the electrical.

So, at some point, it's your choice. And I would just urge us to support this amendment, and let's spend the money now while we can get a great return on our investment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I am rising to express sympathy with the authors of this amendment, Congressman SCALISE and Congressman RICHMOND. And you're eloquent spokesmen for your districts and your regions.

I hope that you and the membership understand that one of the reasons that we reluctantly opposed your amendment is because the mark we were given in our bill is so far below what we need to meet all national needs. Your proposal is actually a new start, if we were using the classification system that we use. And as much as we want to fund it, we simply don't have the funds in the bill to do it.

The Corps has over $60 billion worth, $60 billion of backed up projects that they are not able to complete. It would be the biggest job creator in this country if we could move off the dime and fund those projects.

But to take and prioritize Louisiana as a new start over, for example, Sacramento, that has major challenges with their levee system, or St. Louis, how does one choose? Or the Great Lakes, where we can't dredge ports.

And I often tell the story that, without the dredging in the Great Lakes, pretty soon, rather than having a channel that's like this—they keep narrowing the channel because we have less and less money—pretty soon it's going to silt up. We won't be able to get anything through.

So we have a problem in our bill in trying to fund everything that is necessary for the sake of the Nation.

So your proposal is worthy, but how do we put you in the front of the line when others have been in line and we've not been able to complete their projects? We need to be able to have $60 billion in order to complete the work of the Corps with just existing projects that are already in line.

So I reluctantly stand here today in a very uncomfortable position. That project that you're referring to is billions of dollars in cost, and starting it now is something we simply can't afford, based on the allocation that we were given in our committee. We're below last year. We're below what's necessary for the Nation, and we're paying the price from coast to coast. So, Louisiana is deserving of attention, but so are 49 other States that have projects backed up.

And I say to the chairman, I completely share your pain in trying to hold the line at completing what is in line and not letting anyone else cut the line for their projects, no matter how worthy they are. Our fundamental problem is we don't have the funds to complete everything that is necessary.

So I urge my colleagues to vote with us in opposition to this amendment, as much as I sympathize with its worthiness. It just isn't possible with everything else that is in line ahead of it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASSIDY. First, let's be clear, this is not just for Louisiana. This $2 million will be available nationwide.

And that said, I rise in support of this amendment. Budgets are about establishing priorities and then making wise use of scarce resources. We know with these scarce resources, $1 million in a planning grant, which later on will be funded to greater dollars, can actually save billions in hurricane repair.

So, if I may say, there is lots of money right now in the Corps. The fact is the Corps has even a larger backlog, and these projects are not $2 million to complete. It takes $500,000 to begin the NEPA process or the sampling of the soil or something like that. So small amounts of dollars at the beginning can initiate a process that comes to fruition with an authorization later on.

This is a national issue. Let me just speak just about Louisiana, because you could equally speak about your home State.

The gasoline that is sold in Philadelphia is produced in St. Charles Parish. If a hurricane knocks out that petrochemical plant, gasoline prices rise by 20 cents a gallon in the Northeast.

Now, you could say something similar in Ohio and Mr. GARAMENDI in California and others elsewhere. So we're not saying initiate a process which completely funds. We're saying give seed money so that community in California, Ohio, or Louisiana can begin the process where later on we can make a decision regarding greater funding.

We can, as Mr. RICHMOND said, either spend a little bit now and potentially save billions in the future or, on our budget priorities, we can say we're going to be penny-wise but pound-foolish.

I urge passage of the amendment. I thank my colleague for introducing it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois.

Amendment by Mr. HECK of Nevada.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

□ 1400

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 266, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

AYES—156

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—266

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Latta
Lewis
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell
Gohmert
Grijalva
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

□ 1426

Messrs. TIPTON, BENTIVOLIO, PALAZZO, COSTA, HUDSON, MESSER, PETERS of California, ISRAEL, and RYAN of Ohio changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. CLARKE changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 155, noes 266, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

AYES—155

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)

Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—266

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Broun (GA)
Campbell
Holt
Horsford
Huelskamp
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus
Stivers
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1432

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 252, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

AYES—165

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Southerland
Stockman
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tipton
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—252

Alexander
Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Richmond
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—17

Campbell
Cole
Delaney
Gohmert
Gutiérrez
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Tiberi
Webster (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1439

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 238, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

AYES—184

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

NOES—238

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

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell
Cole
Cramer
Gohmert
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1445

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 227, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

AYES—196

Amash
Andrews
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Massie
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Salmon

Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—227

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Danny
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Gohmert
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Paulsen
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1452

Mr. WENSTRUP changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 332 (Quigley), I was unexpectedly detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOSAR was allowed to speak out of order.)

A MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF THE YARNELL 19

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, we, the Arizona delegation, rise today in the wake of the tragic Yarnell Hill Fire that has left our hearts, the hearts of Arizonans and the hearts of Americans across the country overwhelmed with disbelief and sadness.

This was the largest loss of life of first responders since 9/11.

The town of Yarnell and the people of Arizona will never forget and will forever honor the 19 heroes of the elite Granite Mountain Hotshot fire crew who lost their lives in an act of self-sacrificing bravery.

Out of my deepest respect for these fallen heroes, their families and the communities of Prescott, Peeples Valley and Yarnell, I ask you to keep them in your prayers.

I now ask you to join me and my colleagues for a moment of silence to honor the Yarnell 19's ultimate act of courage and sacrifice.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

The CHAIR. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 86, noes 338, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

AYES—86

Amodei
Bachmann
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Crawford
Edwards
Farenthold
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Hultgren
Hurt
Johnson, Sam
Jones
King (IA)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Matheson
McCaul
McKeon
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Petri
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Radel
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rooney
Ross
Salmon
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Thornberry
Turner
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Wittman
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOES—338

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Nolan
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Gohmert
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus
Young (FL)

□ 1501

Messrs. DAINES, PASTOR of Arizona, and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1715

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP) at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2609.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1716

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. PRICE of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 60, line 12.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. BASS

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on my amendment to the end that the amendment stand disposed of by the voice vote taken on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the noes have it and the amendment is not adopted.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment by Ms. TITUS of Nevada.

Amendment by Mr. LYNCH of Massachusetts.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 243, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

AYES—182

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Marino
Markey
Massie
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stockman
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—243

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy

Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
DeGette
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus

□ 1745

Messrs. FARENTHOLD, DESANTIS, GRIMM, and MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. STOCKMAN, VISCLOSKY, RAHALL, MARINO, MULVANEY, and BROUN of Georgia, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 114, noes 308, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

AYES—114

Amash
Barton
Becerra
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Capps
Capuano
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Courtney
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Gardner
Gohmert
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Grijalva
Hall
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jones
Keating
Kennedy
Kilmer
Labrador
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Long
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McGovern
McNerney
Meadows
Mica
Michaud
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Pallone
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Posey
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Rohrabacher
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Speier
Stockman
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Velázquez
Walberg
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Woodall

NOES—308

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Carter
DeGette
Diaz-Balart
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1752

Messrs. LYNCH and ELLISON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 291, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

AYES—131

Amash
Barton
Becerra
Bishop (UT)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Capps
Capuano
Cartwright
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Courtney
Daines
DeFazio
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Garamendi
Gardner
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Grijalva
Hahn
Hall
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Keating
Kennedy
Kilmer
Labrador
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Long
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Meadows
Mica
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Pallone
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rohrabacher
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Woodall

NOES—291

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Bonner
Campbell
Carter
DeGette
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PRICE of Georgia) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1759

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 337, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

AYES—87

Amodei
Bass
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Brownley (CA)
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke
Cohen
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Frankel (FL)
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kennedy
Kirkpatrick
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Miller, George
Nadler
Napolitano
Pallone
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman

NOES—337

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski

LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
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)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Carter
DeGette
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1806

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 206, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

AYES—217

Amash
Amodei
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fleming
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Gowdy
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (FL)

NOES—206

Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
DeGette
Franks (AZ)
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1812

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act or funds available in the Bonneville Power Administration Fund may be used by the Department of Energy for any program, project, or activity required by or otherwise proposed in the memorandum from Steven Chu, Secretary of Energy, to the Power Marketing Administrators with the subject line ''Power Marketing Administrations' Role'' and dated March 16, 2012.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, on March 16, 2012, the Secretary of Energy issued a ''Memorandum for Power Marketing Administrators.'' This memo, commonly referred to as the ''Chu memorandum,'' has created a great deal of

concern among our constituents who rely on Power Marketing Administrations, or PMAs, for affordable and reliable energy.

As many of you know, the PMAs are four regional Power Marketing Administrations which have been delivering reliable, clean energy to consumers for over 75 years. The PMAs have been successful models of regional collaboration with local stakeholders and a guided principle of ''beneficiary pays,'' meaning that whoever benefits from the specific investments in the PMAs' infrastructure ultimately bears the cost.

The former Secretary's memo directs the PMAs to act in areas involving transmission expansion, renewable energy, energy efficiency, and cybersecurity—all laudable goals—goals that, on the surface, I support. In fact, I have strongly advocated for the expansion of transmission here in Congress. However, I believe the Department of Energy's means of these goals, the ''Chu memo,'' would implement a top-down approach that could certainly impose greater costs and risks that outweigh benefits and could undermine the collaborative and low-cost, emissions-free nature of the Federal power program.

This issue has undergone significant scrutiny here in Congress over the past year. Last year, I and Congressman JIM MATHESON, from Utah, led a letter expressing concern over the Chu memo. That letter was signed by over 160 U.S. Senators and Representatives, almost evenly split between Republicans and Democrats. Additionally, the House Appropriations Committee approved similar language to what I am putting forth today, by voice vote, to the 2013 Energy and Water Appropriations bill barring the Secretary from implementing the Chu directives. There are few issues that Congress has had such consensus on in the past.

Additionally, the House Natural Resources Committee has held multiple hearings on the memo, and it was a major topic of conversation at our recent PMA FY 2014 budget hearing. Members from both sides of the aisle have expressed concern about how the DOE might move forward with the Chu memo.

It is best if we stop this train wreck from moving forward before it is even implemented. My amendment would simply prohibit the power marketing agencies from utilizing their budgets to implement any new program, project or activity proposed under the guise of this memo. It is not intended to disrupt any previously existing activities of the PMAs, including the Bonneville Power Administration, that have been conducted in coordination and with the support of the customers. It is many of our beliefs that the recommendations of the memo fall far from the DOE's authority under the existing law. If the DOE would like to move forward, this amendment ensures the administration will have to come forward in a transparent manner and request legal authority.

I hope my colleagues will support this commonsense amendment that will preserve the existing Federal power program and will ensure our constituents' electricity costs stay low. I urge the support of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I support the gentleman's amendment. As he said, we had a similar provision in last year's bill, and we know the concerns are acute in the power marketing regions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability and Efficiency may be used by the Department of Energy for wind energy programs.

Mr. WHITFIELD (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would like to explain, number one, why I am offering this amendment and then explain, number two, specifically what this amendment does.

The reason it is in handwriting is that, after we submitted the printed amendment, we had a conversation with the Parliamentarian, and a suggestion was made to change it, so it was changed.

This administration has made it very clear to the American people that it is trying to dictate the fuels used to produce electricity in America, and they've made it very clear that they are flagrantly discriminating and giving preferential treatment to the wind industry.

Now, why do I say that?

I don't say it because of the $12.1 billion production tax credit that the wind industry has received this year, and I don't say it because of the billions of dollars that the wind industry has received in past years. I say it because the administration has decided not to prosecute the wind industry for violations of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or of the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act or of the Endangered Species Act.

According to an Associated Press investigation, in fact, the Obama administration has never fined or prosecuted a wind farm for killing eagles and other protected bird species—shielding the industry from liability and helping keep the scope of the deaths secret.

As a matter of fact, to show you how the administration is being very discriminatory in the prosecution of these acts, British Petroleum was fined $100 million for killing migratory birds in the gulf oil spill. ExxonMobil was fined $600,000 for killing 85 birds. PacifiCorp was fined $10.5 million for killing birds. A utility in Wyoming was fined $100,000 for killing one eagle. I could go on and on and on. Yet more than 573,000 birds were killed by the country's wind farms last year, including 83,000 hunting birds, such as hawks, falcons and eagles, according to an estimate published in March in the peer-reviewed The Wildlife Society.

We know that this administration is getting the reputation of deciding what Federal laws it's going to enforce and which ones it's not going to enforce. Now it is deciding that we are going to prosecute on the Endangered Species Act, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act if you happen to be in this sector of the economy, but if you're in the wind industry, we're not going to prosecute you.

Do you know what is even worse than that?

They are now deciding that they want to carve out a rule, which the Obama administration has proposed, that would give wind energy companies potentially decades of shelter from the prosecution of the killing of any birds. The regulation is currently under review at the White House. The proposal, which was made at the urging of the wind industry, would allow companies to apply for 30-year permits to kill bald eagles, golden eagles and other migratory birds. Previously, companies were only eligible for 5-year permits. It's basically guaranteeing a black box for 30 years, and they're saying, Trust us for oversight.

''This is not the path forward,'' said Katie Umekubo, a renewable energy attorney with the Natural Resources Defense Council.

So why should the American people be giving billions of dollars to this industry and be allowing this administration not to prosecute them when they are obviously killing thousands of birds—in direct violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, of the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, and of the Endangered Species Act?

My amendment simply says, with regard to the $24 million set aside for research and development in the committee report, that it not be allowed to use that money simply because of the

extraordinary protection this administration is going to provide to prevent them from being prosecuted under the existing Federal laws that this Congress passed many years ago. That is the purpose of the amendment, and I would respectfully urge Members to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly to oppose the amendment because I know my colleague, my friend from Kentucky, has an incredible reputation of being the friend of animals and birds. Obviously, we are concerned about the issues he has raised.

Our bill already reduces the Wind Energy program from $59 million to $24 million, a cut of nearly 60 percent. His amendment goes a step further by eliminating the Wind Energy program entirely, which would result in the termination of the first offshore wind at-scale demonstration in the United States and would result in a dramatic drop-off in the U.S. deployment of wind energy systems. This setback would come at a time when wind is renewable energy's fastest growing sector.

I oppose my colleague's amendment. I am certainly aware of his heartfelt concern. We are listening to what he said, but I still oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think the gentleman who is proposing the amendment is missing some major points.

Before a wind energy project can continue or go into effect, it has to meet very stringent environmental requirements. Those environmental requirements, among other things, deal specifically with all types of birds. I will tell you that, in my current district and in my previous district, I had the major wind farms in California, and no project was allowed to go forward without addressing these issues. Under the Endangered Species Act, it is possible for incidental takes to take place if there is appropriate mitigation, and I know from the projects in my area that there had to be appropriate mitigation.

□ 1830

The modern wind turbines are far different than the old wind turbines, which were, in fact, deadly to birds. The modern wind turbines are far less so. And if there is an incidental take of a listed species, it can only occur with proper and appropriate mitigation.

The author's reference to the issue of a longtime take opportunity only occurs if there happens to be an adaptive management program in place that allows the Fish and Wildlife Service and other appropriate agencies to review the process and progress, or lack thereof, and apply different measures or stop the projects at that time.

So I would oppose the amendment. I think it is based upon incorrect facts. And I join the chairman in opposition.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Last year, wind energy was the largest source of new generating capacity in our country, comprising 42 percent of all new generating capacity. Overall, America's wind energy capacity grew by 28 percent. That's an incredible record, and it demonstrates that wind energy is an affordable, reliable source of power that produces no carbon or other air pollution.

But the recent success of wind energy in our country doesn't mean we should stop investing in it. In fact, we need to do more, not less, to develop and deploy new wind energy technologies, and we're busy doing that along the Great Lakes.

Wind energy will play an important role in the transition to a cleaner energy economy. According to the American Wind Energy Association, this year alone U.S. wind projects will avoid nearly 100 million metric tons of carbon dioxide being poured into the atmosphere—the equivalent of reducing power sector emissions by over 4 percent or taking more than 17 million cars off the road.

In addition to cutting carbon pollution, investing in wind energy is a boon to our economy. In 2012, the industry supported more than 80,000 full-time equivalent jobs, including more than 25,000 manufacturing jobs at more than 550 facilities. As the global clean energy economy grows, the United States has a tremendous opportunity to attract more investment here and create even more manufacturing jobs, including in Kentucky and Ohio.

But we are at risk of missing out on this opportunity. At a time when the global clean energy market is getting more competitive, the United States has started to lag behind. In 2012, China's level of clean energy financing surpassed our country's for the first time.

Year after year, some House Republicans have pushed budgets and appropriation bills that would slash funding for clean energy and energy-efficiency programs. This appropriation bill is no exception, and Mr. WHITFIELD's amendment just takes it one step further. Eliminating all Department of Energy wind energy programs is exactly the wrong approach and one that will hurt our Nation's competitiveness in this growing market. It certainly isn't consistent with an all-of-the-above energy strategy.

Some may argue it makes sense to cut government investment in wind energy since it is a more mature technology than some emerging technologies, but wind energy isn't operating on a level playing field. The United States currently provides enormous government subsidies and tax breaks to fossil fuels. In fact, the International Monetary Fund just issued a report finding that the United States provides more subsidies to fossil fuels than any other country in the world, even China. Our annual subsidies total over—get ready for this—one-half of a trillion dollars.

We shouldn't cede the growing global clean energy market to China or make any of our other competitors happy.

And let me just say this, as I know quite a bit about this and Ohio has been fast about wind energy. I represent the Saudi Arabia of wind in the Great Lakes, which is called Lake Erie. Lake Erie also happens to be the warmest of the lakes, so it's a bird haven. On the Mississippi Flyway, we have more fish, fauna, and birds than all the other Great Lakes combined. And with that Mississippi Flyway coming up, we have lots of eagles, we have lots of different types of birds. The cormorants are some that are problematic, but, nonetheless, we are really a bird haven. We've learned that the wind turbines don't cause us any trouble. We have to situate them sometimes 3 miles from shore.

The biggest killer of birds nationwide is cats. So if you really want to look at where the problem is, maybe we need more cat control. But honestly, for the number of turbines that we've erected, what happens, especially when you have a set of turbines operating in the air, they create an updraft and the birds—they are pretty smart—sort of fly above the wind. They're amazing. They float on the pathway that the turbines generate. In addition to that, there are new technologies like strobe lights that are actually affixed to the turbines, and they keep birds away. It's almost like a silent radar in a way. So there are new technologies that are being developed to deal with that.

We actually want birds. We want turbines. We want clean energy. We want all types of energy in our region. We haul coal out of Kentucky to many of our power plants. So we have an all-of-the-above strategy in our region, but we really welcome the wind opportunities.

Cleveland, Ohio, and an investment group called LEEDCo is doing everything possible to move additional turbines onto the Great Lakes.

So I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I ask my colleagues to vote against it. And I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kentucky will be postponed.

Ms. TITUS. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to speak on a serious issue that affects my constituents. I've been investigating it since it was brought to my attention several months ago through our local media.

The Department of Energy is in the process of moving dangerous radioactive waste thousands of miles across the country from east Tennessee to southern Nevada. This waste is destined for the Nevada Nuclear Security Site, formally known as the Nevada Test Site. This is a totally separate issue now from the proposed Yucca Mountain storage site debate that we have heard earlier today.

If you're unaware that this radioactive waste is traveling through your backyard, I'm not surprised. The DOE has failed to properly inform Congress about this activity.

The project involves the transport of hundreds of canisters containing high-concentration fissile materials from the Consolidated Edison Uranium Solidification Project in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, to be dumped in my State of Nevada. The materials are so radioactive that they have a half life of more than 160,000 years.

I want to be clear that this is not the kind of low-level waste that the Nevada Test Site has been accepting for years. In fact, just weeks ago, I learned that the Department of Energy had reworked the waste acceptance criteria for the security site to allow storage of materials that have radioactive concentrations more than 40 times higher than anything that has ever been brought to the site for disposal before.

That revision to the WAC, or waste acceptance criteria, was signed off on by the DOE the very same day that agency officials met with my staff and State and local officials, yet DOE didn't think it was necessary or important to inform any of us about this change. As a matter of fact, it took an Internet search days later to discover that DOE had actually reworked the playbook for the site without any public input.

Mr. Chairman, there are far too many questions about what DOE is doing and plans to do at the Nevada Test Site, questions that so far have gone unanswered.

Nevadans have had a lot of experience dealing with Federal officials throughout the days of atomic testing and during the Cold War. We're not going to just turn aside now and let the DOE run roughshod over our communities.

And I can tell you that I'm not alone in expressing my concerns about the DOE's activities. Our Republican governor, Brian Sandoval, has also publicly stated his opposition to the shipments of this radioactive waste. In a letter to the Energy Secretary, our Governor stated that classifying ''this material as low-level waste sets a dangerous precedent.'' I will be submitting the letter from Governor Sandoval for the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, my district sits just 65 miles southeast of the Nevada Test Site. The Las Vegas metropolitan area is home to nearly 2 million residents and more than 40 million visitors annually. Any plan to transport waste through the heart of the Las Vegas Valley would be extremely risky and incredibly irresponsible. The stakes are just too high to gamble on District One's safety.

The DOE has refused to cooperate with repeated attempts to gather additional information so we can have appropriate oversight. It's unthinkable that DOE is moving forward with this program without properly briefing Members of Congress. If we are being kept in the dark, who is overseeing the DOE's plans? It's critical that DOE be forthright about how and why the WAC was changed, how the changes relate to the proposed shipment, and how these changes will affect the safety and security of southern Nevada and communities across the country in the path of this transportation.

I'd like to thank the chairman and especially the ranking member for allowing me to bring this to the attention of the House, and I would ask them to work with me to ensure that there's proper congressional oversight of DOE and that the people of Nevada and beyond get the answers that they deserve.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Las Vegas, NV, June 20, 2013.

Re Planned Shipment of Wastes from Oak Ridge to Nevada National Security Site

Hon. DR. ERNEST MONIZ,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY MONIZ: I'm writing to inform you that after long and serious consideration, I have decided to oppose the Department of Energy's plan to ship the Consolidated Edison Uranium Solidification Project (CEUSP) canisters containing dangerous and long-lived radioactive waste for disposal at Area 5 of the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS).

I am aware that DOE believes that these canisters qualify for disposal as low-level radioactive waste (LLW). My advisors have independently evaluated all of the important technical and regulatory issues. They have concluded that the CEUSP canisters are not commonplace LLW; even if these canisters meet a legalistic definition of LLW, they are not suitable for shallow land burial at the NNSS. Nevada is also not satisfied with the overall process that DOE has followed in developing its disposal and transportation plans, including failure to appropriately address the concerns of affected local governments and Native American Tribes.

The CEUSP canisters can only be considered LLW because they do not meet the legal definition of high-level radioactive waste, spent nuclear fuel, transuranic waste, or uranium mill tailings. Using this logic, DOE is attempting to exploit a gap in current regulations. This dangerous waste should be managed in the same manner as remote-handled transuranic waste, which DOE currently ships to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant for permanent deep-geologic disposal. The canisters contain a high concentration of fissile material (Uranium 235 and Uranium 233), uranium isotopes that are extremely long-lived (half lives of more than 160,000 years), and have a relatively high surface dose rate (300 rem per hour), which makes them dangerous to workers and a potential source of ''dirty bomb'' material. Moreover, qualifying this material as LLW sets a dangerous precedent for the classification of potential future waste streams that exist across the nation.

Both Nevada and DOE have a mutual interest in the long-term and safe management of NNSS. Over the past two decades, the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection has worked successfully with DOE on a broad range of environmental assessment and remediation activities at NNSS. I believe that this provides a basis for shared planning for future uses of DOE facilities at NNSS.

I request a meeting with you at your earliest convenience to discuss in a cooperative manner Nevada's views on the future of operations at the NNSS. Timely matters for discussion include the recently completed Site-wide Environmental Impact Statement and pending issuance of the associated Record of Decision, troubling revisions to the NNSS Waste Acceptance Criteria, and the unsatisfactory manner in which DOE and National Nuclear Security Administration have dealt with affected local governments and Native American Tribes in Nevada.

The State of Nevada is committed to a long-term cooperative relationship with your Department, based on mutual respect, sound science, protection of the environment, and public health and safety. I look forward to meeting with you at your earliest convenience.

Sincere regards,

BRIAN SANDOVAL,
Governor.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

Mr. TURNER. I have an amendment at the desk

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the active and inactive nuclear weapons stockpiles of the United States in contravention of section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2573(b)).

Mr. TURNER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2906.

I offer this amendment in response to the President's recent address in Berlin in which he outlined his plan to further reduce the United States strategic nuclear arsenal below acceptable levels and in contravention of current law.

The President's latest proposal would once again call for unilateral reductions in our strategic nuclear arsenal at a time when countries like Russia and China continue to expand and modernize their nuclear capabilities.

To make matters worse, the President has undertaken this most recent effort without the consent of the United States Senate, as required under the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which states international agreements cannot limit or reduce the military forces of the United States unless enacted pursuant to a treaty or congressional-executive agreement.

Not only do the President's continued calls for weapons reductions jeopardize the safety and security of the United States, but he compromises the safety of our partner nations.

It is unacceptable that the President continues to make secret deals with countries like Russia while at the same time breaking promises with the American people and our allies.

The current threat environment around the world is very real and should not be underestimated. A robust nuclear arsenal is critical in deterring against emerging threats like Iran and North Korea.

My amendment simply ensures that none of the funds appropriated by this act may be used to further reduce nuclear force reductions outside of the formal process established under existing law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I support the gentleman's amendment, and I salute his leadership in this area, both in this Congress and the past Congresses.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and wish to say, first of all, it is unnecessary because there are no funds in the FY14 bill that are allocated to be used for nuclear weapons reductions below the New START levels.

The amendment, in my opinion, is constitutionally questionable because it impinges on the President's ability to set U.S. nuclear weapons policy and usurp's the President's ability to retire, dismantle, or eliminate non-deployed nuclear weapons.

□ 1845

This amendment restricts the President's constitutional authority to negotiate international agreements, including sole executive agreements for arms reductions; and it impinges on the President's authority to determine the number of strategic delivery vehicles needed to meet national security requirements and implement changes in those forces, as appropriate. And it limits the President's authority to determine appropriate force structure to meet nuclear deterrence requirements and to set nuclear employment policy, an authority exercised by every President in the nuclear age. Frankly, it is bad policy.

Blocking nuclear weapons reduction is out of step with post-Cold War and post-9/11 security environment. Secretary Schultz, Secretary Kissinger, Secretary Nunn, and Secretary Perry all have encouraged further nuclear weapons reductions stating in 2007:

> Unless urgent new actions are taken, the United States soon will be compelled to enter a new nuclear era that will be more precarious and psychologically disorienting, and economically even more costly than was Cold War deterrence.

The amendment disregards potential military requirements, including potential Strategic Command recommendations, and instead imposes congressional requirements.

It seems to restrict any reductions below the New START to bilateral negotiated reductions with Russia. So in effect it outsources decisions on U.S. nuclear force structure to Russia, and it requires maintenance of nuclear weapons levels that might be costly and unnecessary in an era of budget constraints.

I think the amendment is poorly written and will not achieve its objectives. It fails to ban unilateral reductions by referencing the ACA section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

It fails to keep deployed forces at 1,550. And, as written, it allows the whole stockpile to decline to that level since that's the limit in New START. This would entail retaining a total stockpile of 1,550 with a deployed force of 1,550, which simply does not make sense. Neither the active nor the inactive stockpile is limited by New START. The treaty limits the number of operationally deployed warheads and delivery vehicles. While operationally deployed warheads are part of the active stockpile, the size of the stockpile itself is not limited. Supporting 1,550 deployed warheads would require the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy to maintain an active stockpile in excess of 1,550 warheads. New START also does not count nonstrategic warheads, so it is unclear whether the amendment intends to count the nonstrategic warheads under the New START limit.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit some additional comments for the RECORD. Obviously, I disagree with the gentleman's amendment and urge my colleagues to oppose his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

TALKING POINTS AGAINST THE TURNER AMENDMENT ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS REDUCTIONS

Turner Amendment language: Sec.__. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in the active and inactive stockpiles of the United States below that required by the New START treaty (as defined in ____) in contravention of section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 USC 2573(b)).

UNNECESSARY

There are no funds in FY14 bill that are allocated to be used for nuclear weapons reductions below New START levels.

CONSTITUTIONALLY QUESTIONABLE

The amendment impinges on the President's ability to set US nuclear weapons policy and usurps the President's ability to retire, dismantle, or eliminate non-deployed nuclear weapons.

This amendment restricts the President's constitutional authority to negotiate international agreements, including sole executive agreements for arms reduction;

impinges on the President's authority to determine the number of strategic delivery vehicles needed to meet national security requirements and implement changes in those forces as appropriate;

limits the President's authority to determine appropriate force structure to meet nuclear deterrence requirements and to set nuclear employment policy—authority exercised by every president in the nuclear age.

BAD POLICY

Blocking nuclear weapons reductions is out of step with post-Cold War and post–9/11 security environment. Sec. Schultz, Sec. Kissinger, Senator Nunn and Sec. Perry have encouraged further nuclear weapons reductions stating in 2007: "Unless urgent new actions are taken, the United States soon will be compelled to enter a new nuclear era that will be more precarious and psychologically disorienting, and economically even more costly than was Cold War deterrence.

Disregards potential military requirements, including potential Strategic Command recommendations, and instead imposes Congressional requirement.

Seems to restrict any reductions below New START to bilateral, negotiated reductions with Russia, so in effect outsources decisions on US nuclear force structure to Russia.

Requires maintenance of nuclear weapons levels that might be costly and unnecessary in an era of budget constraints.

INEFFECTIVE

The amendment is poorly written and will not achieve its objectives.

It fails to ban unilateral reductions by referencing the ACA Section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

ACDA does not prevent the President from making unilateral reductions in U.S. nuclear weapons. It says that the President cannot obligate the United States to reduce its forces in a militarily significant way without seeking the approval of Congress. "Obligate" usually means signing a legally-binding treaty or executive agreement. A handshake, or joint statement of political intent would not be an "obligation" under the terms of this legislation.

It fails to keep deployed forces at 1,550.

As written, it allows the whole stockpile to decline to 1,550, since that's the limit in New START. This would entail retaining a total stockpile of 1,550, with a deployed force of 1,550, which does not make sense. Neither the active nor the inactive stockpile are limited by New START. The Treaty limits the number of operationally deployed warheads and delivery vehicles. While operationally deployed

warheads are part of the active stockpile, the size of the stockpile itself is not limited. Supporting 1,550 deployed warheads would require DOD and DOE to maintain an active stockpile in excess of 1,550 warheads. New START also does not count nonstrategic warheads so it is unclear whether the amendment intends to count the nonstrategic warheads under the new START limit.

Quote by Gen Kehler, in response to question by Mr. Turner at STRATCOM policy hearing on March 5, 2013 (noting that you do not necessarily need an operational pit production infrastructure is needed before we reduce non-deployed nuclear weapons):

Mr. Turner. Great. Because you would agree that our ability to have a long-term ability for production, in a production infrastructure should be a basis for us considering whether or not we reduce any of our hedge in case there isn't an issue with the weapons that we have.

General Kehler. Sir, I think that is one consideration. I don't think that is the only consideration. And I think that there are some scenarios that you can unfold where an interim strategy will serve us even under some technical issues. So I—but I think for the United States of America in the long term that we want a permanent solution to the nuclear enterprise that includes a permanent solution to the plutonium.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I urge the House to support the Turner-Rogers-Franks-Bridenstine amendment.

The New START treaty is perhaps the first unilateral arms control treaty the U.S. has ratified in that it is the first treaty where only the U.S. has to make reductions in the central limits of the treaty.

Every six months new data is released by the Department of State showing that only the U.S. is reducing its deployed nuclear forces to implement this treaty.

Last month, in Berlin, the President announced that he was changing the Nuclear Weapons Employment Guidance and Strategy of the United States to support further reductions in United States nuclear forces.

Never before has a President done something like this.

Yes, Presidents since Truman have updated the nation's nuclear war plan.

But there is no precedent for a President to tell the national security team that, regardless of the nuclear weapons modernization programs of China, Russia, Pakistan, North Korea and others, the U.S. should plan to reduce our nuclear forces.

Every other President has asked one simple question when conducting a review like this: what level of nuclear forces do I need to ensure that a potential enemy or adversary knows that if he attacks the United States or our allies, we will have the ability to respond with nuclear forces that could result in nothing less than total devastation?

It has not been explained to me how fewer nuclear weapons in the U.S. nuclear deterrent is necessarily better for the country's security.

When allies see us backing away from our extended deterrent, and potential adversaries see us giving up these capabilities while they are growing them in practically every way—cascades of proliferation cannot be far behind.

Already we see that allies are concerned with the President's new approach.

For 66 years, since the U.S. used them to end World War II, our deterrent has kept the world safe.

This is not a recipe the Congress will let the President arbitrarily change to satisfy a small cloister of arms control and disarmament ideologues.

The reason the Turner-Rogers-Franks-Bridenstine amendment is so important is that in this new strategy the President announced, he refuses to commit to following the established precedent of only pursuing nuclear reductions with another nation through a treaty or a congressional-executive agreement that must be enacted by an affirmative act of Congress.

Practically every senior military officer who has testified before the House Armed Services Committee on the subject of further nuclear force reductions has been clear they must be "bilateral and verifiable" and that the only way to achieve this is through a treaty.

Yet, the civilians in the Administration refuse to state that this approach supported by the military is also the President's policy.

This amendment is consistent with language I offered, as Chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee that overseas our nation's nuclear forces, which was adopted by the House Armed Services Committee and the House itself, in the recent FY14 National Defense Authorization Act.

The President may think he doesn't need Congress when it comes to international agreements with states like Russia.

He may think he can ignore gross violations in arms control agreements, like those Russia is engaged in today.

But he still needs money to implement his policies.

And that's what we can deny him if he attempts to ignore or circumvent the people's elected representatives in Congress.

I encourage the support of this amendment and I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his support, leadership, and endurance during this long process.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers-Civil—Expenses", and increasing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers-Civil—Construction", by $15,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise to amend H.R. 2609, the Energy and Water appropriations bill, for the purpose of addressing several issues in New Mexico.

More specifically, my amendment would increase the construction account by $15 million to ensure local governments, like the city of Rio Rancho, the county of Benalillo and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, get reimbursed for the work that they have done in conjunction with the Army Corps of Engineers. The Army Corps of Engineers works with local governments in New Mexico to construct levees, implement flood control measures, and other important infrastructure for the safety of the public.

More specifically, the city of Rio Rancho entered into a reimbursement contract with the Army Corps of Engineers and has not been paid back for several years due to the lack of appropriations. The same goes for the county of Benalillo and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, and others across the country.

This delay in reimbursement has led to interruptions in financing for other city projects and also has the potential to hurt the credit ratings of these entities if they do not recover these funds via reimbursement, as stated in their contracts.

By increasing the dollar amount in this account, which includes a number of programs and accounts that are critical to local governments—like engineering, construction, technical assistance, flood control, and environmental infrastructure—we can get these entities reimbursed and get these liabilities off the books of the Army Corps of Engineers to get the projects going.

Mr. Chairman, local governments have been left holding an IOU from the Federal Government for doing work based on good-faith written agreements with the Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there may be opposition from the Republican majority, but I'm hoping I can persuade the chairman to support me in this effort. Section 593 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 is under which the city of Rio Rancho and these other local governments entered into agreements with the Army Corps of Engineers. If the Republican majority disagrees with the authority, they should repeal it; but let's make these local governments whole.

When city and local governments enter into reimbursement contracts, they expect to be reimbursed. They have annual budgets with the expectation they will get paid back. Congress should live up to these obligations in the authority given to the agency by Congress. I understand the constraints that the subcommittee dealt with with the allocations given to them, but we need to make sure that we're working to make these local governments whole. Again, going forward, if this is an authority that the Republican majority feels we should do away with, we should do away with it. But let's make these local governments whole.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the

gentleman from New Mexico's amendment.

The gentleman makes the case that there's a need for this infrastructure, and maybe there is; but the Corps of Engineers has no particular expertise or reason for being the funding source. Especially when we're looking at such tight budgets to begin with, we must focus the Corps' funding on activities which have the greatest impact on our economy and public safety, namely, navigation and flood control—our historic responsibility. So I must oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to bring an action against the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, since coming to the House of Representatives a little over 2 years ago, I have made it a priority to revitalize the economy in central Florida. As a result, I have had the opportunity to meet with community leaders in my district and the surrounding areas to talk about projects that matter the most to them—dredging of canals and the building of new roads.

Again and again, I find, however, that the Army Corps of Engineers is slow rolling many of these projects, not because they want to, but because they're forced to.

The Corps continues to move the goalpost on these communities. And once permits have been given and work has already been done, the Corps has come back with fines and penalties and mitigation.

When I asked the Army Corps what happened with these projects, it's the same thing. I constantly hear from the Corps that they're worried about being sued. They're worried because the advocacy groups all over this country are dedicated to doing nothing other than taking away Congress' responsibilities for setting our Nation's laws, regulatory policies, and giving it to the courts or the executive branch.

These activists don't want people of the United States of America or their elected officials to have any say in how this country is run. They want to force their own agenda on everybody else through the courts; and even more disturbing, they're doing it with taxpayer money.

These groups receive Federal grants; and once they take the Army Corps, the EPA, or any other agency to court, they oftentimes get a cash settlement or payout to go away. That money goes back into the litigation system, furthering the problem.

Take, for example, the group Earthjustice, which in their tax year of 2011 nonprofit 990 tax form described themselves as a ''public interest law firm'' dedicated to pursuing ''far-reaching, big-impact litigation.'' In that filing, Earthjustice used the phrase ''our litigation'' or ''our lawsuits'' over a dozen times. Their 2011 filing includes seven pages of attorneys' fees that have been awarded to them; and that document celebrates the fact that because of the work, the Federal Government is forced to back down. They have an entire section dedicated to their work to stop the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Moreover, they are doing it with our money. Groups like this get Federal dollars through grants. Then they use the money to help fund lawsuits against the Federal Government and these agencies. They take that settlement money that we pay out, to the tune of $5 million in 2011 for just one group, one advocacy group, Earthjustice; and, guess what, that money comes from the pockets of the American people.

Whether or not you support the policy goals of groups like Earthjustice, every single person in this room should be worried about their tactics. Their self-stated mission is to take regulatory power out of the hands of Congress and hand it to the courts. The goal is diametrically opposed to the vision our Founding Fathers had.

Nobody in this Chamber should support abdicating our constitutional responsibilities to activists who then charge the tab back to United States citizens and then come back asking for even more money.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the work that the chairman has done in moving this particular bill through. In discussions with the chairman of the committee, we're going to withdraw this amendment because I believe that we can work together to try to resolve the fact that these groups shouldn't profit on the backs of American taxpayers, blocking justice and the ability for these places, communities that I serve and others in this great Nation to create jobs.

With that, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that requires all new light duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternate fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2014 from being used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum.

Our transportation sector is by far the biggest reason we send $600 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs. But America doesn't need to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel. Alternative technologies exist today that, when implemented broadly, will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet, with over 14,000 being used by the Department of Veterans Affairs and other departments.

By supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage development of domestic energy resources—including biomass, natural gas, agricultural waste, hydrogen, renewable electricity, methanol, and ethanol.

When I was in Brazil, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding their use of ethanol. When people drove to a gas station, they saw what a gallon of gasoline would cost and what an equivalent amount of ethanol would cost and could decide which was better for them. I want Americans to make the same choices. If they can do it in Brazil, we can do it here. We can educate people on using alternative fuels and let consumers decide what is best for them.

Expanding the role these energy sources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies and will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world oil markets.

I have introduced a bill, along with the gentlewoman from Florida, that would also take a major step in this direction, and I think this policy is something that we need to move. So I ask that everyone support the Engel amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1900

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I'm pleased to accept the amendment from my friend from New York State and his annual advocacy on behalf of this cause.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Expenses'', and by increasing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Construction'', by $1,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Chairman, my amendment seeks to increase funding to the Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Construction account by $1 million to support flood and storm damage reduction efforts. With hurricane season underway, it is important that we support the Corps' critical efforts in this area.

In H.R. 2609, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN has provided the Corps of Engineers with $1.3 billion for projects that can mitigate natural disasters, including hurricanes, storms, and floods.

Having lived through Hurricane Sandy, I know the chairman is well aware of the value of these investments, and I would like to thank the chairman and the committee for their efforts on our behalf.

By providing this additional funding for the Corps to conduct important activities, my amendment demonstrates a commitment to addressing the threat of severe weather events and flooding. The Corps has undertaken a number of important flood projects throughout the country, and we must continue to provide the funding we need to support these efforts.

Again, I appreciate the efforts of the chairman and his committee's work in crafting this bill and supporting the Corps' important work, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I'm pleased to support the amendment. And let me thank the gentleman from Florida for his advocacy for his own congressional district and his State, and I commend him.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee to carry out section 301 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 16421a; added by section 402 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111–5)).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would stop a loan program created by the infamous 2009 stimulus bill.

As I and many others have pointed out when the bill was passed, the stimulus, which was billed as funding shovel-ready programs, actually became a vehicle to bake in higher levels of spending and new government programs. As with other government loan programs, we've all too often seen abuses in mismanagement, and this program is no exception.

The elimination of the Western Area Power Administration's green transmission borrowing authority was recommended in the report to this year's House budget; and so if you voted for the budget, I would urge you to support this amendment as well.

I also want to thank my colleagues, Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Chairman HASTINGS, for their work in the offering and marking up of a bill last year to repeal this program.

As the budget report notes:

The $3.25 billion borrowing authority in the Western Area Power Administration's Transmission Infrastructure Program provides loans to develop new transmission systems aimed solely at integrating renewable energy.

This authority was inserted into the stimulus bill without opportunity for debate. Of most concern, the authority includes a bailout provision that would require American taxpayers to pay outstanding balances on projects that private developers failed to pay.

This bailout provision is particularly problematic because, in November 2011, the Department of Energy inspector general issued a lengthy management alert on this stimulus borrowing authority. To quote from that report:

Because of a variety of problems, the project is estimated to be 2 years behind schedule and $70 million over budget, essentially out of funds, and currently at a standstill, with no progress being made. Western had not completed a formal root-cause analysis and corrective action plan designed to ensure more effective program safeguards are in place going forward. Because Western has committed $25 million in developmental funding to a potential $3 billion project that would ultimately require an investment of $1.5 billion in Recovery Act borrowing authority, we are issuing this report as a management alert.

Madam Chairman, this IG report speaks for itself, and I urge my colleagues to support the repeal of this failed stimulus program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I'm not quite sure why he's doing this, but, you know, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act provided $3.25 billion in borrowing authority to modernize the electricity grid.

I believe your amendment focuses on WAPA, the Western Area Power marketing authority, solely; is that correct, sir?

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. That is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank you very much.

Now, I don't live out there. I'm from a part of the country that doesn't have one of these, but most of America is covered by power marketing authorities. If you really look at California, if you look at the TVA, regions of the country that have these borrowing authorities, and the way they work is that the ratepayers then pay back, over time, the costs of that investment.

We have to invest and modernize our grid. That part of the country is growing, and, frankly, they have been returning dollars at a fairly steady rate. I looked at those figures about a year ago.

And with the increase in renewables in the West, there's also a need to alter the grid and its ability to accept new forms of power. That part of the country is growing. The population is just exploding out there. And so, therefore, we're going to have a greater use of power and more of a need to put it on to the system.

So I don't see why the gentleman who comes from Louisiana—now, I know you've got a lot of oil drilling down there in the gulf and a lot of us have voted for that, but I don't really understand the purpose of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I'm happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. These companies, they certainly are welcome to borrow money and invest it themselves. This puts the taxpayer on the hook, and they're not delivering on these loans. They're well behind. And eventually, the taxpayers, as in so many cases from the stimulus bill, are going to be picking up the tab.

If it's so valuable and it returns investment over time, then fine; let them use their own capital.

Ms. KAPTUR. I hear what the gentleman is saying, but they actually do pay it back through usage. Just like you pay a utility bill and it goes back to the company, essentially WAPA is a company, and it borrows and then it pays back. And so these funds are going to be paid back over time.

I wish I had one in my area. I think it would really help us out a lot.

But I have to oppose the gentleman's amendment. I think it would be very counterproductive to hurt any part of our country and their power grid system, their ability to modernize their power grid system.

The gentleman has, I think, Southeast Power marketing authority. I don't know if that covers Louisiana or not. But different parts of the country have different systems that are in place, and I wouldn't want to take away the West's ability to power themselves and to do so in a very cost-effective manner.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. And again, I would just have to say, there's a dynamic to money. And yes, some of it may be paid back. But at the end of the day, if the money is not fully paid back, or paid back at the appropriate rate and the taxpayers have to make up the difference, then I would say that certainly in the private sector that wouldn't work out.

And I think that we should hold government, nongovernment, all those who handle money, and particularly taxpayer money, we need to hold them to the same standard. And they're not delivering on that return of investment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, I would beg to disagree. Reclaiming my time, I'm glad the gentleman stated that, but I think that you will hear strongly from them that they, in fact, are paying back, and they have a good rate of repayment.

I remember our former colleague, Norm Dicks, if I said anything against WAPA, boy, I'd be in big trouble because they do have a very good rate of repayment back. And, in fact, they have returned money consistently and paid back their original loan. So I think that they're free-floating now, and I think they have a very, very good record.

So I would oppose the gentleman's amendment very strongly in support of our colleagues in the West and their need for power and modernizing their electricity grid. And I urge my colleagues to vote against the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Weapons Activities'', and increasing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Construction'', by $100,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I want to commend the staff, the Chair, the ranking member, and all of those who have worked so hard over the last couple of days to get this bill processed and to deal with all the amendments. It's been an arduous task and one that has created, I am told, far more amendments than have ever been presented on any such appropriation bill in the past.

And there's a reason for that. The reason is that this appropriation bill is a direct result of the, what we fondly call—or not so fondly call—the Ryan Republican budget. This is really the first opportunity that America has to see the effects of a very austere budget, one that really decimates programs all across America, programs that are of great value and great utility.

This particular subcommittee was presented with the mark, that is, the amount of money that it had available to it as a result of that budget that was passed by the majority in this House. Now, that budget's not law. There has been no conference committee. In fact, the majority in this House has refused to set up a conference committee, that is, to put in names for that conference committee. So this is really a one-House budget that is being carried out here with this legislation.

It is a remarkable and an extraordinarily important moment in which the American public has a chance to see exactly what austerity, as presented to us by the majority, means. It means that those research programs that allow America the opportunity to advance its energy programs, to take control of the energy programs of the future, the renewable energy programs, the nuclear energy programs, and on and on, those opportunities are lost.

□ 1915

I know the committee was faced with a very stringent budget, an austerity budget. They made decisions that are, in my view, extraordinarily detrimental to America. Specifically, the committee—the majority, that is—made a decision to take the money that was available and remove it from those programs that are the energy future of this Nation—wind, solar, conservation, biofuels, automobiles that are efficient, houses that are efficient, programs that are absolutely crucial to this Nation's future and to the world's future because they deal specifically with climate change—and move money from those programs to the Nuclear Weapons program and to programs that are not needed.

Consider for a moment that the United States has over 5,500 nuclear bombs, which are sufficient to end life on this planet. It's over if those were to be used. And the military says we don't need them. These are programs that are inefficient, ineffective, and are the sinkholes of American taxpayers' money. The majority decided to move the money there. Okay. Who are we going to use those things on? We can't. We don't need them for deterrence. But yet that's where the money goes. Not only does the money come from those energy programs that we absolutely need for our future and for our economy's future, the money comes from programs that are absolutely essential for the well-being of Americans today and tomorrow.

The Army Corps of Engineers protects our citizens with its levees and with its flood control projects. We've heard this over and over again for the last 2 days. And yet the majority continues to insist to spend the money on these nuclear weapons, not on those things that are essential for today's life and essential for the well-being of people now, as the storm season arrives here on the east coast with hurricanes, in the Gulf States with hurricanes, and in my State of California, in my district, where I have more than 1,500 miles of levees. People are at risk.

This amendment would take $100 million from these weapons systems and put that money directly into the Army Corps of Engineers Construction account so that the Army Corps of Engineers can protect our citizens today.

I ask for an ''aye'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I rise to oppose the amendment. We've gone over this ground several times so I'll be brief.

All of us here strongly support investments in the Corps' work and their projects, particularly those projects with the greatest benefit to public safety and the economy, namely flood control and navigation. But this amendment proposes to pay for additional Corps construction by diverting funds needed for our nuclear weapons stockpile for national security. And that is the most critical priority in our bill.

And so I strongly oppose the amendment. His amendment is unacceptable because it is an issue of national security, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise today to voice my support for vital funding for important Army Corps of Engineers' projects across the Palm Beach-Treasure Coast district that I proudly represent.

This bill includes funding for the critically important Indian River Lagoon C–44 project, which will greatly improve the water quality in my district. For those of you unfamiliar with this local treasure, it is the most diverse estuary in North America, many of its species already threatened or endangered. But due to extreme pollution, local officials have issued health warnings advising residents to not contact this waterway. Tragically, it has also witnessed a major die-off of its population of manatees, dolphins, pelicans, and other crucial species. Completion of this project is essential to protecting this vital ecosystem as well as improving the water quality throughout the region.

The C–44 project is part of broader Everglades restoration efforts that the Army Corps is tasked with, which will protect this unique and important habitat. Furthermore, the Everglades provide drinking water for one in three Floridians, and restoration efforts also have a 3-to-1 return on investment in the local economy. Completion of the overall Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Project will shore up Florida's access to clean drinking water and improve the local environment and economy.

Locally, Everglades restoration is part of the solution to the harmful discharges that are currently being released from Lake Okeechobee into the St. Lucie River on the Treasure Coast. By returning water flows south of the lake and improving water quality in the area through projects such as C–44, we can mitigate the effects these harmful discharges from the lake continue to have on our local waterways year after year, devastating the environment and the economy.

Furthermore, the Army Corps is responsible for repairing the Herbert Hoover Dike, which surrounds Lake Okeechobee and is listed as one of the most at-risk of failure in the Nation. This project keeps local residents safe from devastating flooding that could occur if the dike were to fail. The Army Corps has already been struggling to meet its obligations on this and other projects, which is why we must continue to provide funding or risk further delaying these important ongoing jobs.

In addition to the important Indian River Lagoon, Lake Okeechobee, and Herbert Hoover Dike projects this bill supports, it also provides important funding for inlet dredging projects. Being able to access and safely navigate our local waterways and ports is essential for public safety and our economy. The same can be said for those shore restoration programs that this bill also funds, returning our local beaches to their pre-storm conditions after extreme weather events such as Hurricane Sandy.

If you speak with any of my constituents, they'll tell you that all of these projects are vital to their daily way of life and to the health of the local population as well as the economy. We must provide certainty and continue the Corps' funding or risk devastating their progress on these important projects. Jeopardizing funding for these ongoing projects would only further aggravate the serious problem of toxic discharges in my district, prevent progress on essential water quality restoration projects, and have an overall negative impact on our local environment and, in turn, our local economy. To me, that's simply not an option.

Madam Chair, we have the obligation to provide adequate resources for programs that protect public safety, water quality, and our environment, such as these. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the underlying legislation to continue to fund these projects that are critical to the well-being of the Treasure Coast and Palm Beaches.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment that would eliminate funding for the vitally important Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC).

The ARC was established in 1965 to focus on the profound economic needs of the Appalachia Region. It was designed to provide the kinds of basic investment that would assist in strengthening rural communities long-overlooked by the government and ensure that hard-working, loyal citizens could successfully build their communities and their careers and contribute fully to the well-being of the Nation.

Since its establishment, the ARC has had measurable success in addressing the needs of Appalachian families and communities and its good works have improved the outlook for the entire region.

The ARC operates in partnership with State and local governments to help make the best, most strategically effective use of Federal investments, and, in the process, leverages private investments to help create well-paying jobs and lasting improvements to local economies. In Fiscal Year 2012 alone, ARC invested approximately $66 million in projects that leveraged over $267 million in private-sector investment, a 4 to 1 ratio, and helped to create or retain over 20,000 jobs.

In my State, Appalachian Regional Commission investment has meant that thousands of children could turn on the water faucet and drink safe water. It has spurred the creation of small businesses and provided needed funding that enabled rural towns to build basic infrastructure essential to attract new economic opportunities. It has enabled working men and women to receive training and find nearby jobs to rear their families, rather than having to rely on government assistance or leave their homes and the State they love simply to earn a living.

It is said that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link. Cutting a program with proven success at cost-effectively creating jobs and improving the economy of an entire region at this time is senseless. I urge the House to recognize the immense value of fully funding the ARC as a key component to achieving renewed economic strength throughout our Nation and to vote against this amendment.

Mr. SANFORD. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment to eliminate five regional commissions that waste taxpayer dollars. These programs were initially formed with the mandate to improve the lives of those who live in impoverished areas. However, they have instead veered from this mandate by routinely allocating funds to projects that not only fall under state and local responsibilities, but also projects that benefit only those who live in more economically developed areas.

For example, the Northern Border Regional Commission has granted: $250,000 to construct a tower to improve cell phone coverage in New Hampshire, $250,000 to construct a 93-mile, four-season, multi-use trail across northern Vermont and $160,000 to promote and raise awareness of the maple syrup industry in New York.

These examples of government waste are not just confined to the Northern Border Regional Commission. A similar organization called the Delta Regional Commission, which spans from Mississippi to Southern Illinois, granted: $150,000 to build a tornado safe room in a Missouri hospital and $47,000 for updating a sprinkler system at a business incubator in Illinois. While there may be a need for these projects, they do not fall under the original mandate of these commissions. I believe that for government programs to be effective, they must be focused.

The problem is that these projects do not help those that the regional commissions were originally created for—Americans living below the poverty line. The Obama administration, along with the Government Accountability Office, has identified these programs as wasteful and duplicative while possessing no track record of success.

Madam Chair, eliminating these programs will save American taxpayers $90 million and work towards reducing the national debt by targeting wasteful spending.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None the funds made available by this Act may be used for the study of the

Missouri River Projects authorized in section 108 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 111–8).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. The Missouri and Mississippi River basins have faced major challenges over the past few years due to both extreme flooding and droughts. This devastation, combined with the sluggish economy and our aging inland waterways infrastructure, means that now more than ever we must be focused and responsible with taxpayer-funded river projects.

My amendment would prohibit funding for the Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study, also known as MRAPS. This $25 million earmarked study comes on the heels of a comprehensive $35 million, 17-year study that showed that the current authorized purposes are important and should be maintained.

This Congress and this administration need to focus on protecting human life and property by maintaining the safety and soundness of our levees. We also must support the important commercial advantages provided to us for our inland waterway system.

The Missouri River moves goods to the market and is an important tool in both domestic and international trade. That's why American Waterways Operators, the Coalition to Protect the Missouri River, the Missouri Farm Bureau, and the Missouri Corn Growers Group support this amendment.

This study puts in jeopardy not only the lower Missouri River but also the flow of the Mississippi River, which could create devastating consequences for navigation and transportation, resulting in barriers for waterway operators, agriculture, and every product that depends on the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers to get it to market.

The current authorized uses of the Missouri River provide necessary recourses and translate into continued economic stability not only for Missourians, but also for many Americans living throughout the Missouri and lower Mississippi River basins. This study is duplicative and wasteful of taxpayers' dollars. On this exact issue we've already spent 17 years and $35 million on hundreds of public meetings and expensive litigation.

I offered identical language during our first debate on the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution. That amendment passed by a vote of 245–176. In the fiscal year debates of 2012 and 2013, the exact amendment respectively passed by voice vote and by a vote of 242–168, and was later signed into law by President Obama. I appreciate my colleagues who offered their support and hope to have their support again.

Madam Chair, there's no doubt in my mind that water resources receive too little funding. It is time for the Federal Government to refocus and reprioritize to create safer, more efficient infrastructure for our inland waterways and stop spending hard-earned taxpayer dollars unnecessarily.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIMES. I rise briefly to engage the chairman and the ranking member in a colloquy.

First, I would like to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their work on this bill and in particular for their willingness to hear my concerns regarding the needs of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I think I speak for all of us when I say that a well-funded Army Corps means good jobs and important infrastructure improvements in the regions helped by their projects. Of particular interest to me is the special role that the Army Corps plays in mitigating the impact of floods caused by an increasing number of severe weather events in our communities.

I know that I'm not the only Member in this room whose district was ravaged by Superstorm Sandy as it swept up the east coast last year. Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's district in New Jersey was also severely affected by the storm. And Sandy is just one example of the magnitude of damage our cities and towns suffer year after year when they are not adequately prepared. With limited resources available after a storm like Sandy, flood mitigation efforts have become more important than ever. An ounce of prevention is, as they say, worth a pound of cure.

Madam Chairman, back in 2010, I was able to secure an authorization for the Army Corps of Engineers to conduct flood mitigation studies in my area—studies that would culminate in important recommendations for preventing future flood damage in Fairfield County like that which occurred during Sandy, Irene, and countless other storms in recent years. Unfortunately, with the current backlog at the Corps, it is unlikely that these studies or any other so-called New Start projects will receive the funding they need to move forward as promised and needed years ago.

I know there are dozens, if not hundreds, of projects waiting for Army Corps funding, and I have no delusion that my district is more deserving than others of this funding. But perhaps it is time to reevaluate the necessity of these older projects, re-prioritizing the projects that are still necessary and those that are most urgent. We must find a way to begin new projects and ensure our cities and towns are prepared for the next big storm.

I would ask the chairman and ranking member whether this ban on New Start projects is something that merits further consideration, and I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. HIMES of Connecticut makes a good point about the importance of making infrastructure investments before major disasters can occur. I share his concerns about the backlog of Army Corps of Engineers projects, particularly in the backdrop of communities throughout the New England and the Mid-Atlantic area that continue to rebuild after one of the worst storms in our Nation's history.

I want to assure the gentleman that the committee's position on New Starts is reconsidered each and every year. We take a look at the funding requirements of ongoing studies and projects, new studies and projects, and overall funding levels for certain accounts.

I commend the gentleman for his attention to this issue. I look forward to working with him to address these new needs at the earliest appropriate time, and I yield back to the gentleman.

□ 1930

Mr. HIMES. I look forward to working with the chairman as well.

I yield now to the ranking member, the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I join Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Representative HIMES in emphasizing the importance of the Army Corps of Engineers projects.

The Army Corps of Engineers has an important presence in the Great Lakes region, operating an electrified barrier in the Chicago Area Waterway System to keep the invasive Asian carp from entering the Great Lakes and devastating the fishing industry and ecosystem of one-fifth of the world's freshwater. So I appreciate the gentleman from Connecticut for acknowledging the importance of Corps projects beyond the eastern seaboard.

I agree that the backlog of Army Corps projects is preventing the Corps from taking on new projects in a time-effective manner, which is particularly problematic as we approach hurricane season once again. I look forward to working with Mr. HIMES in deciding how we can ensure new projects get the funding they need while also honoring those worthy projects that have been waiting for some time now.

Mr. HIMES. I thank the ranking member and look forward to working with her on this as well, and yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the dais.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to continue the

study conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to section 5018(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, from extreme flooding to extreme drought, the United States has been hit very hard over the past few years. The families who live and work along the Missouri River have endured great hardship.

Though it's one of our Nation's greatest resources, the Missouri River would produce extreme, erosive regular flooding and be mostly unfit for navigation if not for aggressive, long-term management by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Congress first authorized the Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation Project (BSNP) in 1912 with the intention of mitigating flood risk and maintaining a navigable channel from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the river in St. Louis. Though the BSNP's construction was completed in the 1980s, the Corps' ability to make adjustments as needed remains crucial to this day.

President Obama, in his fiscal year budget of 2014, requested $72 million for the Missouri River Recovery Program, which would primarily go towards the funding of environmental restoration studies and projects. This funding dwarfs the insufficient $8.4 million that was requested for the entire operations and maintenance of the aforementioned BSNP. It is preposterous to think that environmental projects are more important than the protection of human life.

I do not take for granted the importance of river ecosystems. I grew up near the Missouri River, as did many of my constituents. Yet we have reached a point in our Nation where we value the welfare of fish and birds more than the welfare of our fellow human beings. Our priorities are backwards, Madam Chair.

My amendment will eliminate the Missouri River Ecosystem Recovery Program, MRERP, a study that has become little more than a tool by some for the promotion of returning the river to its most natural state with little regard for flood control, navigation, trade, power generation, or the people who depend on the Missouri River for their livelihoods.

The end of the study will in no way jeopardize the Corps' ability to meet the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. MRERP is one of no fewer than 70 environmental and ecological studies focused on the Missouri River. The people who have had to foot the bill for these studies—many of which take years to complete and are ultimately inconclusive—are the very people who have lost their farms, their businesses, and their homes.

Our vote today will also show our constituents that this Congress is aware of the gross disparity between the funding for environmental efforts and the funding for the protection of our citizens. During the debate on fiscal year 2012 and 2013 appropriations, the House passed this exact language, which was ultimately signed into law by President Obama. It is supported by the American Waterways Operators, the Coalition to Protect the Missouri River, the Missouri Farm Bureau, and the Missouri Corn Growers Association.

It is time for Congress to take a serious look at water development funding priorities, and it is time to send a message to the Federal entities that manage our waterways. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to support our Nation's river communities and encourage more balance in Federal funding for water infrastructure and management.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise to express my opposition to the gentleman's amendment and my support for a river system that works.

The Water Resources Development Act of 2007—which was passed with such bipartisan support that it overcame a Presidential veto—authorized the Corps to undertake the Missouri River Ecosystem Restoration Plan and develop the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee to consult on the study. This authority provided a venue for collaboration between a 70-member stakeholder group of tribes, States, stakeholder groups, and Federal agencies to develop a shared vision and comprehensive plan for the restoration of the Missouri River ecosystem.

By prohibiting the Corps from expending any 2013 funds on a study and a committee, we continue the delay that started with the same short-sighted amendment that was adopted last year, sadly. This will lead to further erosion of trust in the delicate partnerships in the basin.

While the Corps will continue to comply with the endangered species requirements through other activities, I believe there is a role for a long-term plan for the basin. We face the same sort of issue in my part of the country where we have rivers and lakes that carry commercial trade, but we also have an ecosystem that we are a part of. And we are learning, as a world, how to deal with the natural systems of which we are all a part.

So I think what's been incredible with the Missouri River System is to see some of the flooding that has been prevented because of the Corps' work for a century now. I think all the American people support efforts to try to contain the power of that river at times when it could flood communities and harm both the people and our developed environment.

But I don't really support the gentleman's amendment because I do think there is a role for the ecosystem to be contemplated when long-term planning is done. With what's happening with rainfall, what's happening with population explosion and so forth, it's more incumbent upon us to work together and try to figure out how to work through those partnerships.

So, sadly, I oppose the amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman and ranking member on the Laboratory Directed Research and Development program at the National Nuclear Security Administration.

The Laboratory Directed Research and Development, LDRD, program at the National Nuclear Security Administration's national laboratories has, over the past two decades, made it possible for these labs to develop capabilities that have been critical to meeting the future mission needs via high-risk, high-payoff R&D. For example, at Los Alamos National Laboratory in my district, LDRD has supported a key technology that is now being applied toward the detection of nuclear and radiological threats and is a winner of this year's R&D 100 awards.

LDRD is also very important to recruiting and retaining top scientists and engineers. At Los Alamos, LDRD supports about one-half of the postdocs who have gone on to become the lab's permanent employees and is one of the key and leading sources of new lab employees.

The funding for the program is derived through a certain percentage of each lab's operating budget. Currently, that percentage is limited to not more than 8 percent. The bill we are considering today would lower that to be not more than 4.5 percent. I am very concerned that such a low level could harm the national labs' ability to meet future mission needs and ask the chairman and ranking member to work with us in making sure that the levels allowed for LDRD do not adversely impact the national security capabilities of the labs.

With that, Madam Chair, I would yield to the gentlelady from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

Madam Chair, America is facing security, economic, and environmental challenges that are unparalleled in our history. Our national laboratories have

a unique set of assets we can leverage to meet these challenges.

Projects financed by LDRD have allowed the National Nuclear Security Agency to rapidly respond to unforeseen national security needs. In 1988, Sandia National Labs, located in my district, made a breakthrough in parallel computing that resulted in the ability to compute extremely complicated numerical simulations to ensure the safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons stockpile without the need for nuclear tests. As a result, we have not tested a nuclear weapon since 1993.

The benefits of parallel processing supercomputers have also improved the competitiveness of U.S. industries in the global economy. They were used to map the human genome, develop new drugs, and shorten the development time of products by finding mistakes before they end up in prototypes.

Parallel processing supercomputers have also greatly increased our understanding of atmospheric changes through global atmospheric circulation simulation. These advancements have helped provide an understanding of the climate that cannot be determined by theory or by other experiments.

LDRD investments have been historically important in advancing the state of high-performance computing. Ongoing LDRD investments are enabling next-generation computing hardware and software approaches that will eventually lead to much better performance.

I am confident that we can work with the chairman and the ranking member to fund LDRD at levels that will maintain our vital national security assets, and I thank them for their willingness to work with us on this issue.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I appreciate my colleagues from New Mexico raising their concern for the long-term vitality of the National Nuclear Security Administration's laboratories.

I look forward to working with both of you to make sure that the levels allowed for the Laboratory Directed Research and Development, or the LDRD, program do not adversely impact the national security capability of these remarkable laboratories.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman.

LDRD is an important program for the labs to recruit and retain the top talent that is needed to accomplish their mission. I join the chair in agreeing to work with our colleagues so that the national security capabilities of the labs are not adversely impacted by the levels allowed for LDRD.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their service and for agreeing to work with us on this important issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. NOEM

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to issue rules or regulations to establish a fee for surplus water from Missouri River reservoirs.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Chair, this amendment is quite simple. It would block the Corps of Engineers from issuing rules or regulations that would charge a fee for surplus water on the Missouri River.

I offer this amendment to stop an overreach by the Corps of Engineers in its attempt to charge constituents in South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana for what is legally theirs—water from the Missouri River.

The States of South and North Dakota sacrificed hundreds of thousands of acres of prime farmland during the creation of the dams on the Missouri; but in doing so, they did not give up the right to their own water from the river. The Flood Control Act that created the dams and reservoirs specifically said:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of States in determining the development of watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control.

Madam Chair, I don't believe congressional intent could be any clearer in this instance. Rural water systems, businesses and tribes up and down the Missouri River rely on it for water and have been pulling water from the river for nearly 60 years without a fee.

Let us not forget that 2 years ago at this time residents up and down the Missouri were suffering one of the greatest floods that the river has ever seen. Many are still working to get back to the way things were, to the extent that it's even ever going to be possible. Now the Corps has brought forth this proposal that violates long-held historical and legal precedents to charge us for water that belongs to us.

I want to thank the chairman for being a leader on this bill that we have on the floor today and for the opportunity to talk about this amendment that is so important to the people in South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana. I urge my colleagues to stop the Corps from overreaching and ask them to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1945

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this important amendment. One wouldn't think that the Congress of the United States should have to pass amendments on appropriations bills to ensure that the Constitution is upheld by the bureaucracy or that long-held promises made by the Federal Government are kept.

That's exactly what this amendment does. Not only will it ensure that the Corps of Engineers no longer engages in charging the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana and its citizens and the sovereign tribes along the Missouri River for the water that is rightfully theirs, but it also frees up the Corps to engage in more productive activities that we've heard a lot about tonight.

I am proud to be a sponsor and proud to stand here and support this important amendment, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I am actually very familiar with the effect of rising water costs on a community. In my own hometown in Ohio, water costs will increase by 56.5 percent over the next 5 years, with the average ratepayers bill increasing from $125 to $300 per year. Such a large increase takes a significant toll on hard-pressed families, especially on seniors living on fixed incomes. This is being done in order to construct major water facilities that are seriously out of date and in need of replacement.

The amendment being offered here tonight must be viewed, I think, in terms of equity. Currently, the vast majority of local communities benefiting from water supply from Corps of Engineers projects are charged fees for storage.

The Corps is working to review the current policy case by case in favor of a more consistent policy across the country. My community receives nothing from the Corps in the way of water storage or capacity. The region in question has already benefited from cost-free water storage over several years. It seems to be unfair to provide special treatment to one specific region, or create an exception for one region, from a nationwide policy.

Given the sharp fiscal constraints to agencies funded by this bill, it is particularly difficult to justify such a localized subsidy because we have pressing needs across our country and, frankly, not sufficient funds to meet all the water needs facing our Nation. Frankly, I think these water needs are going to be very significant as time goes on because our population will double. It already has doubled since the last century, and tripled. By 2050, they expect 500 million people to be living in this country. The amount of water isn't going to change. It's a resource

that just keeps replenishing. We have to treat it because we have more people and it's going to cost more to do this.

I respectfully rise in opposition to the gentlelady's amendment, urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development'' is hereby reduced by $30,000,000.

Ms. SPEIER (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, do we suddenly have extra money lying around, because I'm trying to figure out why we are so committed to wasting it.

Budget challenges are forcing us to reexamine our investments. Adding $30 million beyond the President's request to support fossil fuel research is a foolish waste of taxpayer dollars that are better used to invest in the future and paying off our deficit. We simply cannot afford to spend taxpayer dollars on research the private sector can do better, and taxpayers should not be asked to provide additional support to an industry that consistently has record-breaking profits.

Our energy sector has some of the most promising ideas and technologies in the world. Our energy policy, however, is horribly outdated.

H.R. 2609 slashes research and development for renewable energy by some 60 percent and adds additional money that the administration neither wants nor needs to research fossil fuels and clean coal. At the same time, it continues to spend far too much on fossil fuel R&D. In fact, we dole out more fossil fuel subsidies than any other country—more than $500 billion in 2011. They often go to expensive projects with little upside.

The fact is we don't need to spend taxpayer money this way. Fossil fuel companies are highly profitable, posting some of the highest profits in the world, and they can shoulder their own R&D costs. This is a clear example of duplication. Cuts to fossil fuel research are supported by the Fiscal Commission and the fiscal watchdog groups like Taxpayers for Common Sense. These kinds of cuts are necessary to get back on the right fiscal path, and these are the kinds of cuts our constituents elected us to enact.

This kind of research can, is, and should largely be funded by the private sector, since industry has market incentives to make new discoveries in this area. Government spending should be focused on areas where there are emerging markets, where public funds are needed to support basic research.

My amendment reduces our reliance on ''old energy.'' The amendment simply strikes $30 million in R&D from fossil fuels and commits it to deficit reduction, what we've all been clambering for, and maintains the President's requested level of funding for this research.

Our biggest innovators succeed because they are forward thinking. Our energy policy needs to do the same.

We need to stop funding the past at the expense of the future. It is the fiscally responsible thing to do.

I ask that you support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I rise to oppose the amendment. This amendment would cut funding, which has already been cut today, for the Fossil Energy Research and Development program, on top of reductions that we also took of 16 percent in our bill before we brought our bill to the floor.

We all know that American families and businesses are struggling to pay high gas prices. This Fossil Energy Research and Development program holds the potential, once and for all, to prevent future high gas prices and substantially increase our energy security. To cut it further would be dangerous and counterproductive, so I strongly oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the committee for this piece of legislation that's before us today.

Throughout the entire bill, we can see efforts that will result in more efficient use of taxpayer dollars. Additionally, it is encouraging to see the emphasis on certain research accounts at the National Energy Technology Laboratory.

It is clear that you understand the challenges that the fossil fuel industry faces in trying to meet the excessive regulations imposed by this administration. However, I am concerned that the $78 million cut from current funding in this amended legislation represents a 16 percent reduction in funds and will have dire consequences for NETL's ability to manage grants and contracts to conduct the necessary research and development of fossil fuel energy. America depends on fossil resources for over 80 percent of our energy needs and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

As you know, the funding for this research and development has led to horizontal gas drilling, reductions in acid rain, increases in power plant efficiencies, and carbon capture and utilization efforts for enhanced oil recovery.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will continue to agree that, in order for us to continue this vital research in fossil fuel energy, NETL needs to be properly funded and that you will work with us in an effort to try to restore the 16 percent reduction in the funding for this account.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleague from West Virginia for his continued leadership on fossil fuel research. He knows it firsthand. He is a strong advocate. He is a strong supporter of NETL, of which he speaks, which is an important center for a critical, critical purpose.

As he knows well, fossil energy provides 82 percent of our Nation's energy needs, and research into tapping these resources as efficiently and as cleanly as possible is vital to our energy security.

I look forward to continuing to work with him and our other colleagues who have interest in fossil energy research through conference to ensure this vital program has adequate resources.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, thank you for those comments.

These research projects are in every State in the Nation and almost every congressional district throughout our country. Every one of our colleagues has a vested interest in this laboratory operating efficiently, putting us into the next generation of power and use and efficiency. We have appreciated your leadership and commitment to this program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development'', and increasing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies'', by $10,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAYSON. Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, thank you for the constructive conversation that we had earlier today about this amendment. I regret that we weren't able to come to some solution to the problem that it's meant to address, but I appreciate your time and your sensitivity to the needs of coastal communities.

The amendment before us would increase the Army Corps of Engineers' Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account by $10 million. It would do so by moving the same amount from the Department of Energy's Fossil Energy Research and Development account.

The Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account provides communities across the Nation with the funds that are necessary to prepare for floods, hurricanes, and other natural disasters. It also provides support for emergency operations, repairs, and other activities in response to those disasters.

Currently, the committee has requested that we fund this important account by only $28 million. My amendment would increase that amount by approximately one-third. The Fossil Energy Research and Development account does what its name implies; it conducts research pertaining to the extraction and processing and use of mineral substances.

Unlike the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account, this one will be funded at $450 million, almost $30 million above the President's request. My amendment would simply reduce this account by only 2 percent, while still allowing for a $20 million increase above the President's request for that account.

We as a body have tried the sequestration approach. We have axed accounts evenly across the board, but that's not an approach that our constituents favor. It is incumbent upon us to make rational choices at some point to prioritize funding for those items that are most important to our constituents and to America.

□ 2000

Madam Chair, this is what a rational approach looks like. Fossil fuels don't need a subsidy. Oil is selling at over $100 a barrel. Oil companies have more than enough profits with which to conduct their own research. In contrast, there is no profit to be had for communities in disaster preparation—merely self-preservation. These are the efforts that demand our time and our attention and that demand taxpayer funds. The cost of recovering from natural disasters is only increasing. A rational approach to the problem is to put more effort into preparing for them and mitigating the results.

As a Member from a State that has a tropical storm scheduled to make landfall this weekend, I hope that this body will support not only my amendment but the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment, but I appreciate his persistence in trying to find an offset.

I, of course, share the gentleman's support for smart investments in our Nation's water resources infrastructure. In fact, as I've said on a number of occasions, the Corps of Engineers was really one of our primary priorities in putting our bill together. The total program level is $50 million above the budget request and almost $150 million above the post-sequester level.

The Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account specifically is at the President's request. These funds will go primarily to training and response activities. If repairs to projects are necessary due to storms, the Corps has previously-appropriated, unobligated Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies funds which could be used for these purposes.

On the other hand, the bill has already reduced funding for fossil energy by $84 million, which is a 16 percent reduction, and I believe we took another substantial reduction earlier this evening. Research conducted within this program ensures that we use our Nation's fossil fuel resources as well and as cleanly as possible. We simply can't take another reduction to this account.

For this reason and several others, I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise made available by this Act for ''Appalachian Regional Commission'', ''Delta Regional Authority'', ''Denali Commission'', ''Northern Border Regional Commission'', and ''Southeast Crescent Regional Commission'' are hereby reduced to $0.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHABOT. I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for his leadership in cosponsoring this particular amendment with me.

We introduced this amendment because, with a nearly $17 trillion debt, the Federal Government can no longer continue to subsidize wasteful programs and policies. The programs that this amendment would eliminate—some of them in my own State—do little to achieve their intended purpose of economic development. These are wasteful programs that the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, and even the Obama administration have found to be duplicative and possessing no track record of success.

In his 2012 budget, President Obama eliminated Federal funding for the Denali Commission, for example. His argument, which I agree with, was that the Denali projects are not funded through a free market or a merit-based system. Additionally, the White House noted that there are 29 other Federal programs capable of fulfilling this commission's mandate. I would submit that this is also the case for a number of other commissions—for example, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Delta Regional Authority, the Northern Border Regional Commission, and the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission—for which we reduced and eliminated the funding.

Of particular note and concern is a recent report from the Denali Commission inspector general, which states that $100 million is missing from the Denali Commission bank accounts. In his 2012 semiannual report to Congress, the inspector general recounted his attempts to track down the lost funds—unsuccessfully, I might add—and recommended that Congress not reauthorize the commission in light of this mismanagement.

Like Citizens Against Government Waste, I seek to end the Federal appropriations for this commission as well as for the others that I mentioned. By reducing the appropriations to these programs, my amendment would save $90 million for American taxpayers.

GAO analysis found numerous Federal programs that overlap and provide similar services. In these reports, GAO found no fewer than 80 Federal economic development programs administered by four different agencies. Year after year we hear about the inefficiency and waste that is occurring within these programs. This inefficiency, duplication and overlap have cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars over the years.

These commissions were established for one purpose: economic development. Yet the CBO and other organizations have found no factual evidence that these commissions have created jobs or have improved education or health care. The inability to determine the success of these commissions is, in part, due to their overlap with other programs and agencies.

In summary, there is a tremendous amount of duplication and overlap in each one of the programs that I mentioned, so they are better dealt with at the State and local levels. The officials there are much closer to these types of programs than is the Federal Government. The programs have no track record of success in doing what they were intended to do, which is to create economic development and job growth. It just hasn't happened. The GAO report, as I indicated, has stated that the programs are duplicative and that there is a tremendous amount of mismanagement.

Taxpayers are fed up with wasteful spending in Washington. It's time we identified wasteful programs. These are truly almost the definition of ''wasteful programs,'' and we need to cut them. I would urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I rise to oppose this amendment, this attempt by the gentleman from Ohio to zero out the regional commissions' budgets. I want to focus particularly on the Appalachian Regional Commission, the ARC.

The purpose of the ARC is to close the economic gap between Appalachia and the rest of the Nation to bring the region's 420 counties and 25 million people into the Nation's economic mainstream. ARC's goal is to help make this region and its people contributors to the national economy and to give them the opportunity to compete in today's international economy.

As a region, Appalachia confronts a combination of challenges that few other parts of the country face—its mountainous terrain and isolation, a dispersed population, inadequate infrastructure, a lack of financial and human resources, and a weak track record in applying for and receiving assistance from other Federal programs. Even with ARC's funding, in fiscal year 2010, Appalachia received 31 percent less in Federal expenditures per capita than the rest of the Nation. That is $11,435 in Appalachia versus $16,569 for the Nation as a whole.

ARC investments do not result in Appalachia's getting more than the rest of the country. In addition, as mentioned by the gentleman, ARC's programs do not duplicate other Federal programs. Instead, they extend the reach of those programs into the most challenging parts of Appalachia, enabling many distressed communities to take full advantage of other Federal programs when they would not otherwise be able to.

The ARC funds are often used as a local match that enables communities to compete successfully for these other Federal programs. In addition, the recent recession has hit Appalachia disproportionately hard. Nearly two-thirds of Appalachia's 420 counties have unemployment rates greater than the national average. The recession has wiped out all of the job gains that have occurred since the year 2000. A comparable loss for the Nation wipes out the gains only since 2004.

Further, ARC has compiled an impressive record of accomplishments in creating economic opportunity in Appalachia. From fiscal year 2008 to 2012, ARC directed 55 to 60 percent of its non-highway funds to distressed counties. The number of high poverty counties has been cut from 295 in 1960 to 98 distressed and 99 at-risk counties in 2013. The regional poverty rate has been cut almost in half, from 31 percent to 16 percent. Infant mortality has been reduced by two-thirds, and the rural health care infrastructure has been strengthened through the addition of over 400 rural health care facilities. The percentage of adults with a high school diploma has increased by over 70 percent, and students in Appalachia now graduate from high school at nearly the same rate as that of the rest of the Nation. More than 850,000 Appalachian residents now have access to new or improved water and sanitation services through ARC projects.

Madam Chair, the ARC has worked, and it has shown demonstrable improvements in the Appalachian region, but despite these accomplishments, major challenges still confront the region:

Nearly a fourth of Appalachia's counties still suffer from persistent and severe economic distress; 98 counties are formally classified as ''distressed,'' and another 99 are at risk of falling into the ''distressed'' category; Appalachia trails the Nation in per capita personal income and average earnings by roughly 20 percent; roughly 25 percent of Appalachian households are not served by a public water system, compared to 15 percent of the rest of the Nation's households; and 48 percent of the Appalachian households are not served by a public sewage system, compared to the national average of 25 percent. The region has been hit disproportionately hard by the loss of jobs in the manufacturing industry, as the region has lost one-fourth of its manufacturing jobs.

The ARC has been a model that has worked. For these reasons, we oppose the amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNNELEE. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

It is no secret that our Nation's budget is bleeding in red ink. This House has approved a budget that will turn that around, and the Appropriations Committee has brought forth bills consistent with that budget.

I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey, and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio, for their efforts in meeting these budget targets and in eliminating wasteful programs but, at the same time, in preserving our priorities.

This amendment specifically deletes funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission, and I would like to address those priorities that are addressed by that commission. This is not a wasteful program. It has invested in infrastructure. It has changed the lives and the income of the men and women of that region, a region that I represent. When the Appalachian Regional Commission was formed almost five decades ago, it included some of the poorest counties of the poorest States in the Nation. Since then, it has achieved measurable results: the number of people living in high poverty has been cut in half; infant mortality has been cut by two-thirds; and students without a high school education have decreased significantly.

□ 2015

But the men and women of this region aren't sitting idly by, waiting for Federal investment to show up to solve our problems. We've used the Federal investment through the Appalachian Regional Commission and leveraged it with local and other State investments. In the last 4 years, the Appalachian Regional Commission has invested $360 million in that region. At the same time, over $1 billion of other public investment has occurred. What has that done? It's attracted over $2.8 billion in private investment, which has resulted in 122,000 jobs that have been created. This commission has made a difference.

No, it's not wasteful spending. The Appalachian Regional Commission is making a difference in the lives of the men and women and families in Appalachian. Because of that, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise this evening in opposition to my Buckeye State colleague, Congressman CHABOT, and I'm somewhat perplexed by this amendment. I don't really understand why he's offering it. I have to oppose him. If we look at the Appalachian Regional Commission, it actually benefits Ohio. It benefits some of those river counties that have historically been left out of the economic mainstream.

If you come to Ohio, it's rather interesting, because if you look at the State there are the big cities of Cleveland, which I'm privileged to represent a portion of, Columbus which is the State capitol, and Cincinnati, where the gentleman is from. There is a story that goes that those are the Big Three, and then there's the other part of the State that kind of winds its way from Toledo down toward Marietta. And the closer you get to Kentucky and Tennessee, the situation gets a little bit rugged.

In fact, I had occasion to travel there this year for the sad occasion of our former colleague Congressman Charlie Wilson's funeral. And I remember how hard Charlie worked to try to represent his district. In just getting to where we had to go for the ceremonies, I was struck again by how that part of Ohio is so inaccessible, just to try to move through the territory and get to where we were going. When I finally got to the high school where the ceremonies were held, and as I walked into the high school, I saw the bricks that Charlie had used to help start a project to help promote education in his region because there was no institution of higher learning. They had to link up to institutions in other parts of the State.

In just driving around and looking at that part of Ohio, the road system doesn't quite connect as it does from the other Big Three Cs. The other portion of the State doesn't work that way.

So the Appalachian Regional Commission meets a very important need, even though it's not a part of the State that I live in. There are very hard-working people. Economic opportunities, especially in the hillier parts, is more difficult to achieve. The Appalachian Regional Commission spans several counties and several States, and it tries to bring hope and opportunity to these regions.

A great part about our country is we're supposed to take care of one another, and the Appalachian Regional Commission provides a mechanism now going over several decades that has truly made a difference. But I can guarantee you that for the parts of Ohio that are included in its boundaries, the work is not finished. And with what's been happening in certain sectors of the economy, in many of these hollows and many of these nooks and crannies, life has gotten harder, not easier.

I want to say that I don't know what motivates the gentleman's amendment this evening, but I really do think it would hurt Ohio, and it would hurt a lot of these counties, spanning into other States that are covered. And the other commissions that exist are not parts of America—take the Denali Commission or the Northern Border Regional Commission, the Delta Regional Authority—these are not areas that are easily lifted in terms of their economic performance, and they need help.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the gentleman's amendment. I want to thank all those who worked with the Appalachian Regional Commission, particularly in my own State. I know it's not always easy, and we want to do what we can to support them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, I want to rise in opposition to this amendment, as well.

As has been noted here, this was created in 1965 as the ARC, and it has a real proven track record of success in creating economic development in an area of the country that faces unique challenges.

Again, it creates economic development. I think that needs to be stressed. It's not a handout, but it's a way to try to make investment into a region of the country that really can use some economic development encouragement, and that's exactly what this program does.

As a result of ARC funding, the regional poverty rate has been cut almost in half. Infant mortality rates have been reduced, and job-creating infrastructure has provided new and improved water and sewer services to over 112,000 residents. And that's just in the last 5 years.

Despite the tremendous progress that this program has made over the years, there's challenges that still exist. This region has lost roughly one-fourth of its manufacturing jobs and nearly one-fourth of Appalachia's counties still suffer from severe and persistent economic distress.

Now is not the time to zero-out this effective program, especially when you're focusing on economic development. Now, more than ever, we must empower local communities and regional planning commissions to utilize this much needed Federal assistance and provide the basic building blocks for regional economic development.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. It is the sense of Congress that the Army Corps of Engineers should take into consideration and prioritize emergency operations, repairs, mitigation activities, and other activities in response to or in anticipation of any flood, hurricane, or other natural disaster when evaluating construction projects.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Chair, I am very disappointed, to say the least, that significant cuts are being proposed to reduce funding for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. But with that in mind, I've come to the floor this evening with an idea that I think mitigates the effects of those cuts.

I will begin by saying that my amendment has no cost associated with it. It simply expresses the sense of Congress that the Army Corps of Engineers should consider and prioritize projects that mitigate the danger of natural disasters. Eastern North Carolina is especially vulnerable to extreme weather events, and other States have the same vulnerability.

The Corps works to improve the safety of communities near the Neuse River in Goldsboro, North Carolina, and in Princeville, where Hurricane Floyd all but destroyed the town because of the rapidly rising and poorly contained Tar River.

My amendment would give added confidence to my constituents in North Carolina and to many of your constituents, as well, that the Federal Government is doing everything possible to protect and reinforce communities and neighborhood from natural disasters.

For several years, the Nation has witnessed the widespread devastation caused by these disasters. Hurricane Sandy and Hurricane Irene are just two examples. Communities affected by natural disasters like those in my district face a long recovery filled with hardship and painful dilemmas. The underlying bill we are discussing today cuts $104 million in civil projects of the Corps, and it rescinds $200 million in previously appropriated funding.

At the same time, the Corps has a $60 million backlog of projects, and some of my colleagues have referenced that tonight. Many of these are in important places like my district, and many of yours, as well, that experience frequent storms. Due to insufficient funding and a prohibition on new construction, no new projects have been initiated by the Corps since the year 2010.

The Corps has many important responsibilities, but none more so than its effort to mitigate flood and storm dangers. The Corps provides essential mitigation assistance such as repairing damaged levees and providing emergency water supplies to communities in need. It also works to engineer infrastructure that will prevent some of the effects of natural disaster.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has predicted an especially active hurricane season,

with up to 11 hurricanes and up to 16 major hurricanes in the 6-month hurricane season. The number of predicted storms is significantly greater than the seasonal average of six hurricanes and three major hurricanes. NOAA has also indicated that hurricanes threaten inland areas through rain and strong winds and flooding, as we saw in many communities.

Never has funding and support for the Corps been more critical to my constituents and the many areas throughout the country. So as we consider a bill that plans to reduce funding for the Corps, we must keep in mind the communities who may suffer, and many who have spoken tonight come from those districts. They suffer the most from this type of activity.

I remind my colleagues that this amendment costs no money whatsoever. A ''no'' vote on the amendment does carry the cost of heavy inaction.

I ask the Chair to overrule the point of order.

The chairman of the subcommittee mentioned earlier that he supports the Corps and funding for the Corps. This is simply an effort to try to instruct the Corps to prioritize the projects as they make these difficult decisions.

My colleagues, I thank you for listening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of Rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment proposes to state a legislative position.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina proposes to state a legislative position of the House.

As such, the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of Rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, my friend, Mr. DUFFY from Wisconsin, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to develop or submit a proposal to expand the authorized uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund described in section 9505(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, the reason I'm here tonight is to talk about the efforts that are being used to divert Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund monies to purposes other than what Congress intended, and that is dredging and maintenance of our harbors.

I'm talking about fairness, and I'm talking about commerce. We've all known for years that we have a problem when funds are collected for an intended purpose, that sometimes they don't get used that way. So we have money in, but money does not come out for its intended use.

There are a number of reasons for this happening. But until we get more funds for their intended purpose, Mr. DUFFY and I oppose expanding the authorities for the use of this funding.

□ 2030

This is a matter of fairness.

The Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund has carried a surplus since 1997. At the end of fiscal year 2012, the trust fund had an estimated $7 billion surplus that was not spent on harbor maintenance. Yet our harbors are under-maintained.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has estimated that full channel dimensions at the Nation's busiest 59 ports are available less than 35 percent of the time. That's unacceptable. Just from an economic standpoint, it should be unacceptable to us.

Ships, especially those in my district and throughout the Great Lakes, are light-loading. When that happens, American productivity is lost. Light-loading—we can't even load the ship to their capacity because we haven't maintained our harbors. We haven't dredged our harbors. This is an affront to commerce. It goes back to the very beginning of what the Founding Fathers thought about commerce as so important, getting products from point A to point B.

We must ensure that the moneys intended for dredging are not siphoned off for other reasons. Our amendment will prohibit moneys from being used by the administration to expand the authorized uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund moneys.

I know this is something that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) has supported in the past, and I appreciate his consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NOLAN. I rise in support of the Kelly-Duffy amendment, which would prohibit expanded uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund at the current appropriations level.

Let me be clear, the needs of the Nation's ports and harbors are great, and they are largely unmet today. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has made a valiant effort to maintain these facilities, which are essential for American manufacturers and the business community, to access markets around the world. We're talking about jobs. We're talking about business income here in every State, in every congressional district in this country.

Beginning in 1997, however, as Mr. KELLY just pointed out, both Congress and the administration since that time have fallen short of allocating the entire balance of the harbor trust fund moneys to a current rate of less than 50 percent of the total revenues received. Tragically, as a result, we've fallen seriously behind in our essential harbor maintenance. If we were to restore full funding today, the Army Corps estimates it would take 5 years to catch up on the backlog in our Nation's busiest ports and another 5 years to catch up on the Nation's smaller ports, which are nevertheless essential to local and regional economies.

Channel dredging is the most critical factor in maintaining our harbors. To be sure, there are other needs. In 2011, the Army Corps suggested that this fund could be used to increase harbor security. Certainly access roads and other harbor facilities need constant maintenance. But if we expand the use of these funds without expanding the total funds appropriated, we will simply add to our current backlog, choke off future commerce, and cost the American economy the jobs that we desperately need.

The port of Duluth in my district is already restricting outbound shipments to 80 percent of the capacity because of this backlog in maintaining proper channel depth. How can we justify forcing our merchant fleet to operate at less than full efficiency?

I urge my Democratic colleagues to support this amendment and help us prevent a bad situation from getting worse.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I am happy to yield to Congressman KELLY offering the amendment or Congressman NOLAN, who spoke on the amendment, and to say that this amendment gives us an opportunity to talk about the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and the importance of all of our harbors, including those in the Great Lakes.

I spoke earlier today, and I said I don't know how long it's going to take to narrow the channel any more. Some of the ports I represent, what has been happening is that with less money, the width has been narrowing. I said so maybe our ships will actually look like

this some day, rather than having a bow that looks like this. There just simply aren't enough funds to dredge all of the ports that are necessary. And, in fact, there have been some harbors which have actually shut down.

So this gives us an opportunity to talk about the necessity of a review of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and its future use and what we might do in order to get a better allocation to our accounts so that we can take care of all of these ports that are being pressed around the country.

If the gentlemen have anything additional that they would like to put on the record at this point regarding the ports in the Great Lakes or elsewhere, I would be more than pleased to yield to them.

Mr. NOLAN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Chair, I thank Representative KAPTUR for yielding, and I would just add that it's costing business and commerce throughout the country and the Great Lakes billions of dollars. This is critical, essential infrastructure; and we look forward to working with you to find a way to release that trust fund for what it was intended, which is the dredging of our harbors. It is so critical to our commerce, our businesses, our jobs, and our economies.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, I hope the administration is hearing this and the Corps is hearing this and they work with us on a better allocation and not invading the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for other purposes.

I would hate to deny the administration the right to think about this and to make recommendations to us. I don't think that it is the intent of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) to prevent any oversight or activities by the administration to better manage the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. I don't think that is his intent. I think his intent is to ensure that these dollars are spent for harbor maintenance.

But if, in fact, the administration has a good idea they want to throw in to help us with this, you wouldn't deny them the right to do that; am I correct? We need their cooperation in order to make this work.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Chair, they are already neglecting the needs for dredging in our harbors. To divert funds from existing appropriations that are available would only make the situation worse, which is why I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

I know Mr. DUFFY wishes to speak to the amendment as well.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman KELLY, your intention is not to preclude the administration from working with us on the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund if they have a creative idea that would help us?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I think the whole purpose of this—and Mr. DUFFY will have a chance to speak next—this money is collected for a specific reason. I had a conversation with Secretary LaHood talking about why can't we use the money that's been collected and set aside to be used. This is about commerce. This is about fairness. This is about growing our economy and being able to have access to the entire world. We're letting these harbors go unmaintained. We're not dredging them, and we're causing a huge problem in commerce. That's the problem. We can't get from point A to point B. We're lowering the efficiency of our businesses and their ability to get products out there. The whole purpose of this is to use the money that's collected for the intention for which it was collected. It's money that's going in, but not being used the right way, and I don't want to see it get diverted any other way, as we've seen happen already. We're already missing the boat, no pun intended. We're closing down these harbors, and we're not doing the right things by them.

I know my friend from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) wants to talk.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Chair, I will try to address some of the concerns of the gentlelady from Ohio. I think everyone who supports this amendment is willing to work with the administration if the administration wants to work with us to start to dredge our ports, to make sure that we can actually have more flow of commerce through the American ports that haven't been serviced well.

If the administration wants to tap into the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and use those resources for other purposes, I think you would see a strong objection from those who support this amendment because those of us who especially live in the Great Lakes—Mr. NOLAN and I, the gentleman from Minnesota and I, have the great honor of sharing the Duluth-Superior port. We understand how important dredging is to making sure that port functions.

When we don't have enough resources going in to service our port, it gives us great pause because these are jobs in our community. It is economic growth in our community, and if we don't have that, we're concerned. So if the administration is willing to work with us, we are willing to work with the administration, no doubt.

But, again, if they want to take those resources and use them for another purpose, we would have great pause and pushback because what you've seen with the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is that it is funded by the shippers. They pay taxes, they pay fees in the anticipation that those dollars, those revenues, are going to be used to service our ports. The problem is it hasn't been used to service our ports. So they're paying money into a fund that over the last 15 years has run a surplus, and now there's $7 billion in the fund. And they sit back and they scratch their heads and they wonder why isn't this money being used for its intended purpose, which is to make sure American ports work. We've paid for it. We've agreed to pay the taxes; now do, government, what you've promised us to do, use it to make sure that we can actually have commerce in our industry.

I think it's important, the gentleman from Pennsylvania also talked about the Corps of Engineers doing studies and talking about our shippers having to light-load, talking about the Great Lakes ports, talking about Duluth-Superior, the twin ports, where they're unable to load at full capacity because we haven't effectively dredged that port. And that is loss of revenue for our shippers. Not only that, it's driving up the cost of the goods that we're shipping on the Great Lakes, which means the end consumer is paying more for those goods. This doesn't make a lot of economic sense, especially when we have $7 billion of surplus in that fund.

This is one of those issues where I think government can do a better job serving the people. Putting money into a fund, paying taxes to specifically go into a fund for a specific purpose and then have that fund raided and robbed and used for a different purpose is unconscionable, and it is unacceptable; and that is not the agreement that Americans here in the shipping industry had with their government. It's unfair, at best.

To make one last point, this is a jobs amendment. This amendment will again make sure that we can have a growing, effective, efficient economy in shipping in ports across the country; but it also makes sure that we have lower-cost goods because we are effectively using our ports and our shippers across the country.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUFFY. I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I'm glad we've had this discussion tonight. Others have heard it. I think it will help encourage administration cooperation, being the Representative who has the ports of Lake Erie in her district—Cleveland, Lorain, Sandusky, Toledo, and many points in between—I fully understand the challenge here.

One of our budgetary challenges is we have to have a budget that allocates these dollars, and right now that hasn't come from your side of the aisle. So in order to use these dollars, it has to be incorporated in the budget resolution that comes to us. Our mark was too

low in our bill in order to be able to move those dollars. So let's work on that with the Budget Committee, as well, so we get that allocation and it comes to our subcommittee. That's something that we can all work on on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. DUFFY. Reclaiming my time, point well made by the gentlelady from Ohio. Just to make sure we're clear, this amendment is one that prohibits additional or expansion of the definition of use for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, so we can't use it for purposes other than for the ports, which was the original intent.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2045

Mr. RIGELL. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGELL. I rise to enter in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Virginia is proud to be home of one of the Department's flagship national labs in nuclear physics, the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility, or JLab, located in Newport News, and its primary scientific facility there known as the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility.

In fact, the nuclear physics community so values the work at the JLab that they recommended a major upgrade to its accelerator, what's referred to as the 12 GeV project, as its number one priority in their 2007 long-range plan for nuclear physics. That upgrade has received over 70 percent of its construction funding through the tireless efforts of the subcommittee, and work is going to begin there on its commissioning in fiscal year 2014, that is, provided that sufficient funding is included in this appropriations measure.

I'm really grateful that the construction funding that is provided in the bill is at the level requested by the administration. However, I am concerned that the proposed reductions for nuclear physics below the budget request could force unilateral cuts in medium energy nuclear physics operations, and that these reductions could delay the start of the commissioning of the 12 GeV project, which is scheduled to start in the first quarter of fiscal year 2014.

Therefore, I'm asking the chairman if he would be willing to work with me and my colleagues in Virginia and others who support the priorities of the nuclear physics community to work towards completing this important construction project and to begin operations in a timely fashion.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank my colleague for his interest and strong advocacy on behalf of the Jefferson Lab and for the nuclear physics program. Our allocation has made for some tough choices, and we worked hard to fund the Office of Science at $32 million above current levels, post-sequester. This level of funding is sufficient to support a $7.5 million increase for the Medium Energy Nuclear Physics program, which goes to the Jefferson Lab.

I want to thank my colleague for his advocacy and look forward to working with him to support this vital program through the appropriations process.

I also assure my colleague that the bill keeps CEBAF on track to begin operations in fiscal year 2014.

Mr. RIGELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding initially. I thank him for his leadership.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

Mr. LAMALFA I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to regulate activities identified in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 404(f)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A), (C)).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chairman, I'm pleased to be able to present this amendment here. I thank the chairman of the committee for allowing this.

We have a situation here where section 404(f)(1) of the Clean Water Act exempts certain activities from the permitting requirements under section 404, including normal farming, forestry, and ranching activities, and construction and maintenance of farm and forest roads, irrigation ditches, and farm ponds.

In 1977, Congress made a deliberate policy choice to amend the Clean Water Act to provide carefully tailored exemptions for these ordinary activities of farmers, ranchers, and foresters from the costly and burdensome requirements to obtain Clean Water Act permits.

Despite this clear expression of congressional intent, however, the Corps of Engineers and the EPA in recent years have been trying to circumvent the 404(f)(1) permitting exemptions by attempting to interpret a limited ''recapture'' provision in section 404(f)(2) in such an expansive way as to virtually swallow up the exemptions in 404(f)(1).

As a result, we have a situation where Congress clearly provided a regulatory exemption from permitting in one paragraph of the Clean Water Act, only to have the Corps and EPA now take it away through a creative interpretation of the next paragraph.

The Corps and EPA cannot take away administratively what Congress gave legislatively. These administrative efforts to undermine congressional intent have resulted in excessive and overzealous efforts to expand regulatory powers into farming and ranching activities exempted from regulation.

In one instance, a family farm attempted to convert pastureland irrigated by ditch to a piped irrigation system to improve their water efficiency—a laudable goal from any perspective. This is an activity clearly exempted from regulation by section 404(f)(1), yet the Corps' argument that potential runoff from this work, which would run into a man-made drainage ditch and eventually into a terminal man-made pond with no outlet, would impact somehow the navigable waterway, the Sacramento River, which is over 6 miles away, which really bears no relation to reality, this regulation. This claim by the Corps turned a 1-day, $2,500 project into, now, a multiyear legal battle resulting in over $100,000 in legal costs to the family farm, all with no improvement or protection of the environment.

This amendment is intended to make it clear that the Corps is not to use any funds to regulate activities that are already excluded from regulation under section 404(f)(1)(A) and (C) of the Clean Water Act, and that the ''recapture'' provision in section 404(f)(2) is not to be used to undermine those section 404(f)(1) permitting exemptions. The amendment allows the permitting exemptions to stand on their own merits, without the Corps and EPA negating their use through clever legal interpretations.

In no way does this amendment attack or limit regulation of wetlands or our Nation's waterways. As a rancher myself, with wetlands, ducks, other wildlife on my land, I know full well the importance and value of reasonable protections for our natural resources.

Today, farms in California and elsewhere are being targeted for simply changing crops or irrigation methods. They are doing their best to follow every law, the spirit of the law, but are being targeted for something Congress explicitly exempted.

This amendment simply limits funds to ensure that agencies of government only spend money to follow the laws as Congress wrote them. I urge all Members to please support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Our colleague from California describes yet another troubling example of what seems to be Federal overreach, regulatory overreach. I support his amendment, which I think addresses the situation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment. If the proposed amendment would take effect, the Corps would be prohibited from requiring a permit for discharges into waters of the United States from certain agricultural activities.

The Clean Water Act already exempts certain agricultural activities from regulation unless those activities change the flow of navigable waters, then those agricultural activities, such as construction of stock ponds or irrigation ditches, construction of forest roads and reconstruction of recently damaged parts of levees, dikes, and dams, must be regulated.

The Clean Water Act already exempts agriculture business from many of the regulations imposed on others. This amendment would take away the commonsense safeguards built into the Clean Water Act to prevent the negative impact of some agricultural activities, and we have all been witness to some of those.

So I believe the Clean Water Act strikes the right balance in giving relief to agricultural businesses already and, therefore, urge defeat of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this act to the United States Army Corps of Engineers may be used for sediment or soil dumping into the Missouri River.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, we have a situation that exists in Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri that I know of along the Missouri River, which I've represented the entire stretch along Iowa. It's an attempt to save the endangered species known as the pallid sturgeon, and I brought a little sample of him here. He's the only one in congressional captivity. This came from the hatchery at U.S. Fish and Wildlife, by the way.

But what they're doing is an attempt to create shallow water habitats so this pallid sturgeon can reproduce. They're opening up the old oxbows, and that's all right. But what they're doing is dredging millions of cubic yards of dredge spoil out of those old channels into the river channel itself. And we know that dredge spoil is listed under the Clean Water Act as a toxic pollutant.

They wouldn't let farmers do it. They wouldn't let contractors do it. The Corps of Engineers doesn't need to. They have better alternatives that are consistent with the Clean Water Act.

So my amendment simply says none of the funds can be used to dredge this into the river, and they would need to follow their own rules like everybody else does.

I urge the adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chairman, I don't have any objection to the amendment, although I do have a few concerns, which I'd like to cover.

First of all, I want to thank my colleague for bringing these issues to our attention. If, in fact, the Corps' actions are detrimental to flood control efforts in his region, those types of actions need to be stopped, and I would be happy to work with him to do that.

I do believe, of course, that some of these issues would be better dealt with by the authorizing committees that have jurisdiction over the Corps and the Endangered Species Act. So I think there are some concerns that we have that are legitimate here. We're going to do some more investigation and work with the gentleman to see if we can address his concerns.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, the King amendment would provide no funds to be used for shallow water habitat construction if that involves sediment or soil dumping into the Missouri River.

In order to meet the obligations established within the 2003 amended biological opinion, the construction of shallow water habitat is an integral part of compliance. There are two ways to build shallow water habitats: either through flow actions or through mechanical actions.

The Corps has been implementing habitat construction to avoid manipulating flows mainly because of concerns expressed by the State of Missouri. This amendment would prevent the construction of shallow water habitat, leaving the pallid sturgeon fish unprotected.

I understand that farmers in Iowa have concerns that the Army Corps is not creating these habitats in an ecological manner, but the Army Corps studies show there will only be minimal increases in nutrients carried by the river during project construction.

If the Corps cannot put sediment into the Missouri River, it will have to dispose of the sediment in upland areas. There will be increased cost for each construction project. Disposal in upland areas would increase costs by requiring material to be placed in trucks and hauled offsite to upland disposal areas, or adjacent to the habitat projects. Project cost would be increased by 300 percent to 500 percent, depending on site specifics.

So disposing of sediment in upland areas will also result in increased negative environmental impacts. Disposal of material in upland areas will require disturbances of existing mitigation sites and increases the risk of damage to adjacent wetlands. It may also require additional land acquisition for disposal areas.

For all these reasons, we have to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. I yield to my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

And I regret I didn't have that opportunity to sit down and talk to the gentlelady from Ohio regarding this dredging that's taking place in the Missouri River bottom in my district, in my neighborhood where I spent my lifetime working on that river bottom and doing work like dredge work and dredge site work and dredge disposal site work.

We've done a number of projects with the earthmoving side of this thing, working in conjunction with dredge contractors. I've been up and down every mile of this river for decades now. I've watched what they're doing. They would never let a private interest do what they are doing. They wouldn't let a public interest do what they are doing. Only the Corps of Engineers can do what they're doing.

And I've not reviewed these numbers closely, but I did hear that it could be a 300 percent increase in the cost. I'd like to look at it more closely. I'm pretty confident King Construction can bid that substantially cheaper. However, we're not in the business of advocating what we do here in this Congress. The Corps of Engineers has often put out numbers that have been much higher than the actual cost necessary.

And it's pretty simple to me that if you could see what I saw last week, a 20-inch pipe pumping out water and dredge spoil that's churned up by the beater effect of the dredge, pumping that out into the middle of the river where the sediment, the heavy stuff drops out right away; it starts to fill the channel. The lighter stuff goes down the river and gets settled out.

□ 2100

And then the river has to be dredged again by putting that sediment into

the river. It ends up having to be treated. There's plenty of places for them to do this. They are contradicting their own policy. And so I urge the adoption of this amendment, and let's hold the Corps of Engineers accountable the same way they hold everyone else accountable.

Mr. LAMALFA. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order No. 13547 of July 19, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 43023, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chairman, last year, the House adopted my bipartisan amendment that would prevent agencies under the FY 2013 CJS appropriations bill from imposing ocean zoning related to the Obama administration's National Ocean Policy under Executive Order 13547. Executive Order 13547 was signed in 2010 and requires that various bureaucracies essentially zone the ocean and the sources thereof. This essentially means that a drop of rain that falls on your house could be subject to this overreaching policy because that precipitation will ultimately wind up in the ocean.

The Department of Energy is a part of the National Ocean Council established under this executive order that has been tasked to zone the oceans. Concerns have been raised by many groups that the National Ocean Policy will restrict ocean and inland activities. It is also worrisome that the administration has not made any requests for funds for this effort, nor has Congress ever appropriated money for this purpose. We have had hearings on this in the Natural Resources Committee, and no agency has told us from what source they're getting the funding for this initiative. So where is the money coming from? Are they raiding existing accounts and diverting already scarce dollars from existing statutory responsibilities?

On this chart you can see the executive order creates a huge new bureaucracy at a time when we're trying to make the government smaller, more efficient, more accountable, and less intrusive. The next chart lists the 63 agencies that are involved in this effort to try to zone the oceans. This looks like much more than a planning exercise at this point.

Let me say you're going to hear from the other side from time to time something that says that planning is good. Yes, planning may be good. Planning with the intent to in effect backdoor nonstatutory rulemaking is not good.

And here's what the executive order states on its face. It says:

All executive departments, agencies, and offices that are members of the council and any other executive department, agency, or office whose actions affect the ocean, our coasts, and the Great Lakes shall, to the full extent consistent with applicable law, comply with Council-certified coastal and marine spatial plans.

That sounds like rulemaking, to me, that has not been authorized by statute.

It's important to note that ocean zoning was debated during the 108th, the 109th, the 110th, and the 111th Congresses, and each of those Congresses determined that this action was not necessary. This clearly indicates that Congress explicitly does not intend for the oceans to be zoned in the manner that the President is attempting to do. Thus, Executive Order 13547 has no specific statutory authority, and there have been no appropriations by Congress to pay for the cost of this new bureaucracy.

My similar amendment earlier this year passed by a bipartisan vote of 233–190 to the offshore energy packaged we considered last month. This amendment was also adopted on a bipartisan basis as a part of the FY 2013 CJS appropriations bill.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise to oppose the amendment and to stress the importance of ocean policy. We already see acidification, low dissolved oxygen, harmful algae blooms, and dead zones in the Gulf, the Chesapeake Bay, Puget Sound, and throughout our Nation's coastal waterways.

The National Ocean Policy would help us better address the cumulative threats to our aquatic ecosystems from overfishing, coastal development, storm water runoff, carbon emissions, and pollutants in our waterways. The implementation of the National Ocean Policy will help to protect, maintain, and restore our ocean and coastal ecosystems, systems which provide important jobs, food, recreation, and which serve as the foundation for a substantial part of our Nation's economy. Only healthy, functioning, and resilient marine and freshwater ecosystems can support the fisheries we all depend upon so heavily.

There are some reports that show that over half of the fish in the oceans have been fished out. If you go to any supermarket, you're going to find on the shelves—the fish that are there—strange names you've never even heard of before because so many of the varieties that were plentiful are simply fished out forever.

The core approach of the National Ocean Policy is to improve stewardship of our ocean's coasts, islands, and Great Lakes by directing government agencies with differing mandates to coordinate and work better together. The National Ocean Policy creates no new authorities. It's about increased coordination among existing agencies, the sort of effort that should be taking place on a Federal level in order to reduce inefficiency, waste, and redundancy between agencies.

This is an issue of bringing people together so that all of the ocean's users, including recreational and commercial fishermen, boaters, industries, scientists, and the public can better plan for, manage, harmonize, and sustain uses of oceans and coastal resources.

When you think about it, we now have 310 million people in our country. We look at the global populations in the billions. With the rate of population increase rising, more and more fishing going on—and how many of us come from regions where we see that fisheries have shut down? And that in fact what used to exist in Massachusetts, exists no more. That there are places on the West Coast where the fisheries that had been there are shut down. That's because there's so much draw on that life source in the ocean that we have to pay attention as a world how we are going to feed the generations of the future. This is not a casual engagement. This is downright serious business.

I would say that the gentleman's amendment is not forward-looking. I don't know what he has in mind here. But the better we understand what is going on and what Congressman Claude Pepper used to call Planet Ocean, where 70 percent of our Earth is actually water, much of it impinged now by pollutants and so forth. We have a responsibility to the globe. This is not simple.

Prior generations haven't had to think this way, but we have to think this way because there are many more draws on these resources. Look at the problems we've had with some countries going out and doing the fishing and just taking fish to one country and not allowing other fishermen to have equal access, even in the Great Lakes that I represent. It's amazing. Every single year, the number of fish you're allowed to catch goes down, because we've both got more fisherman, because the population is increasing, but there are fewer fish to draw from those lakes. And there are substantial threats in the form of invasive species.

So the gentleman and I are on different sides of this. I think it's important to understand the oceans and to coordinate among our agencies to put the best intelligence forward because the globe is changing and we have to be smart enough to deal with those ecosystem changes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment which addresses another misguided and restrictive Federal regulation.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prohibits Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of fuels unless their lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources. My simple amendment would stop the government from enforcing this ban on all Federal agencies funded by the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill.

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stifle the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquids jet fuel. This restriction was based on the opinion of some environmentalists that coal-based jet fuel might produce more greenhouse gas emissions than traditional petroleum. However, one of the unintended consequences of section 526 is that it essentially forces the American military to acquire fuel refined from unstable Middle East crude resources. Furthermore, section 526's ban on fuel choice now affects all Federal agencies, not just the Defense Department.

This is why I'm offering this amendment again today to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill. The American military and our Federal agencies should not be burdened with wasting their time studying fuel restrictions when there's a simple fix. That fix is to not restrict Federal Government fuel choices based on unsound policies and misguided regulations like those in section 526.

Section 526 also essentially makes our Nation more dependent on Middle East oil. Stopping the impact of section 526 will help us to promote American energy, grow the American economy, create American jobs, and become more energy secure.

Madam Chair, it is also important to know what this amendment does not prevent and does not restrict. And it doesn't restrict or prevent the ability of the Federal Government from purchasing any alternative fuels, including biodiesel, ethanol, or other fuels from renewable resources. It places no restrictions whatsoever on those types of procurements.

I offered this amendment to the Homeland Security appropriations bills and several appropriations bills during the 112th Congress, and they all passed on the floor of the House with strong bipartisan support. My friend, Mr. CONAWAY, also added similar language to the latest defense authorization bill to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Corps of Engineers to set water storage prices for municipal use for a nonhydropower lake constructed by the Corps above the price that was set at the time of the completion of that lake.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I rise today to offer an amendment that will provide temporary relief and assurance for communities who otherwise will soon be hit by some of the sharpest increases in water storage prices ever seen. My amendment is simple. It prohibits the Army Corps of Engineers from using any official resources or funds to set new, increased water storage prices for municipal use on any non-hydropower lake that was built by the Corps.

□ 2115

The Corps would only be permitted to set the same rates on local communities that were in place when the lake was completed, a dollar figure that is well documented and not subject to any sort of interpretation by the Corps.

A source of funding for the operation lakes owned by the Corps of Engineers is derived from water storage contracts with municipalities. The formula for pricing of water storage contracts on Corps lakes is defined legislatively as ''current cost.'' This fixed formula creates a prohibitive financial burden on the citizens of municipalities desiring to contract with the Corps and, as a result, the Corps does not receive any income for the operation and maintenance of the lake.

In drought-stricken areas like Bartlesville, Oklahoma, the Corps' current flawed methodology threatens to raise water storage prices on local residents from around 6 cents to nearly a dollar for the same 1,000 gallons of water. It also raises the total fiscal impact of water storage prices on Bartlesville from around $1.6 million a year to more than $24 million a year.

Earlier this year, the Senate adopted by unanimous consent an amendment by Senator INHOFE to their WRDA bill that requires the GAO to complete a study on the Corps' outdated and flawed methodology when it comes to these water storage prices. As the WRDA bill develops in the House and hopefully moves towards conference and enactment, I am looking forward to working with my colleagues on a long-term legislative solution to replace this outdated formula with one that is fair, reasonable, and affordable to all parties.

By adopting this amendment today, we can provide 1 more year of certainty and assurance for communities like Bartlesville by ensuring that they do not see outrageous increases in their water storage prices that they quite simply cannot afford.

The American taxpayer spends billions of dollars every year to fund the operations of the Army Corps of Engineers; but by adopting this amendment, we can ensure that none of those funds are used to enforce a formula that is outdated, unfair, and unjust as we move through the WRDA bill and other avenues towards a long-term solution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey may state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, 113th Congress, which states:

It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriation bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section. The Congressional Budget Office has stated that this amendment has costs associated with it. The Corps' current pricing policy is based upon ''updated cost of storage'' which reflects today's value (indexed to current price levels) rather than at the original construction cost price level. So reverting to construction cost levels will unavoidably have a cost, with the net effect of increasing the level of budget authority in the bill.

Under section 3(d)(3), an increase in budget authority must be accompanied by an equal or greater decrease. This

amendment does not contain an equal or greater decrease, and so violates section 3(d)(3).

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point or order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New Jersey makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5. Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair his been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chairwoman, I rise only to say thank you to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, who has been in this seat now for 38 days it seems like, but the entire time of this bill. He has not taken a break for any reason during the entire consideration of these dozens of amendments and general debate.

I want to thank the chairman for doing a great job during this debate, but also in drafting the bill, along with his colleague, MARCY KAPTUR, the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee. So, Mr. Chairman, we thank you for a job well done and thank you for persevering through all of this.

Also, I want to say a word of thanks to the staff, who deserve so much credit for the work that has been before the body for the last 2 days. Rob Blair, the clerk of the subcommittee, and all of the staff on both sides of the aisle have worked long and hard to bring this bill to the floor and to transpose it to the population of the House. So we thank you for a great job well done.

As we near the end of the deliberation on the amendments and finally vote on the bill, I want to urge everyone to vote for this bill. This is a good bill. It cuts spending, it does the Nation's business, and it's fair and transparent.

I urge adoption of the bill and yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment by Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky.

Amendment by Mr. FLEMING of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 28 by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment by Ms. SPEIER of California.

Amendment by Mr. CHABOT of Ohio.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 94, noes 329, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

AYES—94

Aderholt
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kingston
Kline
Lamborn
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marino
Massie
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Palazzo
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Price (GA)
Rahall
Ribble
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Stockman
Stutzman
Tiberi
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoho

NOES—329

Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Grimm
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Schock
Shimkus

□ 2151

Messrs. BROOKS of Alabama, LABRADOR, Ms. ESTY, Messrs. BUCSHON, KILMER, TAKANO, ROONEY, Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. SANFORD, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, KELLY of Pennsylvania, HUIZENGA of Michigan, SERRANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. SESSIONS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. JORDAN, CRAWFORD, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, MULVANEY, SMITH of Missouri, HALL, CASSIDY, and RYAN of Wisconsin changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 194, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—230

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

NOES—194

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

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Grimm
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Schock
Shimkus

□ 2156

Mrs. CAPITO changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 253, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

AYES—170

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—253

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton

Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Grimm
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Schock
Shimkus

□ 2200

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

AYES—174

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSantis
Deutch
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)

NOES—250

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Barton
Campbell
Grimm
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus

□ 2204

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 147, noes 273, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

AYES—147

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Radel
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—273

Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Campbell
Cole
Crenshaw
Diaz-Balart
Grimm
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
Larson (CT)
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Schrader
Shimkus

□ 2207

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014''.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Schneider moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2609 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $650,000)''.

Page 3, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 6, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,000,000)''.

Page 22, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 28, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $12,650,000)''.

Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $12,650,000)''.

Mr. SCHNEIDER (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to suspend reading of the motion.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

I rise to offer this motion to recommit to ensure, first, that the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River are protected from the continued threat of invasive species, including and particularly taking practical steps to address the threat of Asian carp to our fishing, tourism, and navigation on our Nation's inland waterways.

Second, that we provide the resources necessary to combat invasive aquatic plant growths that threaten our national fisheries, wildlife, and communities.

Third, that we continue to fund efforts for our coastal communities to help them fully recover from natural disasters, while at the same time proactively prioritizing efforts being made to mitigate future threats to human life and property.

Madam Speaker, the underlying bill represents a historic divestment in American infrastructure, jobs, and energy research.

Instead of prioritizing investments that will safeguard our communities and improve our Nation's navigable waterways, this bill overemphasizes several outdated defense budget expenditures at the expense of making meaningful, forward-looking investments to grow our economy and contribute positively to our environment.

We must not use the guise of fiscal prudence as an excuse to block important investments in alternative energy and basic physical energy research which benefits all sectors of our economy or to block important investments in infrastructure projects to improve our inland waterways and mitigate the potentially devastating consequences of natural disasters or to block investment in weatherization assistance to help our most vulnerable populations.

This bill constitutes a generational abandonment of our communities and children who will have to face the stark reality of the decisions made here today, including a significant rollback of the Clean Water Act.

The proposed amendment does not address all of the concerns I have with the underlying bill, but it will at least help to improve the bill moving forward. Specifically, Asian carp continue to deplete fish stocks and degrade local ecological balance, and must be addressed by a holistic government approach that partners with States to utilize best practices.

This amendment would encourage these partnerships with the States while providing funding that can meaningfully address and prevent the outbreak of this invasive species.

□ 2215

Similarly, the influx of pollution and runoff to our waterways has contributed to an overabundance of aquatic plant life, such as algae blooms in Lake Erie, that choke vital nutrients from our natural ecosystems.

This amendment takes a more practical approach to limiting the causes of this overgrowth, improving our water quality.

The underlying bill also fails to adequately address the continuing needs of coastal communities adversely affected by flooding and other natural disasters.

This amendment would aid in addressing critical vulnerabilities of communities facing severe economic impact from flooding, while prioritizing projects that will help safeguard human life.

Lastly, but very significantly, this amendment would strengthen the current cooperative energy research being performed between the United States and the State of Israel. For almost two decades, we have partnered with Israel in developing scientific, business, and research relationships that contribute positively to the energy sectors of both the U.S. and Israel. This amendment continues that long partnership and capitalizes on our joint research capacities to identify emerging technologies and best practices for manufacturing while efficiently utilizing taxpayer money to continue to strategically benefit both of our nations.

Madam Speaker, the essential provisions of this amendment will only improve the underlying bill, contributing significantly to American job growth, the safety of our communities, and protecting our vital natural resources. I strongly urge my colleagues to support these commonsense changes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The House has worked its will over the past 2 days, and dozens of amendments have been considered in a very open and amicable process. This bill strengthens national security, fosters a stronger economy, and maintains important infrastructure that keeps American open for business and promotes job opportunities.

And we do all of this while making some tough, but smart, funding decisions, saving taxpayers $2.9 billion over last year's enacted level. We have just 2½ months left before the end of the year. This is the time to act. Now is the time to pass our government funding bills. I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit and to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the passage of the bill and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 230, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—195

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

NOES—230

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)

Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Grimm
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2223

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 198, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—227

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

NAYS—198

Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Grimm
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Shimkus

□ 2231

So 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, 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.

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

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 51

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) as a cosponsor to H.J. Res. 51.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2311

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) at 11 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–149) on the resolution (H. Res. 295) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the department of agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today until 3:30 p.m. on account of the birth of his grandson.

Ms. SINEMA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 8 and 9 on account of attending memorial service in Arizona for the Prescott Fire Department's Granite Mountain Hotshots.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 2, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 324. To grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

H.R 1151. To direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2383. To designate the new Interstate Route 70 bridge over the Mississippi River connecting St. Louis, Missouri, and southwestern Illinois as the ''Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge''.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 11, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2196. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Scott R. Van Buskirk, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2197. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration (MARAD) for Fiscal Years 2010-2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2198. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Annual Report 2011, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5617; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2199. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Efficiency Design Standards for New Federal Commercial and Multi-Family High-Rise Residential Buildings [Docket No.: EERE-2011-BT-STD-0055] (RIN: 1904-AC60) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2200. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting a report on The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2201. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network (RIN: 0906-AA73) received July 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2202. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting report to Congress on the Backlog of Postmarketing Requirements (PMR) and Postmarketing Commitments (PMC) for 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2203. A letter from the Surgeon General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting fourth annual Status Report from the National Prevention, Health Promotion and Public Health Council; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2204. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R06-OAR-2009-0710; FRL-9831-1] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2205. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Redesignation of the Indianapolis Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0839; FRL-9832-3] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2206. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second Ten-Year PM10 Maintenance Plan for Canon City [EPA-R08-OAR-2010-0389; FRL-9832-1] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2207. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for Georgia: Partial Withdrawal [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0223; FRL-9831-5] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2208. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York State Ozone Implementation Plan Revision [EPA-R02-OAR-2013-0180; FRL-9830-7] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2209. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Approval of ''Infrastructure'' SIP with respect to Source Impact Analysis Provisions for the 2006 24-Hour PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0805; FRL-9832-4] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2210. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: MAGNASTOR System [NRC-2012-0308] (RIN: 3150-AJ22) received July 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2211. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2212. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Audit of the Accrued Sick and Safe Leave Act of 2008''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2213. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance Regarding Deferred Discharge of Indebtedness Income of Corporations and Deferred Original Issue Discount Deductions [TD 9622] (RIN: 1545-BI96) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2214. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's ''2013 Annual Plan for the Ultra-Deepwater and Unconventional Natural Gas and Other Petroleum Resources Research and Development Program''; jointly to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Natural Resources.

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. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2218. A bill to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are

protective of human health and the environment; with an amendment (Rept. 113–148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 295. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–149). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[Omitted from the Record of July 9, 2013]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 819 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 Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 2637. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 2638. A bill to direct the President to establish guidelines for United States foreign assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 2639. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to add procedural requirements for patent infringement suits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 2640. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to adjust the Crooked River boundary, to provide water certainty for the City of Prineville, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2641. A bill to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 2642. A bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas):

H.R. 2643. A bill to provide for a review of efforts to reduce Federal agency travel expenses through the use of video conferencing and a plan to achieve additional reductions in such expenses through the use of video conferencing, to implement such plan through rescissions of appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2644. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to prohibit funding under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance grant program and the Public Safety and Community Policing grant program to be provided to law enforcement agencies that use license plate readers unless certain conditions are met; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2645. A bill to prohibit providers of social media services from using self-images uploaded by minors for commercial purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2646. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to issue a fishing capacity reduction loan to refinance the existing loan funding the Pacific Coast groundfish fishing capacity reduction program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. COLE, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2647. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for public broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2648. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale or other disposition of a firearm to, and the possession, shipment, transportation, or receipt of a firearm by, certain classes of high-risk individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2649. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reform the Federal Communications Commission by requiring an analysis of benefits and costs during the rule making process and creating certain presumptions regarding regulatory forbearance and biennial regulatory review determinations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 2650. A bill to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H.R. 2651. A bill to improve the understanding and coordination of critical care health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FARR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2652. A bill to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to marijuana-related businesses; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that President Barack Obama has violated section 3 of article II of the Constitution by refusing to enforce the employer mandate provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Rules, and Appropriations, 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. PETERS of California:

H. Res. 296. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that before the United States ends its commitment in Afghanistan and United States involvement in the conflict draws to a close, the Nation needs to ensure no one is left behind and all members of the United States Armed Forces are accounted for; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII

105. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 15 urging the Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 2637.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2638.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 2639.

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

Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 2640.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution (relating to the power of

Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 2641.

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

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of specific legislative powers granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause ''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;'' and Article III, in that the legislation defines or affects powers of the Judiciary that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 2642.

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

The ability to regulate interstate commerce and with foreign Nations pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 includes the power to regulate commodity prices, practices affecting them and the trading or donation of the commodities to impoverished nations. In addition, the Congress has the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 which includes the power to promote the development of Rural America through research and extension of credit.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2643.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Sectoin 8, Clause 1

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2644.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 2645.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 2646.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2647.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois

H.R. 2648.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2649.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power...''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 2650.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution vests Congress with the authority to engage in relations with the tribes.

The clause states that the United States Congress shall have power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2651.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 2652.

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

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 129: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 198: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 274: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 275: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 310: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 322: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 333: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 352: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. AMASH, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. YODER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 367: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 460: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 485: Mr. COSTA and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 521: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 523: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 556: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 582: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 596: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 630: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 647: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 683: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 685: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 690: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 698: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 760: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 763: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 769: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 818: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 850: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 851: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 924: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 948: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1005: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 1020: Mr. POLIS, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1024: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1037: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1070: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1077: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1094: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 1125: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1148: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1199: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1205: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1250: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1263: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1332: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1339: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. VELA, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1395: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1416: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 1443: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1461: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 1473: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1494: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1507: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1553: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1563: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 1585: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1616: Mr. HIMES and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1666: Mr. COHEN, Mr. VELA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1690: Mr. COSTA, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1692: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1696: Mr. KEATING and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1698: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1717: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1731: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1739: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1748: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1763: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1771: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1772: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1779: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1780: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1787: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 1798: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1806: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1825: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 1843: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 1869: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1874: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 1890: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1908: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 1920: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1921: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1950: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 1962: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 1979: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1995: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1998: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2002: Mr. WALZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2009: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 2010: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 2011: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2016: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2051: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 2086: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2116: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2137: Mr. OWENS and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2169: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 2178: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2182: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2218: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 2273: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2315: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2319: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2347: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 2387: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2399: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2424: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2426: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2445: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 2447: Mr. BERA of California and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2448: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2449: Mr. PIERLUISI and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2464: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 2465: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. EDWARDS
H.R. 2485: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2494: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2498: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2504: Mr. TERRY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2523: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2540: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2542: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2544: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2547: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2553: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2560: Ms. LEE of California and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2565: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 2575: Mr. KINGSTON, MR. LANKFORD, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 2579: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 2590: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 2592: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2606: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2619: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. HALL.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. CARTER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. NUGENT.
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. PETERSON.
H. Con. Res. 41: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. LEE of California.
H. Res. 35: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H. Res. 104: Mr. SIMPSON.
H. Res. 131: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H. Res. 201: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 227: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H. Res. 250: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H. Res. 284: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 285: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H. Res. 293: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LATTA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COLE, Mr. YODER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. LUCAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agriculture in H.R. 2642 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative ALAN LOWENTHAL, or a designee, to H.R. 761 the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. LATHAM.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 36: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Operation and Maintenance'', and increasing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies'', by $10,000,000.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. LYNCH

AMENDMENT NO. 37: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development'', and increasing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Department of the Army—Corps of Engineers-Civil—Construction'', by $20,000,000.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT NO. 38: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by a private entity to bring an action against the United States or its agents.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. LAMALFA

AMENDMENT NO. 39: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to regulate activities identified in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 404(f)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A), (C)).

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 40: At the end of the bill, (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development'', and increasing the amount made available for ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies'', by $10,000,000.

H.R. 2609

OFFERED BY: MR. FLEMING

AMENDMENT NO. 41: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee to carry out section 301 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 16421a; added by section 402 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111–5)).

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2013 No. 98

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOE DONNELLY, a Senator from the State of Indiana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty and ever blessed God, we thank You for Your divine grace that sustains us and for each evidence of Your Spirit's leading in our Nation and world.

Lord, inspire our Senators to walk in Your light, as they grow in grace and develop a greater knowledge of You. Make them this day human channels through which Your love can flow to bring harmony where there is discord and hope where there is despair. Empower them to lift high the lamp of truth to illuminate our Nation and world. Incline their hearts to follow Your leading, knowing that in due season they will reap if they persevere.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOE DONNELLY, a Senator from the State of Indiana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DONNELLY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

NEVADA FIRES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I returned from Nevada this Sunday. On Saturday I had a briefing by the head of the Forest Service in Nevada. We thought things were going very well with the fires in Nevada, and they were. Progress was being made—limited but progress was being made. But since that time the fires have gotten much worse.

Not everyone can see this, but I have a picture—of course, I didn't get this until early this morning and didn't have a chance to enlarge it so we could put it on an easel—but this is the beginning of the Las Vegas strip. This is downtown Las Vegas. It is called the Carpenter fire. You can see it burning.

It is only about 10 miles from Las Vegas, maybe 12 at the most. We can see Mount Charleston, a 12,000-foot mountain. The flames are shooting above that. We don't get many clouds in southern Nevada, but the smoke cloud here is intense. One of my staff indicated that where she lives it is raining ash. This is a very devastating fire, and the firefighters are doing the very best they can in a very difficult situation.

My thoughts go out to the thousands who have been evacuated from their homes in southern Nevada's Mount Charleston area—I think hundreds would be a better way to say this. Out where the Carpenter 1 fire is, as it is called, it has burned more than 30 square miles of forest and desert.

My heart goes out to the first responders. They are working very hard in extremely rugged terrain. They are doing a lot in the air with helicopters and large airplanes. A couple of areas have been saved because these firefighters have been able to cut waves so the flames don't jump over into these houses. Yesterday the wind changed, and one of the roads going up to Mount Charleston, Kyle Canyon—it jumped that road, burning there, getting closer to some of the homes we are so concerned about.

Lives have been saved as a result of what the firefighters are doing. They have been working around the clock to contain the blaze and protect their communities. Unfortunately, this is southern Nevada where we had heat last week virtually every day of 112 to 117 degrees. It is hot in Las Vegas without this fire; we don't get much rain. In the entire year we get 4 inches of rain. The summer heat, these dry conditions, and the winds are really working against the firefighters, but they are working very hard.

The progress we were making was erased yesterday. The fire jumped Kyle Canyon Road, as I said, and spread to new forest and new desert land. We thought everyone would be able to return to their homes in Kyle Canyon yesterday, but with the fire having spread the way it did, we hope they can get back in their homes soon. We have had a number of hotels in Las Vegas that allowed people who have been displaced to have free lodging.

As I indicated, smoke can be seen everyplace. We have 2 million people now in Las Vegas. Everybody can see the fire. These flames, one can see them well over the 12,000-foot mountain.

The Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service are all working with other Federal agencies and State agencies. They are assisting firefighters in

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

containing the blaze and helping residents to move.

There is also a fire burning in Reno, south of Reno. It is called the Bison fire. It is the largest fire ever recorded in western Nevada. People have been—especially in the Pipeline Canyon area—urged to evacuate. I am going to continue to monitor both of these fires because they are disasters.

I appreciate all the work done at the State level. My office has extended support to Governor Sandoval to do everything we can to assist the State in anything they need, and I will do everything I can to ensure every Federal resource that is available will be made available to support local officials and fire crews.

There are currently more than 20 active fires in 11 States, including Nevada's neighbors: California—and we all know about the fire in Arizona, but there are others—Oregon, Idaho, and Utah. There are thousands of firefighters working around the clock to save lives and to save property. I will do everything I can, I repeat, to help them.

STUDENT LOANS

Mr. REID. In a couple of hours we will vote on whether to begin debate on our plan to keep loan rates low for students for an additional year. Last month Republican obstruction forced interest rates to double from 3.4 percent to 6 percent for about 7 million college students.

If we fail to roll back this increase, those students will each pile on lots of new debt to get a college education. These rates will be particularly harmful to low- and middle-income families that rely on these Federal loans more than anyone else.

We have the Pell grants, which go to low-income people, but people who are middle class have to do these loans; schools have become so expensive. States have cut back on the support they give to colleges, so this is a very difficult situation.

Students shouldn't suffer because some Senators are standing in the way of that compromise. That is why we have proposed a 1-year extension of last year's 3.4 percent rate. We don't want it to double. The extension will allow us to craft a long-term solution to mounting college debt without harming students in the short term. However, a number of Senators met at my direction this morning at 9 o'clock, and there is progress being made. Maybe we can come up with a compromise. It will be imperfect, like a lot of things that happen legislatively, but it will be a way for us to move forward. The meeting went very well. It was done in Senator DURBIN's office. Democrats and Republicans attended that meeting. I think we are making some progress.

KEEP STUDENT LOANS AFFORDABLE ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 124, S. 1238, Senator REED's student loan bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1238) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following the remarks of Senator MCCONNELL, the time until noon will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders, with each Senator permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

At noon there will be a cloture vote on the motion to proceed on S. 1238, the student loan bill.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. For more than a month, I have been coming to the floor to talk about student loan reform. I have said that to an outside observer, this is an issue that should have been an easy bipartisan slam dunk. I have noted that the proposals put forward by both President Obama and congressional Republicans have been strikingly similar. We both agree on the need for a permanent reform, and we agree on the need to help all students and not just some of them. Yet here we are after the July 1 deadline and Democrats are still blocking bipartisan student loan reform.

You have to ask yourself why. It is because they have prioritized politics over helping students. There are basically two different Democratic groups battling for supremacy: a more responsible reform-permanently faction and a more political campaign-permanently faction.

In the first group are the sensible Democratic Senators who agree with both President Obama and Republicans that it is time to finally solve this issue. Washington should actually help students and stop using them as pawns in a political chess match. They support the bipartisan compromise plan put forward by Democratic, Republican, and Independent Senators alike.

Unfortunately, this faction is opposed and outnumbered by the campaign-permanently Democrats. They are the ones whom I suspect would actually prefer to see rates lapse so they can manufacture another campaign issue. To hear the musings of some top Democrats, one would have to conclude that the Democratic leadership is on the side of campaigning permanently and against helping students.

As the majority leader put it a few weeks ago: ''[We're] not looking for compromise.''

Another Democratic Senator in leadership boasted a goal in this debate was to show ''the difference between the two parties on a key issue.''

I mean, this is just the kind of thing that makes people so cynical about Washington. Washington Democrats yell and wave their arms about the need for something, and then they appear to do everything possible behind the scenes to sabotage it, apparently so they can manufacture a politically convenient crisis. They are doing it on student loans, and they have been doing it with nominations too.

All week it seems they have been breathlessly telling any reporter who will listen that we have a nominations crisis around here; that Republicans are holding up the President's nominees. It is really laughable.

To hear some of the over-the-top rhetoric, one would think Republicans have blocked all of the President's second-term Cabinet nominees. But then, of course, you would be entirely wrong.

The truth is, since the President swore his oath of office in January, the Senate has confirmed every single Cabinet pick that has been brought up for a vote—every single one of them.

Let me repeat that. Every single one that has been brought up for a vote, all of them have been confirmed. Many of them have been confirmed on unanimous or nearly unanimous votes. Yesterday, the ranking Republican on the Environment and Public Works Committee announced his support for an up-or-down vote on Gina McCarthy's nomination to be EPA Administrator. So there is no question she is going to be confirmed.

It is clear that facts are getting in the way of the Democrats' arguments, which is why they are forced to gin up this fake—absolutely fake—nominations ''crisis.'' It is why we see them bringing out all the nominees who have been appointed to office either illegally or who are exceedingly controversial. Democrats themselves have delayed consideration of these nominees literally for months—because the majority leader determines the timing—so they could pull them all out of the woodwork at the same time, in the hopes the Senate would reject them.

Democrats are out there daring the Senate to do it. They want it so badly it appears to be their goal. And there is a reason for this. It is because the far-left base seems to be getting fed up with the democratic process. The big labor bosses are sick of waiting for the special interest legislative kickbacks they must feel they are owed, and now they know that altering the rules of our democracy is the only way to get what they want.

This isn't going to work. The facts show the truth, and the truth is that any crisis over nominations is a crisis of Washington Democrats' own making—one they have stirred up intentionally—an absolutely manufactured crisis by any objective analysis.

As of last night, there were 140 nominees pending in various committees.

These nominees are under the control of the majority, not us. And there are a little over two dozen or so eligible for expedited floor consideration, many of whom Republicans have already said we would pass unanimously. Why hasn't the majority leader called for votes on any of these folks? Clearly, if anyone is obstructing here, it is the majority leader, because this whole conversation isn't about making the Senate work better, and he knows it. It is all about his power grab. Well, let me caution him again to think long and hard about what he is doing.

As one of the most senior members of the Democratic Party said yesterday, deploying the nuclear option would mean breaking the rules to change the rules—breaking the rules to change the rules. As the majority leader himself once said, it would ''ruin our country.'' And we all know why. Once the trigger is pulled, there would be no limit to the consequences, not just for Republicans or for our country but for Democrats too. They should think very carefully about the ramifications for them when a future Republican President makes his own appointments to the Cabinet and to the Federal bench.

Look, we know Senate Democrats are not serious about implementing student loan reform. They have already demonstrated that by blocking just about every bipartisan effort to do so. But on the nuclear option, it is certainly my hope that cooler heads will prevail. I have to believe they will choose the long-term health of our democracy and of their party over what frankly amounts to the narrowest—the narrowest—of short-term political considerations. Pulling the nuclear trigger is not something the history books will look favorably on, and they know it. And, of course, there will be consequences.

When the President was in the Senate back in 2005, and the then-Republican majority was thinking about something akin to this, this is what the President had to say. ''If they choose to change the rules and put an end to the democratic debate, then the fighting, the bitterness, and the gridlock will only get worse.'' The President was entirely correct.

Senator REID said in 2009, a couple of years ago, ''There is no way I would employ the use of the nuclear option. No way.'' He said it would ''ruin our country.'' He said, ''It would have destroyed the Senate as we know it.''

Hopefully, that was not then and there is some different standard now. And, of course, we know we had this debate at the beginning of the year. Actually, we have had it at the beginning of the last two Congresses, and the Senate—the occupant of the Chair had newly arrived here—voted on two rules changes and two standing orders, after which the majority leader said, ''The rules issue for this Congress is over.''

He gave his word in January of this year. We are waiting to see if that word will be kept.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 12 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the future of student loans for America's students. When I say students, I have to define who that is because, as we know, today we have students of all ages.

We have a category of students where a financial impact requirement is applied, such as for a 19-year-old who has entered their freshman year, and depending upon where the income of their family is, under the current system they may get a subsidized loan. The maximum they can receive under that subsidized loan as an undergraduate is $3,500.

I would be willing to bet the President pro tempore and I both can't pick an institution in any of our States where the tuition on an annual basis is $3,500. It doesn't happen today, and that is the reality that has been left out of the debate so far. This debate has been all about politics and it has not been about students and how to apply affordability as broadly as we can in the marketplace.

Let me describe where we are today. Between 1965 and 1992 the cap on the student loan program in this country was 10 percent—10 percent. In the mid-2000s, Congress, very politically, said: You know what. We are going to adjust it, and subsidized loans are going to be at 3.4 percent and nonsubsidized loans are going to be at 6.8 percent, graduate loans are going to be at 7.9 percent, and if you are a parent borrowing, you are going to have an even higher rate, in the 8-plus percent range.

That strikes me as incredibly unfair. We are taking two undergraduates—two 19-year-old freshmen—entering the same institution with the same financial obligation and we are saying to one: We are going to give you a rate on your student loan that is half of the person who sits in the seat next to you—half. In this chair, the student will pay 3.4 percent, and the student sitting in the chair next to him will pay 6.8 percent. Understand, the parents of the person sitting in this chair, depending upon the cost of the institution, may have an income over $100,000. Yet they may qualify for a Federal subsidy.

Let me suggest to you that the marketplace is the thing that ought to dictate and decide what the rate is. That is the only thing that is fair to the taxpayers in this country—the predictability of knowing it is tied to something.

Let me suggest that the bill we are going to take up—and we are going to vote on a motion to proceed at 12 noon today—is a bill that was created in the 2000s. Two years ago we kicked the can down the road and said we are going to extend this inequitable student loan program at 3.4 percent for some, 6.8 percent for others, 7.9 percent, and 8-plus percent for parents. Why? Because we are overcharging some to subsidize others. Let me say that again. We are overcharging some—we are overcharging some 19-year-old undergraduate freshmen in college—at 6.8 percent so they will subsidize the 3.4 percent we are charging on the subsidized loans.

Let me point to a chart I have here which shows undergraduates under the student loan program. This is a comparison. Actually, let me move to a different chart, because this one best displays what I am talking about.

Twenty-six percent of our Nation's kids are undergraduates and are subsidized, and 55 percent of the eligible students are either undergraduates or graduate students who fall under a 6.8-percent interest rate. So when the Senate majority leader came to the floor and said some were upstairs trying to negotiate a deal, he was 100-percent accurate. But the reality is we are still only going to have a vote on one plan at 12 o'clock. There is no option for Members of Congress.

What I would suggest is that this displays why, at best, there should be two options and, at worst, we ought to vitiate the motion to proceed and see if we can come up with another bipartisan agreement.

You see, another option—the Manchin bill—is a bipartisan approach.

It is Democrats and Republicans coming together and saying we can agree on something that we think is fair and equitable and financially sustainable.

But this is the plan we are going to have a vote on at 12. Fifty-five percent of the population of students, quite frankly, are being screwed. They are overpaying. They are paying 6.8 percent for interest, when a home mortgage for 15 years is 3.8 percent. Yet we are charging students 6.8 percent, and we are saying that to go to this is an injustice to our students, where all of a sudden we take 64 percent of the kids and we treat them all alike and we charge them 3.66 percent. Something is inherently wrong in the debate we are having.

If this is about kids and about affordability, this is the plan on which we

should be having the motion to proceed, not this one. This plan merely kicks the can down the road for 12 more months.

Let me say this plan wasn't created by JOE MANCHIN or RICHARD BURR or TOM COBURN or Senator KING or Senator ALEXANDER. This plan was created by the Congressional Budget Office. The Congressional Budget Office in their March 2011 report to Congress came up with the idea of tying the interest rate to the 10-year Treasury bond, except the CBO says it should be the 10-year Treasury bond plus 3 percent. That is what Senator COBURN and I introduced. When Senator MANCHIN, Senator KING, Senator ALEXANDER, Senator CARPER, and others got involved, we decided what we needed to do was continue to have a blended rate. We all agreed that an undergraduate student shouldn't face an interest rate schedule that is not equitable to all undergraduates.

So instead of applying it to 26 percent, we applied it to 100 percent of the undergraduates. We said: If you are an undergraduate in college, we are going to give you the best rate, which is the 10-year bond plus 1.85. It is fair. It is understandable. It is predictable. It is consistent. One year in advance you know exactly what your rate is going to be because it is determined on the 10-year bond every May.

My good friend Senator HARKIN, whom I have great affection for, came to the floor and said we were balancing the budget on the back of the student loan program. The student loan program is a $1.3 trillion program. Based upon the CBO score on this bill, it had a 0.7-percent surplus. By Washington standards, in a $1 billion program, 0.7 would be a rounding error. This is a $1.3 trillion program. Let me assure the President and my colleagues, this is a rounding error. I can't look everybody in the face and say it might not cost us $100 billion. It might save us $100 billion. But we are certainly not balancing a $17 trillion deficit debt on the back of the student loan program. Let me assure you of that, and for any who suggest we are, that is, in fact, disingenuous.

This is the first time I have been accused of balancing the budget on the backs of our kids. But in 2010, as part of the health care reform act, Democrats ended the Federal Family Education Loan Program, FFEL, at a savings of $61 billion. Of that, the Democrats directed $19 billion to deficit reduction and the rest to help pay for ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act.

If I am being accused of balancing the budget on 0.7 percent, determined by CBO, and in 2010 the Democrats voted to eliminate the FFEL Program and save $61 billion and applied $19 billion to deficit reduction and the rest to help the Affordable Care Act, then they plowed this ground long before I did.

As a matter of fact, in 2007, as part of the College Cost Reduction and Access Act, the Democrats found $21 billion in savings and spent a good amount of it on new programs—and then directed $1 billion to deficit reduction.

I said earlier, I have great affection for Senator HARKIN. Senator HARKIN said this should be part of the Higher Education Reauthorization Act—that may or may not happen next year.

We made changes to the interest rate on student loans outside of the higher education reauthorization in 2012 with a 1-year extension of the 3.4 percent. We did it in 2010 with the elimination of the FFEL Program. We did it in 2005 under the CCRAA, the Deficit Reduction Act. Senator HARKIN's Appropriations Committee has made changes to the eligibility rules for Pell grants each of the past several years outside of the higher education authorization, including the elimination of summer eligibility, ability to benefit, and lowering of the automatic enrollment for low-income students.

It is not fair to come and say to me that I am doing it outside of higher education reauthorization when there is continually a track record of the person who accused us of doing it of doing it himself.

Mr. MANCHIN. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. BURR. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. MANCHIN. I thank the good Senator for working in such a bipartisan manner. I think this truly is a bipartisan bill.

This bill has been described as belonging to one party or the other, and that is wrong. Senator BURR, Senator ALEXANDER, Senator COBURN, Senator KING, Senator CARPER, and I sat down and looked at how we could fix something. We looked at it from the standpoint that this deadline has hit. One year ago we extended it. They said it was the political atmosphere and we had to extend it. We knew that year would come and, similar to everything else that has happened here for the last 2 or 3 years, nothing gets done. We just said: Enough is enough. It has to be fixed, and if we want to fix it, to understand the program, we have to look at the whole program.

I think now they are making accusations that students are paying profits so we can pay down the debt. Whether there is profit built in depends on the accounting procedures used by our Federal Government. It was built in. You can blame whomever you want to blame, but it is built into it. We have to deal with the facts in front of us.

What I would ask the Senator, all of us have agreed in a bipartisan manner that no profit will be made on the backs of students, what we can determine through the bill we are working on, right?

Mr. BURR. That is 100 percent correct.

Mr. MANCHIN. So we have all come to that agreement—Democrats and Republicans—no profit in debt reduction. It should go to lowering the rate.

Mr. BURR. That is correct.

Mr. MANCHIN. We agreed on that. We have agreed on a long-term fix, 10 years, rather than kicking it down the road another year, knowing another year will come and go and we are probably going to be standing here debating. That is the conclusion we have come to, which is different than what the House sent us. I applaud the Senator for working with us to put in a fixed rate.

So if it is at 3.66 this year and I am able to qualify and I am subsidized at $3,500 of a subsidized loan the taxpayer will be paying, that 3.66 is fixed for the full life of the loan. We agreed on that, correct?

Mr. BURR. That is correct.

Mr. MANCHIN. So when they say it is a Republican bill or a Democratic bill, that is erroneous. That is not fair. This is truly a bipartisan effort, and we are working with all of our colleagues in my caucus—and I know the Senator is in his caucus—to understand that if I have a subsidized Stafford loan, that means the Federal Government—the taxpayers of this country—will pay my interest while I am in school, correct?

Mr. BURR. That is correct.

Mr. MANCHIN. At the end of that, then I pick up whatever interest rate has accumulated while I was in school, and I take it from that day forward.

What I think a lot of our colleagues don't understand, I can't make it just on that $3,500. I have to borrow more money. So now, if I go with my colleagues on the Democratic side, if I borrow more money, I have to borrow that at 6.8 percent.

We were able, in a bipartisan way, to bring that to 3.66 percent for all undergraduates, correct?

Mr. BURR. The Senator is correct. I might add to my good friend, this chart shows exactly what we talked about. Under the plan on which we will vote at 12, because of the need for students in the subsidized category to borrow additional money at 6.8 percent, at the end of their process, they owe $78 a month, where under the bipartisan bill, where every undergraduate is treated the same, they owe $75. It is actually cheaper, even for the undergrads who are subsidized.

Mr. MANCHIN. So the money I would have to borrow, even though I qualify because of my income for a subsidized loan, I don't have to pay the interest on an annual basis. So by bringing it down to one low rate, I am making much lower payments. So that is less obligation and less hardship on me as a college student to make that lower payment than it would be to make that higher payment.

We want to help the subsidized, very poor kids. I might be poor, but I can't make it on just what you give me because I am poor. I have to have a little more help. Then, on top of that, I want to go to graduate school after I get my college degree. So then I am at 6.8 again. Ours brings it down to 5.21, which is more savings, which I know the Senator agrees to.

If I may ask my colleague from Tennessee, right now we know we have a

consolidated cap at 8.25 percent. Let's say I graduate and I went to school during the high recession times. At the end, I have an 8.75-percent accumulative interest I owe. I can cap that and consolidate at 8.25, correct?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, if I may respond to the Senator from West Virginia.

First, I wish to congratulate Senators MANCHIN and BURR for helping the full Senate understand this issue. This is similar to a lot of issues we have to face. They are not simple. I used to be a college president and the U.S. Secretary of Education. I had to re-educate myself on this legislation. I still made some mistakes.

I was saying last night, for example, that there were only 2 million subsidized loans. What I was forgetting was the point that the Senator from West Virginia makes, which is that 80 percent of the students who have subsidized loans, the low-income students, also have unsubsidized loans. So when we only take care of these subsidized loans, we are leaving 7 million students with unsubsidized loans out here hanging high and dry, and nobody is taking care of them. So we are hurting both the middle-class families and the low-income families when we have an incomplete solution.

The Senator from West Virginia posed a question. Let's say I graduated from the University of Tennessee and I had two loans; I had a subsidized loan, which means the government paid my interest while I was in college. Typically, if I am similar to four out of five students, I also had an unsubsidized loan, so I accrued that interest. Suddenly the interest rates have gone up for me because the country's interest rates have gone up to 10 percent. What I can do is take all my government loans at once and turn them into an 8.25-percent loan. So that is, in effect, a cap on my loan, and then I would have the choice.

I would say this to the Senators from West Virginia and North Carolina. I have heard some Senators say that when I consolidate my loan at 8.25 percent, that means the student is going to have to pay a lot of interest because it spreads the loan out over a long period of time.

But does not the student have that choice? Isn't it similar to a 15-year mortgage, where you have higher monthly payments, but you pay less interest because you pay it off quicker?

Mr. MANCHIN. I think what they are referring to—and I might have misunderstood, but I think I am accurate on this. Everyone will take the loans for the longest period of time, and I just got out of school so I want the smallest payment. Four or five years out I have a better job. Instead of paying $150 a month, I can afford to pay $300 or $400.

There is no penalty for me to shorten that, as it would be in a conventional market. Is that how the Senator understands it?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask consent that the Senators from North Carolina and West Virginia and I be permitted to engage in a colloquy for a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is how I understand it. I would say to the Senator from North Carolina,—I would presume a graduate of the University of North Carolina would be smart enough to make that decision for herself or himself?

Mr. BURR. I think they would. I think one of the agreements we came to was that students ought to be in control of their decision about their loan rate based upon what is available to them. If students go through the next 4 years and they have a combined interest rate of about 4.5 percent for the life of the loan, why in the world would they be excited at 8.25? If for some reason 10 years from now somebody got out of school and their combined interest rate was 9 percent, we give them the option of going back to 8.25.

I think the Senator from West Virginia made an extremely good point. For the most subsidized students, they can only borrow $3,500. Think of the institutions that are out there—none of them have an annual tuition of $3,500. We know they are going to borrow out of the 6.8-percent pot. What we are offering is that the pots are the same and that the subsidy is that—for students who qualify for the subsidy—they are not responsible for the interest rate while they are in school. That subsidy still exists. It is just that we are not overcharging one group and we are certainly not overcharging the ones we just subsidized because they have to borrow more money to complete their college education.

Mr. MANCHIN. To both of my friends, let me say that I graduate from college—no matter what the interest rates are, no matter what they might have been—I graduate and economic times are tough. I find a job that is not what I think my value is, but I find a job at $40,000—$40,000. I am married now, and I have a child or two. Don't we have in our bill a protection which has been in place for a long time—both Democrats and Republicans have supported this protection—which is called income-based repayment? By law, I can only pay 15 percent of my disposable income. I think that breaks down to my payment can only be $142. Isn't that a subsidy too? Wouldn't we be subsidizing that to an extent? I am also understanding that if my economic condition does not improve and that is all I pay, by the end of 25 years it is exonerated. I pay nothing. I am done.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If I could respond to the Senator who suggested that,—the answer is yes. I think it is fair to say that the consolidation option that a student has in case the rates go up, at 8.25 percent can be called a cap. It is not a hard cap, but it is a cap. And the second cap is the income repayment provision of which the Senator speaks. If you are making $40,000 a year, after they apply the formula you probably are not spending more than about 10 percent of your income—it is something called disposable income—to pay for your student loan. Loan repayment then continues for about 20 years. If at the end of 20 years you have not paid your loan off, the loan is forgiven.

Any student who has a loan has that opportunity. They can consolidate at 8.25 percent, and income repayment limits the amount they have to pay each year. So they have that.

One of the things I noticed about the Manchin-Burr bill that I would like to ask the Senators to talk about is that you have come up with—what I am beginning to understand, as I study this more and more—a very significant contribution: the idea that all of the undergraduate student loans—which, as I understand it, are about two out of three of the loans—should have the same interest rate. First, it is confusing the way undergraduate loan interest rates are now, but the other reason is that about 80 percent of the people who have subsidized loans, the low-income students, also have unsubsidized loans. So your contribution is to say: Let's simplify it, provide certainty over a long period of time, and treat all undergraduates the same. Otherwise, it seems to me, you are leaving 7 million middle-income students who have unsubsidized loans high and dry, and the 80 percent of the low-income students who also have these unsubsidized loans, you are not helping them either.

I wonder if the Senator could comment on this idea? I notice, without a cap, you are able to get the interest rate for all undergraduate loans down to about 3.66 percent, which is a pretty low rate.

Mr. MANCHIN. Let me say very quickly—and I will use $10 million hypothetically that is borrowed every year—$10 billion, $10 million, whatever you want to use—25 percent of that money goes to the subsidized, just 25 percent. I understand that it is close to about 40 percent of the students who participate in borrowing money, but the volume of money is about 25 percent, one-fourth of the money that is loaned out. So if we are keeping the rates low on one-fourth of the money, that means we artificially have much higher rates on three-fourths of the money students need to get an education.

What we are saying is that we are going to bring a larger majority of that down to the lowest rate. We think it is a good policy that we should be discussing and talking about. That is where we are. That is why we came up with the plan we did, but we reduced all the rates. The PLUS loans I think went from 7.9 to 6.21, yes, and then the graduate loans went from 6.8 to 5.21.

But if you do all of the undergraduate, it would go from 3.4 to 3.66, a quarter and a point—.26.

Mr. BURR. The most significant part is for the undergraduates who were not subsidized, they would go from 6.8 to 3.6.

Mr. MANCHIN. Right. Right.

Mr. BURR. This goes to the heart of what the Senator from Tennessee said. Today the subsidy goes to 26 percent of our students; 55 percent pay the 6.8 rate. Under the bipartisan bill, 64 percent—all undergraduates—get 3.66.

If this is about affordability, if this is about what provides the greatest flexibility for students to afford it, then the answer is clear. It is on the chart. But it also computes in the monthly payments to which students are obligated. The fact is that for a typical student in their first year, taking $5,000 out, $3,500 comes from the subsidy—$5,500 out, $3,500 comes from the subsidy, $2,000 comes from the 6.8 rate.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield for a question.

Mr. BURR. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. HARKIN. I just want to ask—I am sorry, I couldn't see the chart from the other side, so I came here. On the undergraduate student, 3.66, 64 percent, for how many years does that hold, that 3.66 percent? For how many years?

Mr. BURR. It holds for 1 year until the readjustment of the 10-year bond, which could by higher, it could be lower.

Mr. HARKIN. Just 1 year.

Mr. BURR. Higher than it was in May——

Mr. HARKIN. And what does the CBO project the rates will do in the next 10 years?

Mr. BURR. I am sure the Senator came with a chart. But let me say that we have an 8.25-percent consolidation cap. The reality is that if you are going to move to a market-based system, the question we have as Senators is, How do we drive interest rates the lowest for our Nation's students? If you put a hard cap of 8.25, then all of a sudden this interest rate goes up, if we are getting to a zero surplus. It is not going to cost us anything, not going to make anything; 3.66 goes up, it doesn't go down. So by having the flexible cap at 8.25, where anybody can consolidate at any time, we are able to do it at the 10-year bond plus 1.85. And this is all CBO numbers. We are using the same source for this.

But I think at the heart of this, and I say to my good friend from West Virginia, the real question is, Are we going to let 26 percent participate in an attractive interest rate or are we going to extend it to 64 percent, which is the entire class of undergraduates?

Mr. MANCHIN. That was the bipartisan agreement we had. I appreciate that very much. Let me say, here is the last 10 years. If we would use the last 10 years, with the bipartisan bill kicked in, this is what the students who basically are paying the higher rate now—6.8 percent frozen—would have been able to take advantage of, the lower rates. They never got a chance to take advantage of the lower rates. All we are assuming is that if rates go up in 3 or 4 years, they are going to be paying higher rates. We never assume the market—that is the reason why you fluctuate with the market on the 10-year T-bill. This would have happened with the 10-year T-bill. Look how much lower they would have been paying in the last 10 years.

I know we can all use figures any way we want to use them, but the bottom line is that it is either going to be market—it has always been that before. There have been caps that have been much higher, and we are trying to find something that is affordable, but the bottom line is, do we try to protect the lowest rate?

Most undergraduates have the hardest times. Once you get your undergraduate degree, you have a much higher percentage of making it. If you want to get a graduate degree and a higher Ph.D. degree, you have a much better chance.

The bottom line is that we want to keep the rates low so that when students go out they are not burdened with the highest payments. We have a lot of protections built in that a lot of times are misunderstood and are not explained properly, and I am glad we are having this colloquy.

Mr. BURR. Would the Senator from Iowa like another question?

Mr. HARKIN. I have a statement to make but not a question.

Mr. BURR. I will wrap up and move on.

Mr. HARKIN. If we are going to get into a colloquy, that is fine.

Mr. MANCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BURR. I would rather make the points that I need to because at 12 we are going to vote on one bill. We are going to vote on a 3.4-percent extension, kicking the can down the road for 12 months, not fixing the problem, not finding the solution, and continuing to overcharge some students and subsidize another pool and go to bed at night and feel good about this.

I think the reason we have a bipartisan agreement is there are some who do not feel good about that. We look at it and we say the Senate has not done what people sent us here to do, and that is to get it as close to right as we can.

Again, I say to my colleagues—and I can go to the CBO again—the CBO scored the bill, and CBO says the bipartisan bill is within .7 percent of having no cost and no surplus. I am not sure you can get any closer than that. They have also told us verbally and showed us in scoring: put the cap in and you raise the interest rate on all students, all postgraduates, all parents. And our objective, when Senator MANCHIN and Senator KING and Senator COBURN and Senator ALEXANDER got into the discussion, was, How can we get rates as low as we can? Our focus was on the affordability for the students; secondarily, the sustainability of the program, which was long-term, something we do not visit every 1 or 2 or 3 years.

Let me get into specifics because there are four proposals out there. One of them has already passed the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives has a 10-year variable rate that fluctuates annually. For unsubsidized loans, the rate is 4.31; for subsidized loans, the rate is 4.31, which is 10-year plus 2.5 percent; for PLUS loans, 5.74. It removes the consolidation cap—removes it—and it creates caps of 8.5 and 10.5 percent.

The vote that we will have at noon, I think everybody knows it is a 6.8-percent rate for most students. Twenty-six percent get a subsidized rate of 3.4 percent. The PLUS loans are at 7.9 percent, and that is 18 percent of the loans at 7.9 percent.

Under the President's proposal, the unsubsidized is—I think this is backward. I think it is the subsidized at 10-year and .93; the unsubsidized at 10 year, 2.93; the PLUS at 10 year plus 3.93; and it is uncapped and fixed for life.

So it brings us to the bipartisan bill. The Senator from West Virginia said it well. What were the agreements we made? We are not going to make money and we are not going to lose money We are at .7 percent, according to CBO.

An undergraduate is an undergraduate. We should not cheat one to subsidize another. But there should be a subsidy for low-income at-risk students. The assumption is that they are not responsible for the interest payment while they are in school. The reality is that we extend the same 10-year bond plus 1.85 percent to all undergraduates.

For the graduate students, we would bring the rate down to 10-year plus 3.4, and for PLUS loans, 10-year plus 4.4, and we keep in place the consolidation cap that has been in law. Let me remind my colleagues what I said earlier before they came to the floor. From 1965 to 1992, the cap on student loans was 10 percent. If we put that in today, it will raise the percentage each individual is going to pay.

Mr. MANCHIN. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. BURR. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANCHIN. I am not sure how the Senator voted on the extension a year ago. I voted for the extension a year ago.

Mr. BURR. As did I.

Mr. MANCHIN. I don't intend to vote on the extension again because we have not fixed it. By voting on this extension, what we are voting on is 3.4 percent just for the subsidized, and everybody will be at 6.8 percent, and 7.9 percent for PLUS loans.

When my colleague is talking about that, the difference of savings between our bill—if we got a vote on our bill, which is a compromised, bipartisan bill, we would save close to $9 billion in

interest that students wouldn't have to pay. I believe we agree on that.

Mr. BURR. That is correct.

Mr. MANCHIN. I think we are going to have a chance to vote on one bill, and that is about $2 billion. In West Virginia that is a lot of money in savings of $7 billion that students don't have to pay in interest, which is across the board for students who have subsidized and unsubsidized loans. That is the point we are trying to make, and we hope we get that through.

I know the Senator hopes, as I do, that we get a vote on this today.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANCHIN. I believe Senator BURR has the floor.

Mr. BURR. I am happy to yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. My friend from West Virginia made a statement a few minutes ago that resonated with me. He said we are trying to get the market rates because we always had the rates.

When I first went to college in 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961, I borrowed money under this program. It came into being in 1958, so 1959 was the first year I borrowed money. It was called the National Defense Education Act or the Eisenhower bill. I went back and looked to see what the 10-year Treasury note was at that time for those 3 years that I borrowed. The 10-year Treasury note at that time ranged between 4.2 percent and about 4.8 percent. I borrowed money at 2 percent.

I say to my friend, that is not a market rate. Not only did I borrow the money, but all the time I was in college I paid no interest charges. I spent 5 years in the military with no interest charges. I then went to law school—3 years in law school—with no interest charges. Then I had a 1-year grace period after I graduated from law school with no interest charges. For all those years the interest rate clock never started ticking.

Mr. MANCHIN. Was that for every student who was in college at that time no matter what their ranking or what service they had performed in the military or whether they had the GI bill?

Mr. HARKIN. Everybody.

Mr. MANCHIN. Everybody in college during that period of time could borrow at the low rate of 2 percent with no interest at all?

Mr. HARKIN. That is right. The reason I raise that is, Why were we so special? Why was my generation so special that this country was willing to subsidize my education, but for these young people here we are saying: No, no, you have to pay interest rates?

Mr. MANCHIN. Maybe Congress did a better job of getting its financial house in order than we have.

Mr. HARKIN. We made a commitment at that time to invest in a generation of young Americans so they wouldn't have a huge amount of debt hanging over their heads.

Mr. BURR. What didn't exist when my colleague went to college and graduate school was that we didn't have an income test for repayment. We don't charge anybody over 15 percent on an annual basis.

When the Senator went through the system, he was responsible to pay back 100 percent of it. Today, after a certain period of time on the subsidized loans, we forgive it. We have a lot of programs that didn't exist when he went through school. We have Pell grants that extend a tremendous amount of money that is not obligated to be paid back—$4,000. We have student loan higher education tax credits that did not exist when he went through college.

We have a basket of products. What we are looking at is, How can we take one program, which is the rate-based program, and make it as attractive and affordable for students as we possibly can? Under this scenario, we are able to accomplish that for 64 percent. Under what we will vote on, we only do it for 26 percent. We can't help but make the argument: You are overcharging here to subsidize here.

I agree with my good friend from Iowa, for whom I have great affection, that I want to make sure every student has an opportunity to go to college and that it is affordable for all. We have a system right now where the Federal Government controls 100 percent. When my good friend went through college, there were private lenders that competed with the Federal Government. At this time we have no private lenders. We legislatively eliminated the private sector from competing for student loans. It is all dominated by the Federal Government. At least we can try to get those loans as inexpensively as we can for the largest group of college students.

I have a unanimous consent request. I hope we will entertain this because not only is the debate worthy, but a vote is worthy.

I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is not invoked on the pending motion to proceed to S. 1238, the Jack Reed bill on student loans, it then be in order to move to proceed to S. 1241, the Manchin bill on student loans; further, that the cloture motion, which will be at the desk, be considered filed on the motion to proceed; and further, notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate then immediately proceed to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the pending motion to proceed to the Manchin bill, S. 1241.

Before the Chair rules, let me just say this agreement would allow us to have two votes on two versions of student loan rates that start at noon today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, this is an important issue, and I want to thank my colleagues who came together this morning to try to find an additional solution.

I thank Senator MANCHIN, Senator KING, and Senator CARPER because they were willing to try to fix this problem. I am convinced that my good friend from Iowa is doing this in good faith, but now is the time to find a solution. It is not a year from now, it is not a month from now, it is not a week from now, it is today.

Mr. MANCHIN. I have one question that I would like to ask in the spirit of a colloquy to my dear friend from Iowa. They are saying 1 year, and they are looking at the compromised, bipartisan bill we have worked on. In 3 or 4 years the rates may go up because market rates will change. If we are only looking at 1 year, is there anything prohibitive in our bill that we couldn't go back a year from now if we see a better solution? If we get an education bill, we can say: Hey, here is the grand bargain, which is better than what we thought we had.

Still yet, our bill saves $9 billion, and the bill my dear friends in my caucus support only saves $2 billion. If we only do it for 1 year, we help more people save more money, and then we can still rewrite another bill in 1 year. Are we able to do that?

Mr. BURR. I have learned in my 20 years in Washington that ''permanent'' is defined as a 2-year session of Congress, and the next could easily change it.

Mr. MANCHIN. If we look at it from year to year, we have 3.4 percent for the smallest group, 6.8 percent for everybody above that, and 7.9 percent for PLUS.

Under our bill, it is 3.66 percent for all undergraduates, and every rate comes down; correct?

Mr. BURR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANCHIN. So that is $9 billion versus $2 billion, and that is about as simple as I can make it.

Mr. BURR. As I said earlier, how does that compute to the average student? It means a lower monthly payment. Under the bill that we will vote on, which is the current extension—the kick-the-can-down-the-road plan—they will pay $78 a month, and that number is based on a student borrowing $5,000. Under the bipartisan bill, it is $75 a month.

On the graduate Stafford comparison by month, the person who borrows under the graduate program—under the kick-the-can-down-the-road plan—is going to pay $251. Under the bipartisan solution, they are going to have a monthly obligation of $230.

For the highest group, the PLUS loans—and in a lot of cases those are parents—the monthly obligation is going to be $197 on the kick-the-can-down-the-road plan, and under the bipartisan solution, the monthly obligation is going to be $180 in payments. Again, this is figured with $5,000 borrowed over a 10-year amortization of the loan.

It makes the good point my friend from West Virginia made: Why would we not take the opportunity to make

this cheaper for everybody for the next 12 months? If we find a better way to do it, let's change it 12 months from now.

Mr. MANCHIN. I think what we are talking about also is that they are saying if it consolidates, it strings the payment out for the maximum of 30 years, which means they are paying a lot more back in interest; correct? That is the argument I have heard from different people. So that means, why would you have an automatic consolidation?

With that being said, I understand that with the government-run loan right now, there are no penalties for me. If I string it out to get the lowest payment for 30 years, and then I said I want to have 10 years, I can do that; correct? That is able to be done. So I can reduce that amount of time and amount of interest with my affordability to pay more.

Mr. BURR. The Senator is exactly right.

There are others on the other side who would like to speak.

Madam Chair, at this time I reserve the remainder of the time on our side and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I know Senator STABENOW has an important meeting to get to, and I will yield to her in just second.

I just want to respond to my friend from North Carolina as to why I objected since I don't believe in all of these reservations for objections. Either you object or you don't, and there is a time to explain that later on.

I wanted to explain why I objected. If we vote for cloture at noon on this underlying bill, then what the Senator from North Carolina wants, they can add as an amendment. They can offer that as an amendment to the bill. The bill will be open to any amendments anybody has.

So the reason I object is because we have a bill, and it is under regular order. We have cloture and the bill is open for amendments. So the Senator from North Carolina or Tennessee or West Virginia or anybody else can offer any amendments they want, and that is the way the regular order ought to proceed.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I think what we are witnessing today are people who have differences in philosophies and want to solve problems with different approaches.

I believe the issue before us at noon is a vote on doing no harm. There is not an agreement on both sides of the aisle as to whether we keep the student interest rates as low as possible for an ongoing basis or whether we tie it to market rates going up so that they go up over time. There is not agreement on that. I hope we have an agreement to do no harm.

The vote at noon is, let's keep it at 3.4 percent, where it has been, which is, by the way, the market rate. Right now you can go out and get a car—and I encourage people to purchase a new American-made automobile—with a 4-percent interest rate. You can get a mortgage for about 4 percent.

Doubling the rates makes no sense, and putting in place something that students are asking us not to do, which starts where we are and goes up over time, does not make sense either. So let's do no harm. Let's vote yes to give us a year.

We have people who care about this issue. We can sit down and spend that time working under Chairman HARKIN, who is committed to addressing this in a comprehensive way. He is interested in addressing not just the interest rates on subsidized Stafford loans but on all of the issues. There is a range of issues, not the least of which is the $1 trillion that students and families are carrying in this country, which is more than the credit card debt that we have.

Let's start with do no harm. If we do that, then 7 million students are not going to be hit with the interest rate hike that is going to be in place. If we do that, we are going to be saying to students: We are not going to see the government making billions of dollars in profits on the backs of students because the loan rates have gone up.

So I would encourage everyone—people of different philosophies—to vote yes to give us the time to work out what is clearly a broad comprehensive issue to make sure young people and people going back to college have the opportunity to dream big dreams, to have the same opportunities many of us have had.

I went to school on student loans. I went to school on a tuition-and-fees scholarship because of my own family situation growing up. The reality is we have the opportunity to do no harm, and then work together on something comprehensive that does not down the road see students paying 7, 8, 9 or, in the case of what the House did, top out rates at 10.5 percent. I reject that. Colleagues on this side of the aisle reject that.

Let's vote yes and do no harm and then get to work in a bipartisan way on the larger problem and solve it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, let me commend Senator STABENOW, Senator HARKIN, Senator WARREN, Senator FRANKEN, and Senator HAGAN, particularly, who is the cosponsor of the legislation I have proposed.

My proposal would keep the student loan interest rate for subsidized Stafford loans at 3.4 percent while we deal with a very complicated and complex set of issues. It is not just the rate structure; it is the issue of providing appropriate incentives to control the costs of higher education. It is also the issue of refinancing existing debt and prospective debt so that this huge wall of debt, the avalanche of debt affecting college graduates and professional school graduates today, can be addressed. I don't think we can do that—because these are complicated programs—off the cuff, as we are attempting to do today or as we have been over the last several days.

It turns out that if we do not extend this rate for at least a year, but instead take up the so-called bipartisan proposal eventually rates will rise on students across the board. That is because the law now calls for a 6.8-percent rate for the Stafford subsidized and unsubsidized loans and 7.9 percent for PLUS loans—fixed rates—and in order to score this as a zero in terms of the Congressional Budget Office and deficit effects, we have to over that time make up all of that interest.

The proponents of the alternate approach are suggesting we will go with a lower rate now, but that simply means mathematically we will have to have higher rates in the future. The question of when that future arrives is a function of the way interest rates will be moving in the overall economy, and every indication is those interest rates will start rising, and perhaps quickly. The Federal Reserve has already indicated they are beginning to pull back on their quantitative easing, which means rates are likely to go up. We have seen a significant rise in the 10-year T-bill rate. Since May, it has gone up almost a full percentage point. So we are in a rising rate environment, and the other side proposes moving from a fixed rate to a floating rate, without an effective cap.

What we know is that—it might not be next year or the following year but relatively quickly—we could likely see and will likely see students paying higher than the 6.8-percent rate and, without a cap, it could be significantly higher.

If we adopt the proposal suggested by my colleagues—and they have been working with great energy and great sincerity to try to come to a solution—I am afraid we are going to ultimately end up seeing students paying much more, and that is not what we should be about.

We have a situation right now, even with the 3.4-percent rate that doubled to 6.8 percent on July 1, where the Federal Government is making about $50 billion this year, between the cost of funds and the repayments being made by students, so students have become profit centers for the Federal Government rather than, as I think the intention of the program was, that the Federal program was going to help students get through college so they can help us as productive workers in our economy.

It is projected that these Federal student loan programs between now and 2023, over a 10-year period, will make $184 billion for the Federal Government, in terms of the difference between what students are paying back

and the cost of borrowing from the government. So there is a lot we could do—but not in 24 hours—to redesign our program so students are not essentially being hammered with huge debts as we are benefiting profitably from those students.

The CBO estimates that under this Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act, between 2017 and 2023, students would pay an additional $37.8 billion more on their loans than they would under the current rate of 6.8 percent. This goes to my initial point. The first few years have been designed so interest rates will be lower than 6.8 percent. However, according to the CBO, between 2017 and 2023 they will be much higher—so if a person is a high school student right now, they are looking at paying a lot of money if they intend to go to college—about $37.8 billion more—because it all has to balance out to effectively generate as much revenue as a 6.8-percent interest rate, which is the current rate.

Students know that. That is why they have come to us and said, Listen, thanks, but no thanks. This short-run discount of a few years in terms of the interest rate, we know we might get the benefit if we have already started or are just finishing college. We definitely know that our younger brothers and sisters in high school and another generation of Americans will be paying for it.

So I don't think we should take that approach. I think what we have said is let's wait. We have a lot of work to do. We want to look at proposals that might actually align the real cost of Federal lending for a college education and the real charges we impose on students. Right now, my sense is what our colleagues have done in their bipartisan approach has been essentially to make sure the first few years look good—they are certainly less than 6.8 percent, close to 3.4 percent—but then they have to put in a rather arbitrary delta—an increase in costs—because at the end of the 10-year period they are going to have to make up all of the interest that would have been charged at 6.8 percent. I don't think that is the way to approach fundamental reform of college loans in this country.

There is another point I think is important to make as well, which is we have always either had a fixed rate or an adjustable rate with a cap on each loan program—a cap on subsidized Stafford loans, unsubsidized Stafford loans, and on PLUS loans for families. Now, in the bipartisan proposal, they don't have a cap. There is some discussion that if students consolidate loans, they will get an 8.25-percent cap. But consolidation can only take place after a student is in repayment. And before a student is in repayment, all of that interest on the unsubsidized Stafford loans and the PLUS loans is accumulating and being capitalized into what the student owes. So when the student consolidates, they have a much bigger principal to pay off. There might be a cap of 8.25 percent, but it is a much bigger principal. By the way, the loan is extended over a longer period of time, so they also have to pay for that longer extension of time.

That is not the cap we have had before in the context of these programs. It has been a cap on the individual loan, a cap on the subsidized loan and unsubsidized loan, and a cap on the PLUS loans. I think that is a major fault within the proposal we are seeing today.

The other issue, which goes to the index, is that a 10-year T-bill interest rate has been chosen. Typically, we have chosen a 91-day T-bill, and the 91-day T-bill is cheaper, frankly. We start off with a much lower index, which lowers what the student has to pay, and then we add other costs to it, including the discount estimate of default, and all of those things come up with the final rate. But we are going to a 10-year T-bill rate, which means students will be paying more relative to a 91-day T-bill rate. Again, I don't think that is what we want to do.

We want to take the time to try to address this whole set of issues, to do it in a thoughtful way, to understand that one of the big challenges we have is not just the issue of what rate but also how do we keep college costs in check. How do we provide the kind of education students need to be competitive in the workplace? How do we deal with the interaction between all of these different types of loans? How do we go ahead and—again, this might be one of the biggest challenges we face going forward—how do we somehow allow these students who are drowning in debt to effectively refinance these loans so they can buy homes, they can buy cars, they can participate in the economy? That is not included in this proposal.

Indeed, one of my concerns is with these rates locked in—and this is long-term legislation—we won't have the proper incentive to effectively deal with these issues; we will just let them slide along. I think that would be to our great detriment and, more importantly, to the detriment of families throughout the country.

There have been—and appropriately so—comments and criticism of this short-term approach. We should have fixed it last year. Well, we haven't fixed it, and I think we have to give ourselves the time to fix it.

There is the suggestion that we are dealing with a portion of the loans—the subsidized Stafford loans—and everybody else won't get a benefit. From the numbers we have seen from CBO, one thing is certain: In the last years of the other side's proposal, from at least 2017 to 2023, everyone—subsidized, unsubsidized, and PLUS loans—will be paying more. So the one conclusion we can draw, if we go to the alternative approach, is that eventually every borrower will be paying more.

Therefore, I very strongly urge that we move forward with this cloture vote to get on to the legislation. As Senator HARKIN rightly pointed out, once we are on the legislation, it is open to amendment. At least we can debate the proposals from all of my colleagues that could improve or change or modify the underlying bill. But if we don't get to cloture, then we are not moving forward, and I think we should at least move forward.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I know we are still on our time; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I understand Senator HOEVEN wanted to take 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I wish to clarify for the esteemed Senator from Iowa that I intend to speak in support of the student loan certainty act which he may not be in favor of, so I wish to be clear.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes, while preserving the 2 minutes remaining for the distinguished Senator from North Carolina prior to the vote at noon. I wish to be clear so the good Senator from Iowa understands as far as whether he wishes to object.

Mr. BURR. If it influences the Senator from Iowa at all, I will allow my 2 minutes to go to him, if the Senator wouldn't object to him having 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. That would be fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. My understanding is to preserve the 2 minutes for the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Go ahead.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I rise to speak to the permanent solution that is being put forward on a bipartisan basis today, which is the Student Loan Certainty Act. Again, I wish to emphasize that this is a bipartisan solution. Senator JOE MANCHIN, a Democrat from West Virginia; Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER, a Republican from Tennessee; Senator RICHARD BURR, a Republican from North Carolina; and Senator ANGUS KING, an Independent from Maine—I guess tripartisan, right? This is truly a bipartisan effort, including the support of Senator TOM CARPER, a Democrat from Delaware, myself, and others. This is a bipartisan effort to come up with a permanent solution.

I have been listening to the floor debate and what everybody says over and over is we need a permanent solution, and that is exactly right.

A year ago I served on the conference committee for MAP 21 which is the authorization for the highway program. We included in that conference report an extension, a 1-year reauthorization, of the Federal student loan program. So we could do what? Put a permanent solution in place—not come here a year later and extend it again for a year.

So that is what the vote at noon is all about. It is yet another 1-year extension. We need to put a permanent

solution in place. Our bipartisan plan is simple and straightforward. It provides students with dependable low-cost financing on a long-term basis. We call it the Student Loan Certainty Act because it provides just that: certainty for our students and for our families, not another 1-year extension.

There has been a lot of discussion here, and it is easy to get confused. But let's go through it for a minute. How does it work? This is a simple straightforward plan. The plan would tie all student loan rates to the 10-year Treasury note to reflect current market and employment conditions.

Right now, that index rate—the 10-year Treasury note rate—is 1.8 percent. Then both subsidized and unsubsidized Stafford loans would be 1.85 percent over that rate. Graduate Stafford loans: 3.4 percent over that rate. PLUS loans—loans parents take out—4.4 percent over the 10-year Treasury note rate. Those rates are then fixed, locked for the life of the loan. The student knows that is a fixed rate then for the life of the loan, until it is paid off.

So let's compare the programs, compare the existing student loan program to what we are proposing. That is easy enough to do.

Subsidized Stafford loans. Right now they are actually at 6.8 percent because the existing program expired, didn't it. But under the old program they were at 3.4 percent for the subsidized Stafford loans. Under our proposal: 3.66 percent—3.4 percent; 3.66 percent—so it is about the same, isn't it.

Actually, those rates have gone to 6.8 percent because, again, we go year to year. This program expires so we are really bringing them down. But even if you assume it has not expired, it is about the same rate—3.66 percent versus 3.4 percent.

For unsubsidized Stafford rates, again, under our proposal, you get the same rate as for the subsidized student loan program—3.66 percent. That compares to 6.8 percent under the existing program. That is a big-time savings for 60 percent of college borrowers, big-time savings: 3.66 percent versus 6.8 percent. Which would you rather have? Big-time savings for 60 percent of the undergraduate borrowers.

Graduate student loan rates under our proposal: 5.21 percent versus 7.9 percent under the existing program; parent PLUS loans: 6.21 percent versus 7.9 percent under the existing program—in both cases, again, lower rates.

The consolidated loan rate remains at 8.25 percent. That is a cap. We keep that in place—8.25 percent—in essence, providing students and families with a cap, another safety feature.

There is also another protection measure in the bill. The good Senator from North Carolina just referred to it a minute ago. Under the income-based repayment level provision, student loan payments are limited to 15 percent of income. So your repayment, your payment amount is limited to 15 percent of your income, and after 25 years, if the loan is not paid off, the balance is forgiven. So you have both a cap and a repayment limit provision to protect borrowers.

Furthermore, this program is designed solely for students and their families. What do I mean by that? This program is solely for students and their families. Unlike the existing student loan program, it does not subsidize health care. The current program, in essence, provides a subsidy for Federal health care—the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare. It provides a subsidy, and the students pay for it. Why would we do that? Why would we continue that?

What we are talking about is a vote at noon to extend the current plan. It is a 1-year extension, meaning we are going to be right back here 1 year from now doing the same thing. Furthermore, it is paid for with a tax increase on withdrawals from retirement accounts—a permanent tax increase to pay for a 1-year extension. That does not make any sense. What are we going to do a year from now to come up with the revenue to once again extend it? A permanent tax increase for a 1-year extension.

The third point is, why in the world are we using a student loan program to subsidize the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare? That does not make any sense. Why would we do that?

Again, I come back to the point I started with, the point I made earlier that I think reflects on the debate and the discussion we have all had here: There is a desire to come together. I do not think we are very far away. I think this bipartisan measure is very close to something we can agree on. The good Senator from Iowa said himself he wants a permanent plan in place that takes care of students. I think we are close to doing that. I think the Student Loan Certainty Act provides that bipartisan framework we can now gather around. It may need some modification, but we can gather around it and get a permanent solution in place. I know that is what all of the Members of this body want. I ask my colleagues to join with us so we can get that done, and we can get it now—not extend it for a year and hope to get it done. Let's get it done for the benefit of our students across this great country and their families.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I am proud to rise today to support the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act. This bill would extend the current interest rate of 3.4 percent for subsidized Stafford loans for the next school year. This interest rate reflects a record low for interest rates on Federal student loans, and these loans can only go to students and families that demonstrate a need for them; 60 percent of dependent subsidized loan borrowers come from families with incomes of less than $60,000. Subsidized Stafford loans help more than 7 million college students without worrying that the interest on their loans will begin accruing while they're in school. It helps more than 105,000 students in Maryland. Middle class families are feeling stretched and stressed and if we fail to act, students could be facing an additional $1,000 in debt over the life of their loans.

I would also like to announce my support for the Bank on Student Loans Fairness Act, introduced by Senator ELIZABETH WARREN. This legislation would lower the current interest rate of 3.4 percent to 0.75 percent for subsidized Stafford loans for the next school year, which is the same interest rate that banks pay. Banks have arbitrarily raised interest rates on consumers, and applied higher interest rates retroactively. They charged fees without any legitimate purpose—and then charged interest on top those unfair fees. And they marketed their products to college students who they knew could not afford the credit they were providing.

The banks are not looking out for the best interest of students; they are looking after themselves to make a profit. The Federal Government has worked hard to keep student loan interest rates as low as possible to ensure that access to higher education remains a viable option for students and their families. That is why it is important that we work together to keep the interest of students at heart and not create additional burdens on them. So why not let students pay the same interest rates as banks?

I have said this often, but we in this country enjoy many freedoms—the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, the freedom of religion. But there is an implicit freedom our Constitution does not lay out in writing, but its promise has excited the passions, hopes, and dreams of people in this country since its founding. The freedom to take whatever talents God has given you, to fulfill whatever passion is in your heart, to learn so you can earn and make a contribution—the freedom to achieve.

When I was a young girl at a Catholic all-girls school, my mom and dad made it clear they wanted me to go to college. But, right around graduation, my family was going through a rough time because my dad's grocery store had suffered a terrible fire. I offered to put off college and work at the grocery store until the business got back on its feet. My dad said:

> Barb, you have to go. Your mother and I will find a way, because no matter what happens to you, no one can ever take that degree away from you. The best way I can protect you is to make sure you can earn a living all of your life.

My father gave me the freedom to achieve. And this legislation will give millions of Americans that same freedom without adding a dime to the deficit.

Students will bless us if we are successful in keeping their student loan interest rates as low as possible. Getting a college education is the core of

the American dream and I am going to be sure that every student has access to that dream and make sure that when they graduate their first mortgage is not their student debt. Senator REED's legislation should be passed in a swift, expeditious, uncluttered way. It gives our students access to the American dream. It gives our young people access to the freedom to achieve, to be able to follow their talents, and to be able to achieve higher education in whatever field they will be able to serve this country.

While our work is not done when it comes to ensuring access to affordable higher education, this bill helps us get there. While these bills will fix the problem today, I will continue to work with my colleagues to figure out a longer-term solution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Well, Madam President, I think we have had a good debate and colloquies on this bill. At noon we are going to be voting, as I understand it, on a cloture motion on whether we are going to have a bill on the floor. That is all we are saying: Will we have a bill on the floor to which amendments can be offered by anybody?

I say to my friends on the Republican side, if they have an idea—and some of them do—that has some Democratic support—and there is some of that—the best way to flush this out and to see whether the Senate as a whole agrees is to vote for cloture on the motion to proceed to the bill at noon. That means the bill is on the floor. That means it is open for amendment. That means if Senator BURR wants to offer an amendment that incorporates his whole bill, he can do that and we can have a debate on that. And I would say to my friends on the other side, it only takes 51 votes, not 60. It only takes 51 votes to adopt an amendment.

It seems to me the proper way, if you want to proceed on this, is to vote for cloture. That brings the student loan bill to the floor. If my friends from North Dakota or Tennessee or North Carolina or wherever—or my friend from West Virginia on this side—if they want to offer amendments, do so. We can debate it. And then it only takes 51 votes. I do not know why they would be opposed to voting for cloture on the underlying bill because that moves us to a point where 51 votes is controlling. So I hope we will get the 60 votes necessary to move ahead with this very important bill and this issue.

A lot has been said here this morning, and my friend, I think, from West Virginia said there are a lot of numbers floating around and there are a lot of charts floating around. Everybody has a chart on this and numbers on that. No one is trying to befuddle anyone, and no one is deliberately trying to mislead anyone. It is just that when you get involved in an issue such as this, it is complicated, it is very complicated, because if you do a little bit on this one thing—let's say on a cap—then it does something on other interest rates. If you do something on consolidation, all these things bounce around. You can look at what an interest rate would be today, but you do not know what it is going to be tomorrow or what it is going to be next year or the year after. All we have to go on is CBO estimates, Congressional Budget Office estimates.

I will be forthright. I will say honestly, I can love CBO one day and hate them the next because of the way they figure things, and sometimes it is almost inscrutable how they figure things. But, nonetheless, those are the rules we have to sort of play under here. So we have to look at what the CBO scores are and how they score all of the various proposals.

My friend from North Carolina had all of his charts out there and different things about interest rates and all that. I asked the question: How long does that 3.66 percent interest rate last? He was forthright. He said 1 year. But then he went on to talk about what would happen in the future.

Well, here is yet another chart that I present for the Senate. Their bill is S. 1241. That is the Burr-Manchin-Alexander et al. bill. So what we did was we plotted it out as to what would happen in the outyears. As you can see, if you look at this line about right here on the chart: 6.8 percent. That is where the student loan interest rate is today because on July 1 it doubled from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. And 6.8 percent is permanent law. Madam President, 6.8 percent is permanent law, so that is where it is today.

If you look at S. 1241, the Burr-Manchin et al. bill, they are quite correct that in the first 2 or 3 years the interest rates are lower than 6.8 percent. That is why I asked the question. He mentioned 3.66 percent down here on the chart. That is good for next year. But we can only go by CBO estimates, so we asked CBO: What are your projections of the 10-year Treasury notes? That is what we have to go by. If you use that, and you look at what their bill proposes, you will see almost like a classic bait and switch. For the first couple, 3 years, interest rates are lower than 6.8 percent. But beginning in 2016—2½ years from now—both the graduate Stafford loans and the PLUS loans go way above 6.8 percent—up to 8.6 percent and 9.6 percent.

If someone looked at that, they would say: Well, for the first couple, 3 years that might be OK, but what about these students out here? How about these young students getting ready to go to college? They and their families are paying these high interest rates. That is why we heard from so many student groups saying: That is not a good deal. We do not want just a good deal for us for a couple of years and then stick the students in the future with higher interest rates.

Then for the undergraduate Stafford loans—which right now are at 6.8 percent—the Burr-Manchin and others bill goes up to 7.1 percent. You might say that is not much of a difference, but it is more.

So in every single case, by 2018, the interest rates under the Republican bill are higher—higher—than if we stuck with current law, which is 6.8 percent. That is a fact. They cannot dispute that unless they want to say they do not want to use CBO figures. But that is what we have to apply. I have asked—I make the request again—any of the supporters of S. 1241, if you disagree with this chart, please come to the floor and tell us why this is not right. I challenge anyone to come here and tell me why this is wrong, if they think it is wrong, and why they think it is wrong. But that is exactly what will happen under their bill.

It seems we have a couple of courses here. As I said, the first thing is to do what we can to keep interest rates low, and then to address this in a comprehensive fashion.

The bill before us, the bill we are going to vote cloture on, is just a 1-year extension at 3.4 percent. Again, that has a cost. CBO told us what the cost was. So we had a pay-for, as we say around here a pay-for—how do you pay for it—by closing a loophole in the IRAs, the individual retirement accounts. As we developed those, those were to be used for retirement. But a current loophole in the law allows very wealthy people to build up a retirement account in an IRA and use it as an estate planning gimmick.

So millionaires, billionaires can pass on millions in than IRAs to their heirs without paying taxes for years, if not decades. That was never what IRAs were for. That is a loophole. It has to be closed. I think in anything coming before this body in the way of a tax reform, I can assure you that loophole will be closed. So we are saying, for 1 year, we will close it and use the savings from that to keep student loans at 3.4 percent for 1 year.

Am I saying we have to keep student loans at 3.4 percent forever? No, I am not. What I am saying is that this whole area of student loans and interest rates is one piece of a jigsaw puzzle, the jigsaw puzzle being how are we going to do two things; one, make college more affordable in the future and how are we going to address the $1 trillion-plus that is in student loans out there right now. This is just one part of that.

When we take one part out of that jigsaw puzzle, it affects everything else. That is why I have argued for a long time that our committee, the HELP Committee, needs to address this in the Higher Education Act reauthorization. The Higher Education Act expires this year. So we have to reauthorize it. My good friend Senator ALEXANDER is the ranking member on the committee. We have already had discussions about the Higher Education Act. I believe this is the proper way to proceed, so we can have experts come

in and tell us: OK. If you jiggle this number a little bit, if you do this on student loans, how does that affect Pell grants. If you do something on Pell grants, how does that affect college work study.

All of these things fit together. We need to address a comprehensive measure on college affordability, on making sure college costs are transparent for our students and their families. Comparisons. Why does one course of study at one college cost $200 a credit hour and another college the same course costs $400 a credit hour? Why is that? Should parents not have a good comparison chart? What can we do to encourage colleges to have a better graduation rate in 4 years or 5 years? Secretary Duncan has talked a lot about promoting an idea of having high schools graduate kids that after 4 years they can get an associate's degree. If they study hard and do advanced placement courses, they might even graduate from high school or shortly thereafter with an associate's degree.

These are interesting ideas. We need to pursue them. But if we take this out, if we take out the student loans, it sort of messes up the rest of the formulas. That is why I think we should extend the 3.4 percent for 1 year, pay for it with the closing that loophole for 1 year, and let our committee do its job. We have good people on the committee. Senator ALEXANDER, Senator BURR are on the committee. We have thoughtful, smart people who understand this.

I think generally we work pretty good together on the committee. This issue now of the student loans, it reminds me of all my time in the Senate, now marking 39 years. It seems that every time we rush to judgment, we have a deadline, that is when mistakes are made. Need I go any further than to talk about the sequester?

It is a horrible mistake. But faced with a deadline, we have to do all of this, then we rush to judgment on something such as this. I think we made a terrible mistake on that.

So I plead with my fellow Senators to put this over for 1 year. Let our committee do its work, so we can address the whole issue of college affordability, college completion rates, and how we address also the issue of the $1 trillion that is hanging out there. That may be more of an issue for the Finance Committee, but there may be partial jurisdiction for both the Finance Committee and the HELP Committee.

Again, last year, we extended the 3.4 percent for 1 year, to July 1 of this year. I know I have heard some say we did that for 1 year and we did not address the issue. But, again, I remind my fellow Senators that last year was an election year, campaigning, we were not here that much, had a big election in November, then we had all of these budget things facing us at the end of the year.

With the budget problems we had earlier this year, there just was not time to do anything, plus the fact that the Higher Education Act does expire this year. So it is incumbent upon us to address the issue of higher education. That is where this belongs. I would again hope we would extend the 3.4 percent for 1 year and let our committee do its work.

I urge my colleagues to support the 1-year extension. My friends on the other side, they say they want a long-term solution. I have no problems with that. But let's do a long-term solution based upon a rational approach, one that comprehensively looks at all of the issues surrounding college affordability. The way to do that, as I said, is through the committee's work.

There was one other point that was made this morning that I wish to address myself; that is, consolidation. Everybody thinks consolidation is such a hot deal. I have pointed this out before. For example, we took a $41,000 Stafford loan borrowed in school—$41,000—and used that as the baseline. Then we said, under current law, the student would pay $21,716 in interest over 10 years. Under the Republican bill, S. 1241, they would pay $28,607. Under consolidation, they pay $69,000.

So consolidation is not the big deal people think it is. Now here is one that is even more drastic. Again, the $41,000 in Stafford loans and $30,000 in PLUS loans borrowed by a graduate student, under current law, $43,760 is what they would pay back. Under S. 1241, they would pay $52,498. But if they consolidated it, they would pay $148,000—$43,000 to $148,000. That is under consolidation. So you wonder why students do not consolidate? Because they realize they are going to be paying back three and four times as much in interest charges than if they never consolidated.

The other point I wish to make on consolidation is you only get to do it one time—one time. So let's say that you graduate from college. You decide I want lower monthly payments. I want to stretch it out for a longer period of time. You do that. You consolidate. Then let's say you want to go to graduate school. You cannot consolidate after that. That is it. You are through.

So if you have to borrow money at higher rates and stuff, you cannot consolidate those later on. I think that is what some of my friends forget. You can only use consolidation one time—one time. So consolidation and having a cap or whatever it is on consolidation is certainly not any kind of an answer to these high interest rate payments students are making.

Again, what we are looking for—I know people want to have a long-term solution. They want to get to something that is revenue neutral. I understand that. I hope if we get cloture and we can move to the bill, Republicans can offer their amendments. As I said, it only takes 51 votes to adopt an amendment. But if not, then let's just extend this for 1 year. I do not think that is too much to ask, to extend it for 1 year and let us do this in a comprehensive fashion.

I would hope that would be what we would do and not double these interest rates on students right now. I think both sides agree on that, even under S. 1241, next year interest rates will be 3.66 percent. I am all for that. On 1241, they want to keep interest rates at 3.66 percent next year. That is fine. That is pretty close to 3.4 percent. The problem is what happens in the outyears, as I have pointed out.

If both sides agree that in the next year interest rates should be down around here at 3.6 percent for the undergraduate loans, 3.4 percent, 3.6 percent, not a heck of a lot of difference. Why do we not just extend the 3.4 percent for that year and then fix this in the Higher Education Act? I would agree. They want to keep it at 3.66 percent for 1 year, fine. But there is not that much difference between 3.4 and 3.66 percent.

I think what we all agree on is in the next year, interest rates should not go up—should not go up. Where we are not agreeing is on a long-term fix. Again, if we cannot agree on a long-term fix, then at least let's do no harm. Let's extend the 3.4 percent for 1 year and take care of the long-term solution in the Higher Education Act reauthorization, which we can have on the floor sometime next spring.

With that, I again ask my colleagues to vote for cloture on the bill. Let's extend 3.4 percent for 1 year and let our committee do its work.

I yield the floor and reserve whatever time we may have remaining.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Madam President, we are about to take this vote. It is vitally important. The proposal is very straightforward, to extend the interest rate for subsidized Stafford loans at 3.4 percent. It is fully paid for. It will allow us to work through a very complicated set of issues. It will allow us to avoid raising rates this year and work toward a proposal we hope will avoid rising rates in the future.

The alternative proposal eventually raises rates on every student, not immediately, but CBO indicates by at least 2017 the rates will be up.

This is on top of a huge cascade of student debt we have to deal with. In fact, one of the major issues we should deal with is how do we refinance the existing loans that are at high rates. Refinancing will be even more important if we were to enact the rising rates coming from the proposals on the other side.

I urge all of my colleagues to support cloture and move forward to debate this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 124, S. 1238, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Patrick J. Leahy, Amy Klobuchar, Tom Udall, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ron Wyden, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Sherrod Brown, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Al Franken, Richard J. Durbin, Debbie Stabenow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1238, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted: yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 171 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Harkin	Pryor
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Rockefeller
Boxer	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cowan	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—49

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Reid
Burr	Heller	Risch
Chambliss	Hoeven	Roberts
Chiesa	Inhofe	Rubio
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Coburn	Johanns	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Collins	King	Thune
Corker	Kirk	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	Manchin	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	
Enzi	McConnell	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote the yeas are 51, the nays are 49. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. REID. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is entered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, last week 40,000 students in my State got some very bad news: The rates on new Stafford student loans doubled. Today, these students got bad news again. Today, our Nation's students once again wait in vain for relief.

These students work hard; they are ambitious. They know how important a college education is. They know what it means to their future and to our Nation's future. They expected more of us, and I share their disappointment.

We saw this coming. This bus has been approaching the cliff for a year. That ought to be time enough to turn it around, and turn it around without throwing students underneath it. I know many of my colleagues here are trying—trying to find a long-term solution, but today we failed. Our Nation's students pay the cost of that failure.

For so many in my State, grants and loans make the difference. Federal subsidized Stafford loans are absolutely crucial, opening a door to college, to opportunity, to investing in the future. We all know these students. Most have lower incomes and fewer advantages. We ask them to work harder, and now we ask them to pay more.

They are folks such as Lori Cole. Lori was quoted in the Las Cruces Sun News. She said:

> I'm almost 50 years old and returned to school last year. I've had to take out loans on top of my grants. I don't like the rates going up but what can I do? I have a teen in college and a mortgage. I have no choice but to continue with my student loans if I ever want to make more than $10 an hour.

They are folks such as Josh Dunne. Josh wrote the following on his Facebook page:

> As a disabled combat vet, my wife and I who are both students do not have a choice but to eat the increase . . . I don't understand how they can continue to raise the rates on us not only for tuition but now also the loan rate and expect the amount of students to continue to go to school. Hope they can figure it out for our future.

I say to Josh and to so many other students like him, I hope we can figure it out too.

These students are struggling. Our economy is slowly recovering. Now is not the time to set up more barriers. Now is not the time for interest rates to double, weighing down students, weighing down hard-working families, weighing down the middle class.

The Keep Student Loans Affordable Act of 2013 would have helped, keeping the interest rate at 3.4 percent for new Stafford loans for 1 year and giving Congress time for a broader solution. But the problem is not just interest rates, it is the growing burden of student debt.

Higher education is at a tipping point, and we need a long-term plan—a plan that is sustainable, that is comprehensive. These are complicated questions that require careful answers. But one principle should be clear. For fairness, for investing in our Nation's future, college should be within the reach of all American families, not just the privileged few.

Students know how to set goals, they know how to set priorities. They expect the same of us. And priorities come down to choices. The Keep Student Loans Affordable Act offered a choice—to help students to work toward real solutions, and we could do it by simply closing a tax loophole. No new tax, no new debt, just closing a tax loophole—not exactly a radical notion.

I will do all I can to ensure the Senate will find its way to long-term answers. We will not give up on this issue. Seven million students and their families are waiting, waiting for predictability, waiting for more affordable education, and control of spiraling costs. They and their families do the heavy lifting. Every day we should lend them a hand.

The average college senior has over $26,000 in debt at graduation. Some have much more. The burden is heavy enough. We should not be adding to it now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, this issue is very important to millions of Americans, and one with which I am too familiar. I think I have shared this in the past, but I will share it again.

Obviously, my parents didn't make a lot of money. So I would not have gone to college, I would not have gone to law school had it not been for Federal financial aid, both in the form of Pell grants, loans, and work-study. All of these programs opened that door for me. In fact, I don't think any of my siblings could have gone to college without some assistance.

The point is that I know how important these programs are to Americans. In fact, when I was elected to the Senate in 2010, I still had a student loan that was over $100,000. I was fortunate to write a book—which is now available in paperback, if anyone is interested—and with the proceeds that I made from that, I was able to pay off that loan. Had it not been for that, I am not sure when I would have been able to pay off my student loan for law school.

Early on, when I had multiple student loans from both undergrad and law school and the private loans I had to take out for the bar study, there were months where my student loan payments were higher than anything else I was paying. At its peak, it was about $1,400 a month. That is with a graduate and a law degree, and making what most people would consider a pretty good living. Even with that, it was a real load.

Obviously, that is at the high end of the spectrum, but even if you talk about the average loan debt in America today being around $25,000 or $26,000, the evidence is clear this is having an impact on graduates.

So you graduate from college, you have the student loan debt around your neck, and it actually prevents you from doing things like starting your life, buying a home. In some instances, if you fall behind on your payments, it starts to hurt your credit rating. The evidence continues to grow that a significant percentage of young Americans are facing a challenge that no Americans before us have faced with regard to this sort of student loan debt that hangs over their heads.

So, clearly, we have to figure out a permanent solution—not a 1-year solution but a long-term solution—on the issue of student loan rates. That is an important part of this debate, but here is what I think is missing from this debate; that is, an open acknowledgement that what we have today in higher education as it is currently structured is becoming increasingly and inexplicably unaffordable. And that is the part that isn't being discussed.

The fundamental problem isn't the loans. The fundamental problem is the tuition rates that continue to climb across this country. In fact, according to the Wall Street Journal today, institutions of higher education grew their revenue faster than inflation from 2005 to 2011. Of course, the spending also grew. How many other parts of our economy grew their revenue and their spending at a pace faster than inflation over the last decade?

The evidence is that every time we increase the amount of student aid that is available in both Pell grants and in loan programs, that is just eaten up by higher tuition rates.

Now, as a former State legislator in Florida, that was a battle we had every year because the universities said they needed higher tuition in order to retain quality faculty, et cetera. To some extent, I imagine some of that is true. But at the end of the day, there comes a point—especially in our public institutions—where quality but also affordability have to meet. We cannot continue to price people out of higher education in this country because it is inextricably linked to our future well-being.

There are two fundamental problems that face our economy. No. 1 is we don't have an economy that is growing fast enough, producing the kind of middle-class jobs that allow people to have the kind of lifestyle all Americans want. The other problem is we have a skills gap in America where a growing number of people simply have not acquired the skills they need for 21st-century middle-class jobs. The only way to close that skills gap is through education—and particularly higher education.

What I would argue today is that the model of higher education we have in place today, largely based on 19th- and 20th-century models, is broken. It no longer lives up to the reality of the 21st century.

For example, many of the higher paying jobs in the middle class today don't require a 4-year degree from a liberal arts college. They require less than 2 years or a 2-year degree program that you could get at a community college.

There are other things available to us in terms of how we can incentivize or reform our higher education programs. We should look at accreditation reform.

Right now, in order to get student loans or aid from the Federal Government, you have to go to an institution that is accredited. Traditionally, these are the 4-year or 2-year institutions. But there are now alternatives available to us, things that we weren't doing a few years ago.

No. 1, we should rely on community colleges, which, by the way, are a treasure in this country. The services that community colleges provide students to get 2-year degrees—in fact, some community colleges are in the 4-year degree program, and they have tailored programs that allow people to go to school while they continue to work. That is an important part of the backbone.

It is also an extraordinary part of retraining people. You might have a job, and all of a sudden that job doesn't exist anymore, and you have to get retrained in a new skill or a new trade. Community colleges are an important part of that component.

It goes beyond that though. Career and technical education, for the life of me, I do not understand why we have stigmatized that in this country; why we have created this idea that unless you get a 4-year degree or more that you are somehow not successful when we know we have a shortage of people we need to be trained in the skills and trades we once used to do in this country. We should get back to some of that. We should encourage that, quite frankly, even before the college level.

Why can't we graduate kids from high school with an industry certification and a career in a trade, so when they graduate high school they get a diploma and they are industry certified to go to work?

We have an example of that on a smaller scale in south Florida, where a friend of mine actually takes high school kids and begins to train them as BMW technicians. They go to school in the morning for a couple of hours. Then they go to the shop and get trained. When they graduate from high school, they are BMW-certified technicians. Within a year after that, they can get even higher levels of accreditation, and some of them start making $35,000, $40,000 a year out of high school.

Why aren't we doing more of that? Instead, we leave kids trapped. They feel as though they are studying things they don't like and don't speak to them. They drop out of high school. They languish in the economy for 10 or 15 years, and then sometimes they will find themselves in a for-profit college or some other program to try to get trained.

Let's avoid all of that. Let's allow these high school students and others across this country with an opportunity to study something they enjoy and they love and to get the needed skills so they can avoid all of that.

We also have this new revolution in massive online coursework. Now, not every course can be taken that way, but we now have the ability to allow people to actually have self-directed learning, to use the Internet platforms that are available so they can take a course in political science from Harvard and economics from Yale. You can sit there and actually put your own course work together. This is still being developed, but this is an important part of our future innovation—the ability to bring the in-classroom learning to the student, not just require them to sit there for lectures for an hour and a half in a classroom when they can easily get it online and it can be tailored to their work schedule, to their workload, to their needs.

Beyond that, innovations, in terms of giving people credit for work experience or life experience—we see that colleges are doing that now where you can go in and say: This is what I have done for the last 20 years of my life, and you get credit for that work because you have life experience and work experience in a field. They don't make you sit there and spend a bunch of money on electives you are never going to use and don't really need because they want you to be ''well rounded'' but all it does, in fact, is drive up the cost of your education.

I don't know about you, but in the last 4 years of my degree I was searching for electives to take because I had to have electives. I don't remember what some of those electives were, but I paid for them with student loans and Pell grants. I would much rather have gotten my degree in the things I needed to know so I could have moved on to law school and done that there.

These are some of the ideas we have in terms of how we should revolutionize our higher education system to reflect the needs and the realities of the 21st century. The fact is that we now have a challenge before us unlike anything we have ever had. Industries are now evolving on a yearly basis. Most Americans are going to have to

be retrained at some point in their lives on a new skill because that is the pace of change, and we need to have infrastructure in place to provide that for people in a way that is affordable.

It reminds me of a story of a friend I had who was one of the parents on one of my son's teams, and the mom was always struggling. She was always the first one to get laid off at her office. She worked primarily as a receptionist at a dental clinic or medical clinic, got a little bit into billing. What she really needs to become and would like to become is an ultrasound technician so she can make a little bit more money, have a little job security, and provide her kids with the opportunities she wants them to have. The problem she has is that she has to work 8 hours a day. How is she going to do that and go to school and get that training?

In many parts of this country we do not have the infrastructure in place for that to happen and the financial aid programs both on the loan side and Pell grant side do not provide the flexibility to allow them to do it in the most cost-effective way. To that end I have proposed a number of pieces of legislation. Most of them are bipartisan. I have worked with Senator WYDEN and others on the Student Right to Know Before You Go Act. That basically means that before you take out these loans, you are going to be provided meaningful information: This is how much it is going to cost to go to school here, this is how much people who graduate with this degree from this college make when they graduate, and this is how much you are going to owe. You can still take the course, you can still major in that, but you deserve to know. You deserve to know that if you are going to owe $20,000 and you are only going to make $20,000 a year when you graduate with this degree, it will take you a long time to pay it, if ever.

Students have a right to know before they go. That is the Student Right to Know Before You Go Act.

I also offered the Higher Education and Skills Obtainment Act, which will create one universal tax credit for higher education, and it will produce measurable savings, some of which can be redirected to the shortfalls in the Pell Grant Program that are coming up. The bill offers one tax credit for students who are most in need, giving students the ability to avoid navigating a confusing maze of temporary tax provisions worth different amounts for different income thresholds.

By the way, people involved in job skill training would also have access to this universal credit as opposed to all these different credits floating out there now that people do not fully understand how to use.

There are other ideas I have proposed. I have introduced legislation with Senator COONS that provides an innovative partnership that will create an interactive source of information for students to be able to create college savings accounts. Studies have shown that American children with college savings accounts in their name are seven times more likely to go to college than students without one. This bill will combine innovative student support tools with savings accounts to promote access for low-income students in our country so they put some money aside to be able to do this.

The fact is that today's 21st-century student requires a higher education system that best suits their needs, whether it is in the form of a traditional university, a community college, a career or technical education, workforce retraining programs, or a combination of all of these.

I am not saying this is not an important debate to have because it is. It is facing people right now. But I hope at some point we will look at our student aid programs and what we can do to tailor them to the 21st century, to all of the innovations that are now available to us to allow people to gain the knowledge they need to become competitive in a 21st-century economy. That is going to require, in my opinion, a significant restructuring on how our higher education is developed.

This is not a threat to liberal arts colleges or a transitional 4-year college education. That will always be a part of our system. It is an important part of our system. But that does not work for everybody, not because they are not smart enough but because they have a job during the day, because they are raising three kids. If you are a single mom with three kids and a full-time job, you cannot just leave all that behind and go to Gainesville, FL, to the University of Florida for 4 years. You need the ability to get that degree that allows you to do that. I lived that. My sister had to do that. She went back to school in her thirties and finished her college degree and then got her master's to become a teacher, and today she is an assistant principal, all the while raising two boys on her own. She would not have been able to do that if the only choice she had available to her was the University of Florida, Florida State, because she couldn't just move. That doesn't work for someone in that part of their lives.

We need to have answers. So I hope we will spend some time focusing on what we can do and reforming the way we accredit colleges, particularly when it comes to student financial aid, and in the way we structure our financial aid programs so that the education system meets the needs of our 21st-century students and not the other way around.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from New Hampshire is going to go next. I ask unanimous consent that the time until 5 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, that Senators be permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that any time in a quorum be equally divided between Democrats and Republicans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

MS. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an issue we are all very concerned about, particularly in my home State of New Hampshire; that is, the rising student loan rates. In fact, one study that looked at it for the class of 2011 found that for New Hampshire, the average load of debt for the class of 2011 was $32,000—over $32,000.

Like the Senator from Florida, I have experienced it personally as well. I would not have been able to get a law degree or to have the education that I have without the ability to take out student loans—and only paid them off, fortunately, right as we had our first child. So this was something that—basically, I used to call it ''I had a mortgage to pay'' to pay off my student loans. But I was grateful for the opportunity to get those loans and get the education that I was able to receive. We want to make sure all students are able to pursue higher education in the most affordable way possible.

Here is where we are today. This is such a complete, typical Washington deal. We just voted on a proposal on the floor, and that proposal is a 1-year fix. It only applies to 40 percent of student loans. We would be back again next year—like Groundhog Day—trying to fix this problem again. It is a complete Washington deal in this way.

There actually has been a bipartisan proposal that has Members of both parties coming together. What happened is we saw that the President put forward a proposal as to how to deal with the increase in rates on July 1. The House Republicans had a proposal on how to deal with those rates. I was with Secretary Duncan at a hearing, and I asked him about that, and he said: They are not too far apart. Can't we come together? There was an opportunity for compromise.

As a result, a group of Senators got together here. I commend Senator MANCHIN, Senator ALEXANDER, Senator BURR, Senator CARPER, Senator COBURN, and Senator KING. They sat down and came up with a permanent solution to try to make sure student loan rates would not rise from where they are right now. This solution, of course, would decrease the rates for almost every student and put a cap on consolidated loans and also, most importantly, is not a 1-year fix so that we are back here again like Groundhog Day putting students and parents in a very difficult situation, not knowing how to plan, and educational institutions—everyone in the tough situation of not knowing what is going to happen and thinking that they are facing a dramatic increase in student loan rates.

I think the American people are very tired of what happens here and the

gamesmanship played in Washington. Here is the unfortunate thing. We had the vote on the 1-year fix.

By the way, I thought the Washington Post addressed that 1-year fix very well this morning in its editorial in which it said that lawmakers should ''reject this pathetic non-solution and put their efforts instead into finalizing a compromise plan.''

There was a compromise plan that Senators from both sides of the aisle have worked on. I am a proud cosponsor of that plan. Yet we are not being offered a vote on that plan. That is why I say this is a typical Washington deal.

I can understand why the American people would be so frustrated that a bipartisan proposal that would prevent the loan rates from doubling would not receive a vote on the floor of the Senate. It is a proposal where Senators from both sides of the aisle have tried to take what the President wanted and to take what was done by the House Republicans and come up with a very reasonable agreement that is a solution that does not just leave us here in the same position next year. It doesn't just address 40 percent of student loans. It addresses all student loans and puts us in a situation where we would have a solution that would be bipartisan and would give students certainty. It would make sure their rates do not double as they did on July 1. Yet it does not even receive a vote on the floor of the Senate. That is what is wrong with Washington.

I hope the majority leader will reconsider. He may not like the proposal. I understand. But to not give it a vote on the floor of the Senate, where it has bipartisan support, is absolutely wrong. It deserves a vote. It deserves a thoughtful vote given that it has bipartisan support and it is very close to the proposal that was put forward by the President of the United States.

I hope that we will end the gamesmanship on this important issue, that we can address it, that bipartisan proposals like the one I just talked about will get a vote on the floor of the Senate, and that we will resolve this issue on behalf of students and parents as well, for whom I know this is causing a lot of unnecessary consternation. To not give a proposal that has bipartisan support a vote, at a minimum, seems to me just wrong. It is what is wrong with Washington. I hope the majority leader will at least give it the vote it deserves. I hope we can come to an agreement on this important issue.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

SH ENERGY SECURITY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to speak on the floor of the Senate to express my disappointment in last week's district court decision on the Cardin-Lugar provision of the SEC rule. An amendment offered by Senator Lugar and me on the Dodd-Frank legislation imposed certain transparencies on extractive industries. It was a pretty simple position. It said that those companies that are registered on the SEC that are involved in extraction of minerals would be required to disclose on a project-by-project basis the details of those contracts.

We did that for many reasons. We did it because we thought transparency is right. We did it in order to deal with energy security so that we know the types of contracts that are being entered into. We did it so investors would have information in order to decide whether they wanted to invest in the stock.

The United States has been in the forefront of transparency, and this decision will delay implementation of a vital transparency rule that will shine much needed sunlight on information designed to protect investors and to promote U.S. energy security.

The Cardin-Lugar amendment and the SEC rule are critical to achieving important U.S. policy objectives. These objectives include protecting U.S. interests in both national and energy security. Why do I say that? Having transparency in what the extractive industries are doing makes it more likely we will have stable energy sources globally. Stable energy sources are critically important to our national security interests. These provisions are important for our national security. It also ensures investors awareness and protection. If you are going to invest in a stock of an oil company or a mineral company, you have the right to know where they are doing business. You have the right to know what countries they are doing business in and the specific contracts they enter into so you can make the right decision as an investor. That is why the SEC rules make sense.

Lastly, it promotes America's core principles of transparency, integrity, and good governance worldwide. It is interesting that we sometimes talk about the mineral wealth of a country as being a resource curse. Although they have wealth, that wealth is taken by the elite of the country and used to finance corruption, which just adds to the misery of the people.

Some of the wealthiest nations that exist as far as minerals are concerned have some of the greatest poverty in the world. Well, the provision Senator Lugar and I coauthored was an attempt to deal with that and an attempt to deal with good governance. If we can trace the money, we have a better chance to end corruption, develop good governance, and stable regimes.

The district court's ruling of API v. SEC, which sends the rule back to the SEC, is disappointing. The rule is flawed because the court completely misread not only the statute but the clear congressional desire of the statute. The statute provision was for transparency, and yet the court's ruling strikes down the SEC rule which implements that transparency. The court spent a tremendous amount of time addressing the issue of public disclosure of company reports. The whole purpose of section 1504 was to provide transparency to investors and citizens about payments made to the government.

Why would Congress write a law to increase transparency for investors and then allow the SEC to keep the reports secret? Congress was clear in the letter and the spirit of the law that this information should be in the public domain.

On the issue of the host country exception, over the very lengthy comment period for the rule, the SEC was not presented with one concrete example from industry about a specific law or contract that would prohibit these types of disclosures. In fact, examples are to the contrary, including the fact that companies such as Norwegian oil giant Statoil regularly report their payments to countries such as Angola and China—where industry says prohibitions exist—yet that company had no negative repercussions. The API is trying to muddy the waters by having the SEC address problems that the industry has failed to prove exists.

The United States has been a leader on transparency in the extractive industries. It is the district court that has now put a hurdle on that transparency. The district court's decision is not only contrary to the law, it is contrary to what is happening globally today.

The EU has already enacted a law requiring the same payment disclosure that section 1504 requires on a project and company level without exceptions.

In a summit last month, the G8 issued a communique unequivocally backing mandatory disclosure. Canada said it will develop mandatory disclosures in 2 years. The Canadian mining industry endorsed that provision. Despite the oil industry's continued fight in the U.S. court, the overwhelming momentum is on the side of mandatory disclosure. Why? Because of national security. Why? Because investors have a right to know. Why? Because it is the right thing for good governance.

Despite this setback, let me make it clear: We will not give up. This law still stands, and the SEC has many options to appeal the decision or revise the rule. The SEC must make sure it finishes the job.

As Senator LEVIN, Senator Lugar, and I stated in our amicus brief in this case:

> Resource companies can believe whatever they wish and make any communication they wish about their payments to foreign governments. ''The resource curse,'' or the benefit or costs of transparency; they have done so throughout this process. What resource companies may not do is impede the power of the legislative branch to require disclosure of objective information to fulfill compelling public policy objectives, including the strengthening of American national and energy security and investor protections.

That is exactly what that provision did. Congress exercised its right, as the

legislative branch, to require transparency for good public reasons. Members of Congress and the administration on a bipartisan basis have long supported transparency through comprehensive disclosure of payments made by resource companies. That support will continue as we work with the SEC to implement this important law.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN JOBS MATTER ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I rise today to speak on the American Jobs Matter Act. This legislation was introduced by myself, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator BROWN, and Senator MERKLEY.

No one is going to disagree that this country has the greatest, most powerful military in the world. Although the Defense Department has not been spared from the draconian cuts included in the sequester, we still have a robust defense budget. Annual defense spending has grown from $287 billion in 2001 to over $700 billion today. Today it is hovering at around 6 percent of GDP.

A significant portion of these Federal defense dollars are used to purchase manufactured goods that make our military the preeminent fighting force in the world. In order to have the best military, you need the best people—we certainly have that—and the best stuff, which we have as well.

It is not debatable that our industrial base—going all the way back to the iconic assembly lines that churned out the machinery which was used to defeat fascism during World War II to today's shipyards that are producing our nuclear-powered submarines—is not still the best in the world. But 20, 30, or 50 years from now are we still going to be the best? That is the question before us today and the question this legislation seeks to answer.

Over the past 5 years the Department of Defense has cumulatively spent about $700 billion on manufactured goods. Over that same period of time, the United States has lost 1.7 million manufacturing jobs.

Why is this? Obviously, there is no single answer to this question, but it is telling that during this period of time DOD has spent $124 billion purchasing goods from foreign manufacturers. Some of these foreign manufacturers are in countries that are our allies today and will always be our allies, but some of these foreign manufacturers come from countries that are not our allies today and will never be our allies.

The bottom line is that when we outsource defense-manufacturing capabilities—either to our allies or to our adversaries—manufacturers shut down in this country and our capability to create and make critical defense items for our soldiers vanishes. The erosion of our industrial base kills jobs, and it jeopardizes our national security.

There are countless examples of how these spending decisions harm our industrial base, but I will give two examples that affect my home State of Connecticut.

In Waterbury, CT, there is a company that makes the metal tubing which goes into every ship the Navy builds. It holds the wires and the conduits. It is an incredibly complicated product, such that there are only two or three companies in the world that make this. For over 150 years this company in Waterbury, CT, has employed people in my State and kept our Navy equipped with the tubing it needs.

Over the years, the Navy has started to favor a foreign competitor who, frankly, has a history of engaging in unfair trade practices in order to undermine its competitors. They are offering the Navy a slightly more discounted price than the American company. So from the Navy's perspective, it is tempting to award that bid to an overseas contractor, but the monetary costs to the Navy cannot be the only thing we look at.

First of all, if this company in Waterbury goes under, then we will forever lose the ability to make this critical defense item in the United States. The country from which we are buying this equipment might be our ally today, but who knows what the case will be 10 or 20 years down the line. The fact is, you cannot just recreate the expertise, personnel, and machinery that makes this specific type of metal tubing.

Second, even if the Navy gets a 5- or 10- or 15-percent discount on this particular item, that benefit to the Navy essentially disappears when you look at the overall cost to the U.S. taxpayer because when those jobs are lost in Waterbury, CT, those men and women start qualifying for Federal benefits such as unemployment and Medicaid. We lose the tax revenue that comes to the local government, the State government, and the Federal Government. And, all of a sudden, that small discount they get by going to a foreign manufacturer vanishes before their eyes.

Here is a second example and one that to a lot of Americans will be absolutely maddening. We have a machine that makes dog tags. Essentially, we have a machine that goes out into the field and makes them for soldiers. There is nothing more iconic and emblematic of the danger soldiers put themselves in, the sacrifice they sometimes make, than the dog tag. It has historically been made by an American-built machine. But, recently, bids have been going to an Italian company that makes a similar machine simply because the Italian company's machine costs 3 percent less than the American machine.

First of all, it is not acceptable that our dog tags are not American made. Second of all, that 3-percent difference is negligible when we compare it to all of the money lost when those jobs disappear in the United States. How can this happen?

There was overwhelming bipartisan consensus when Congress passed something called the Buy American Act 75 years ago, which said we should give preference to companies in the United States when we are buying things for the U.S. military. I don't think anybody today questions the wisdom of that act. But over the years we have built loophole after loophole, exception after exception, into the Buy American Act such that sometimes a minority of the parts of a particular thing we are buying for the Department of Defense comes from American firms.

The real world examples I mentioned and many others have prompted me, along with Senators MERKLEY and BROWN and BLUMENTHAL, to introduce the American Jobs Matter Act. Here is what this legislation will do; it is pretty simple: It will require that the Department of Defense, for the first time, has to measure domestic employment as a factor in awarding a contract. It is a simple premise. In the same way that DOD considers price and past performance when awarding work, they should also consider the impact on domestic employment in the award of a contract.

Under this bill, our largest contractors would also have to account for the expected job creation of their subcontractors, because that is where a lot of the problem is. We are not buying a lot of big goods that are assembled in other countries, but the hundreds of thousands of parts that sometimes go into a submarine or a jet engine or a tank or a humvee are often made outside of the United States. This would require the contractor to present an estimate of how many jobs throughout the supply chain are created here in the United States. Under this bill, when DOD gets two similar bids and one would create more American jobs than the other bid would, DOD can take that into account when awarding the contract.

Frankly, most people I talk to back in my home State of Connecticut think this already happens. People assume that if past performance and price are about equal, the home team should win. But, today, there is no law that allows military contractors to make that distinction. This bill would allow them, for the first time, to do that.

Retired U.S. Army BG John Adams recently published a study about the vulnerabilities in our defense supply chain. His report, which mentioned actually some of the specific examples I referenced, said this:

The health of our manufacturing sector is inextricably intertwined with our national

security, and that the United States' national security is threatened by our military's growing and dangerous reliance on foreign nations for the raw materials, parts, and finished products needed to defend the American people.

It is time we changed that. The American Jobs Matter Act will put our defense industrial base on a stronger footing for the future.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I wish to make some comments about the vote we had on the floor awhile ago. I think it is time to stop holding the students of this country hostage 1 year at a time. That is what the bill did that just got turned down for cloture. It kicked the can down the road for a year. There were several Democrats who voted with the Republicans on that one, because they thought it is time to stop kicking the can down the road.

How do we stop kicking the can down the road? Take a look at the Republican alternative that was offered. The Democratic bill was going to save 40 percent of the students half of the interest rate for 1 year so that 3.44 percent would be their interest rate. The Republican plan solves it for all students getting a loan and it solves it in perpetuity. It does it by making it 3 percent greater than what the Federal Government borrows its money at, which at the present time is 3.66 percent. I submit 3.66 percent is not much higher than 3.44 percent and it is a lot less than 6.88 percent.

Why do we have a rise in the interest rate to 6.88 percent? The Federal Government, this body and the other body, and the President, decided a way we could fund health care in this country would be to take over the student loan business and then raise the rates to 6.88 percent. It provides money for the Affordable Care Act.

So we had a vote without having a side-by-side. Nobody got to vote on the 3.66-percent interest rate for everybody in perpetuity, but we got to vote for the 3.44-percent interest rate, which means kicking the can down the road for a year for 40 percent of the students. That is wrong.

Why didn't we get to vote on both of them? Well, the Republican plan would have had more votes than the Democratic plan. There are people on the other side who don't want to kick the can down the road and who understand the alternative is a reasonable solution to the problem. It would take care of all the students and take care of them from now on, and it provides a solution to the problem.

I have to say it is pretty clever, that by bringing up this bill by itself and having it defeated on cloture, it solves two problems: No. 1, they get to blame the Republicans. No. 2, the money will still be there for the Affordable Care Act. That means keeping the money and blaming the Republicans. How can it get better than that? It can get better than that if we solve the problem for all of the kids applying for loans this year, not just 40 percent of them, and solve it so they know exactly where the interest rate is going to be at the time they apply and it stays that way on their loan for the whole time they have the loan.

In future years, as others apply, the interest rate may be higher. The rate will be the same as whatever rate the Federal Government pays to borrow money. We are not going to be able to borrow at the low rates we are borrowing at now, but students will get the same break everybody else does, at just the 3-percent higher interest rate.

I notice the majority leader changed his vote to no, and that is so he can bring up this bill again. Why would we bring up this bill again without having the alternative bill so people can vote for it, which I think might pass? It is so we can be blamed one more time.

This isn't supposed to be a blame game around here. This is supposed to be about finding common ground and getting things done. I think there is some common ground; otherwise, there wouldn't be some Democrats joining with Republicans on a bill Republicans proposed, but that is not the way we need to do bills anyway. We need to have the chairman and the ranking member of the appropriate committee sit down and work out a basic bill that can then be amended on the floor—first amended in committee. We are not going through a regular process on a lot of these bills and yet we should be. I assume it would go to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. Maybe, since it deals with the health care act, it would go to the Committee on Finance. At any rate, there would be an appropriate committee for it to go to, perhaps both the Finance Committee and the HELP Committee, but it didn't come to either. Neither proposal came to that committee.

It is time to quit making deals around here and start legislating. That is the way things have been done in America for a couple of hundred years and it is time we did that again. We can get solutions if we go through the regular process.

It is time to stop kicking the can down the road. I hope we can reach a solution. I hope we get to vote on both proposals and we can see where a majority of the votes go. Slowly, people are coming to realize that a solution for 100 percent of the students taking out loans is better than a solution for 40 percent of the students taking out loans, and one that goes on in perpetuity is better than one that goes on for 1 year.

Every year in July we say to the students, Your interest rate is going to go up unless we take action, and then we show how one side or the other doesn't want to take the action.

We have to get this problem solved. There are a lot of other aspects of higher education that need to be solved as well. It is time for that bill to be reauthorized, and it should go through the regular process as well.

I hope we quit blaming each other and get something done. I personally like the long-term solution for 100 percent of the students instead of half of a solution for 40 percent of the students.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMPLOYMENT AGENDA

Mr. COONS. I rise today to talk about something we do not hear enough about on the Senate floor these days: Jobs, jobs, jobs. During the 2012 election, the monthly jobs numbers were even more closely watched and analyzed than the daily polls, but ever since it is as if Congress has forgotten there are still 12 million Americans looking for work, and from my home State of Delaware alone, 32,000 Delawareans are out of a job.

Sure, we are eager to hear if the unemployed numbers nudged up or down a tenth of a percent. But maybe Washington is all too willing to put the unemployed on the back burner. We are adding nearly 200,000 jobs a month now, according to the most recent jobs report. That is certainly progress. But one of the things I found most chilling was an analysis that said at this pace, it will be 2017 before our Nation gets close to full employment again.

Is that acceptable to the Presiding Officer? That is certainly not acceptable to me. When is Washington, when is Congress, going to get back to working on behalf of those still looking for work?

The jobs numbers that are typically reported mask an even deeper and more concerning structural problem in our economy as well. Almost 40 percent of those currently unemployed, about 4.3 million Americans, are described as the long-term unemployed. These are folks who have been out of work 6 months or more. Short-term unemployment has dropped, but long-term unemployment remains persistently high and troubling. The longer a worker is unemployed, the more difficult it becomes to

find a job, whether it is because there is a stigma attached to being unemployed or because their skills need to be updated or because we need something to help lift their spirits and make them successful in job interviews.

Across all of these different reasons, in my view we need stronger, more engaged, more agile interventions by the Federal Government, by State and local governments, in our economy and in support for those seeking work to help them find employment.

I think we need to act swiftly on measures to improve skills training, job placement, and collaboration with State and local labor agencies. The fact is the longer we wait to deal with long-term employment, the tougher it will be to help these folks get back to work. Yet many of us here in Congress apparently cannot or will not focus on unemployment, long term or short term, much less on other measures to stimulate our economy. Is it any wonder the American people think Congress is not even trying anymore?

Here in the Senate, we know that while deeply challenged by filibusters and ideological fights and caucus politics, we are still managing to get big things done. It would be an overstatement to say we are making it all work, that it is easy. But thanks to a contingent of Republicans and Democrats here who are working in good faith together, we have been able to make some meaningful bipartisan progress. The Senate passed a bipartisan farm bill that would have taken steps to modernize our Nation's agricultural system, which supports 16 million jobs, and actually reduce the deficit by $24 billion.

What a remarkable trifecta of accomplishments: supporting one of the world's most cutting-edge agricultural economies, supporting significant job creation, and significantly cutting our deficit. What is not to love in that farm bill? Well, the House passed a series of amendments that eliminated our hard-fought bipartisan compromises and has effectively doomed the bill.

Similarly, the Senate here passed a bipartisan Water Resources Development Act to modernize America's water infrastructure all over the country, including drinking water, wastewater treatment, shipping channels. It got 83 votes here out of 100 in the Senate. It is being slow-walked in the House over ideological objections about the empowerment of the government on environmental authority.

After a historic committee markup, after the Congressional Budget Office said it would reduce the deficit by $150 billion in the first decade and $700 billion the second, this Senate passed an overwhelmingly bipartisan immigration reform bill—I think one of the biggest accomplishments of this Congress. This Senate passed an overwhelmingly bipartisan immigration reform bill, only for it to languish stubbornly in the partisan hunger games that are today's House of Representatives. The headline in Politico from today reads ''Immigration Reform Heads For Slow Death.''

Americans are frustrated with this, and so am I.

The House of Representatives has sadly become wholly dysfunctional, paralyzed by partisan civil war over the fundamental question of whether government should be an instrument of good in people's lives. That is the key here. Sadly, the fighting within the Republican Party is dividing that caucus internally. On the one hand you have genuinely principled Republican lawmakers who believe in this legislative process, who are committed to working collaboratively on the challenges our Nation faces. These folks have worked with me and others and cosponsored many bills I have introduced and others to try to make a difference here. On the other hand you have an antigovernment, frankly anti-Obama faction that took over the House in 2010. Their numbers are small but their voices are loud. It is their core belief that Congress and the Federal Government cannot and should not legislate, that government has no meaningful or constructive role to play in our society.

I worry that that belief informs their tactics of stall and delay, investigate and repeal. The Huffington Post reported this week that this Congress, in particular this House, has had only 15 bills signed into law so far—15. You have to go back a long time to find a Congress that has passed fewer pieces of legislation, between House and Senate, than this one, the 113th Congress.

Democrats and many Republican lawmakers look at this as an embarrassment in a time of enormous challenges overseas and at home for us to take so few actions together. But the tea party and some conservative ideologues look at it as an accomplishment and say that any compromise is a four-letter word, especially if the alternative is broad or progressive legislation. So what we have is a fight between folks who would, for example, trim the scope of funding for the Federal Department of Education, and folks who would fundamentally think there should not be a Department of Education. That is a fight in which I think the American people do not win.

An opposition party is a great thing, a necessary thing for our democracy. But this opposition party within the opposition party is crippling this Senate, this House, this Congress. By my count it has been 90 weeks since a Republican filibuster blocked a jobs bill that was designed to keep teachers, police officers, and first responders on the job. It has been 87 weeks since a filibuster blocked a bill to put Americans to work through investments in infrastructure, and 51 weeks since a Republican filibuster blocked a bill to give tax breaks that bring jobs home and end a tax deduction for companies that move jobs overseas. Frankly, just 42 weeks ago, a Republican filibuster in this Chamber blocked a bill to help 20,000 veterans find new jobs.

In the other Chamber, it is no better. The House of Representatives has now voted 37 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The New York Times did the math. The House has spent 15 percent of its time voting to repeal the so-called ObamaCare. In May, the Congressional Budget Office, which is the arbiter of what is or what is not necessary, the scorekeeper, actually said the House has voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act so many times it will no longer issue new scores as it attempts over and over to achieve what seems to be its most basic purpose: repeal. That is how much time and energy this House has wasted on this particular project, that could be better invested in finding ways to implement this bill more responsibly.

How much time do we waste here in this Chamber, running out the clock, waiting for 30 hours for cloture to ripen, because we cannot get simple agreements to move forward? I know this is not what our side or our leadership wants. I suspect it is not what most Senators of either party want. It is certainly not what our constituents want. What should be taking days is taking weeks. What should take weeks is taking months or even years.

We are not here to run out the clock. We are here to make a difference, or at least that is why our constituents sent us here. Ideological obstruction has rendered this Washington, this Congress, so ineffective, so inert, that when it comes to helping people get back to work in Delaware, my colleagues Senator CARPER and Congressman CARNEY and I have taken an unusual action for Members of Congress. We have started hosting job fairs. We have used the power of the office to convene when we cannot use the power of the office to legislate. We have had actually 13 job fairs up and down our State in all three of our counties in Delaware. We have watched as hundreds of folks have come and had the opportunity to apply for and pursue new employment.

Congress should be taking a clue from that effort. We should recommit ourselves to helping our innovative small businesses grow, to helping open new markets for American goods, to helping Americans find good jobs, and to supporting those who have not been quite so lucky yet.

I think we need an agenda, an agenda that focuses on five areas where investment now will lead to new jobs, not just for today or tomorrow but long into the future. First should be education. We have to do more, as I said before, to help the long-term unemployed get professional skills to thrive in this job market. We have to do more to prepare young people for the challenges of the modern economy.

I have a bill, the American Dream Accounts Act, cosponsored by Senator

RUBIO and others, that would help get our at-risk kids through school and into college.

We should also support innovative cutting-edge research. I have a bill that would make the R&D tax credit permanent and open it to startups. It is called the Startup Innovation Credit Act, which has been cosponsored by a wide range of Senators: ENZI and RUBIO, BLUNT and MORAN, STABENOW, KAINE and SCHUMER, a truly bipartisan bill.

I am proud to be working with Senator ALEXANDER of Tennessee on, hopefully, strengthening and reauthorizing the America COMPETES Act.

The third area we should be focusing on is tied to us doing more to harness the resurgence of American manufacturing. There are a dozen smart bills—many with bipartisan support—that have been introduced, taken up, and passed in the Senate that are currently languishing in the House. We should work to make a real difference for America's manufacturers.

Fourth, we have to help grow our economy by growing our markets, by growing our opportunities around the world. As chairman of the African Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have worked across the aisle to push forward bills that would create new market opportunities for American businesses.

With Senators DURBIN and BOOZMAN, I have reintroduced a bill which aims to triple the amount of U.S. exports to Africa over the next 10 years.

Fifth and last, an area on which I thought all of us would be able to come together, is investing in infrastructure. The BUILD Act, introduced and taken up in the last Congress—which I hope we will soon move to—would create a national infrastructure financing vehicle, an infrastructure bank, if you would, to help bring private funds into vital infrastructure projects. It has had bipartisan support in the past from the Chamber of Commerce to the AFL–CIO.

It is my wish we can take it and use it as a vehicle to help the 12 million people who are looking for work find the jobs they need.

I have a simple question: When is Washington, when is Congress going to get back to work on behalf of those still looking for jobs? How much longer will we wait? How much more clock will we run out? How much more time will we waste?

It is my prayer that this Chamber, this country, finds a way to work together to get over this partisanship that has paralyzed our political process.

In closing, I wish to say a word of thanks to colleagues I have seen who have come to join me in the Chamber, Senator MCCAIN and Senator FLAKE of Arizona. They are exemplars of the folks who have worked together across the aisle to find solutions to some of the big problems facing us.

They worked tirelessly with Democratic colleagues to put together the architecture of the bipartisan immigration bill that was passed through this Chamber in recent weeks. It is my hope that others in the other Chamber will see that spirit and take this opportunity to take up and pass legislation to put America on a track toward growth. There are 12 million reasons for us to do that, 12 million Americans looking for help getting back to work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

HONORING THE FALLEN HEROES OF THE GRANITE MOUNTAIN INTERAGENCY HOTSHOT CREW

Mr. FLAKE. I rise today with a heavy heart to remember 19 brave men, 19 grieving families, 19 empty places in the Prescott community that will never be filled. Arizona and the entire Nation, shares in their sorrow.

The loss of the members of the Granite Mountain Hotshots and the loss to the community was both terrible and swift. We are right to ask why.

Why were they taken from us? Why were these seemingly fearless men, these exemplars of all that is brave, good, and decent in men, choose a job that causes them to run into an inferno just as everyone else is running away from it?

In answering that, we get an essence of who these men are, these 19 lives of achievement and purpose, courage and discipline.

From all corners of America, they came together in Prescott with a single goal in mind: protecting people and property. To do this, they trained relentlessly, willingly took the worst that Mother Nature could throw at them, all to save lives and homes for their friends and their neighbors.

They did so accepting the risks, embracing them even, in the words of the old hymn, ''calm in distress, in danger bold.''

They did so in the name of community.

Americans are characterized by the world, by our sense of communal spirit, civic duty, and service to others. This is what makes us who we are.

Those characteristics describe perfectly the 19 members of the Granite Mountain Hotshots. They were not merely given the gratitude and respect of the citizens of Prescott, they earned it. They earned all of our admiration and respect, as well.

Now in that same communal spirit, we must help the families who carry the weary load.

Grief is a lonely thing, but those who are grieving for a husband or for a son, know that millions of us are thinking of you and praying that your hearts find solace and comfort.

To the children of these men, carry deep inside of you the knowledge that they were as proud of you as you are of them.

This band of 19 embodied what is best about our country. I am honored that they were, in the end, Arizonans. We should all be proud to live in a community, State, and nation built on the kinds of guts and selflessness that these men personified.

Today we are all, in the words of A.E. Housman, ''townsmen of a stiller town.''

May God bless the souls of these 19 brave men.

Senator MCCAIN and I had the privilege yesterday to travel out with the Vice President, two Cabinet Secretaries, and other Members of Congress to a memorial service for these brave 19. It was an incredible experience to see a community come together as it did. The townspeople, people from across the State, across the country, and people across the world were sending their condolences for the actions of these men.

We are so fortunate to live in a country like this. Senator MCCAIN and I are so fortunate to be Arizonans. We are fortunate to witness what we have witnessed in the past couple of weeks.

I am pleased to submit this resolution to honor these men.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. First, I thank the Senator from Delaware for his kind words about me and my friend and colleague from Arizona, who I believe is carrying on in the fine tradition of his predecessor Senator Kyl in a spirit of bipartisanship and dedication to the people of Arizona.

I come to the floor with my colleague from Arizona to offer a resolution honoring the fallen heroes of the Granite Mountain Interagency Hotshot Crew.

Yesterday, Senator FLAKE and I were privileged to attend a memorial ceremony in Prescott, AZ, honoring the life and sacrifice of the 19 brave men of the Granite Mountain Hotshots who lost their lives last week battling the Yarnell Hill Fire in Yavapai County, AZ.

I know I speak for all of my fellow citizens in expressing our gratitude to the Vice President of the United States, who came all the way to Arizona and gave a moving, stirring, and wonderful testimony to these brave Arizonans. I believe it is typical of my friend for so many years, the Vice President of the United States, that he and his wonderful wife would come to Arizona to join us to honor the efforts of these brave men.

These were not men merely worth knowing, they were men to admire. They were men to emulate if you have the courage and character to live as decently and honorably as they lived. Not many of us can. But we can become better people by trying to be half as true, half as brave, half as good as they were and to make our lives count for something more than the sum of our days.

The news accounts of their lives and the testimonials to their virtues that have appeared in the days since we lost

them give the rest of us a glimpse of what a blessed memory they are to those who knew and loved them. Some of them were the sons of firefighters who grew up wanting to be like dad, their hero. Some leave behind wives and children. Some were expecting the birth of their first child. Some married their high school sweethearts. Some were engaged and looking forward to being husbands and fathers.

Two were cousins and best friends. One rescued horses. One aspired to preach the word of God. One was a standout ball player. One dressed in a yellow raincoat when he was 6 and pretended to put out fires. Some were born in Arizona. Some came from other places and fell right in love with the beauty and people of Arizona.

Some were shy. Others were practical jokers. They were all respected and admired, the kind of men you just like being around.

They all loved the outdoors. They were athletic and adventurous. They loved their jobs. They wanted to serve others. They wanted to make a difference. They all had a purpose greater than themselves. They were all young, so young. They were all brave, so brave. They were all loved and were loved, so loved. They will all be missed, so terribly missed.

I will forever be touched by what their families and friends have told me about them and how much they meant to them and their communities. Their stories teach us how to be better people. Their loss reminds us to hold each other a little tighter, to love each other a little harder. I will always consider myself disadvantaged for not having known them. From the little I know about hope in the face of daunting challenge and the indomitability of the human spirit, it is so vital to helping us keep our faith and to endure. I hope I can offer some solace when I say the courage of those we honor today is immortal. It does not perish with them. How they lived and what they did will inspire others to live courageously, purposefully, selflessly.

Of these qualities, we tend to see merely flashes throughout our lives. In these men of the Granite Mountain Hotshots, we see grand examples—sublime, shining, and unforgettable examples—that will summon good men and women today and long after our time has passed to live bravely, compassionately, and honorably.

In a fierce and terrifying encounter with extreme danger, they stood their ground like the heroes they were and fought for their community. While they did not come home to the people who loved them so much and will miss them always, I firmly believe we will see them again in the better world that is to come.

Until then, we fondly remember the humanity and the heroism of these brave men, their wonderfully unassuming down-to-Earth nature, all of their marvelous imperfections known only to their closest family and friends, and how, in the face of dire peril, they rose beyond all that makes us merely ordinary and let God cradle them in his arms and carry them away.

The lost men of the Granite Mountain Hotshots died having taught us all to live. For that, as we honor them and pay our respects to their loved ones today, I submit we should all find great solace.

I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 193, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 193) honoring the fallen heroes of the Granite Mountain Interagency Hotshot Crew.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCAIN. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 193) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Mr. McCAIN. I yield the floor.

Mr. FLAKE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KEEP STUDENT LOANS AFFORABLE ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

DISABILITIES CONVENTION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, 23 years ago I stood here on the Senate floor as we voted 91 to 6 for the conference report on the Americans With Disabilities Act. I predicted this landmark piece of legislation would literally unlock the resources of individuals with disabilities that had previously been wasted. I worked long and hard to get it enacted into law. It is one of the bills of which I feel most appreciative.

In 2008, I again stood here on the Senate floor as we passed the ADA Amendments Act by unanimous consent. I said it was part of our ongoing effort to expand opportunities for individuals with disabilities and to help them participate in the American dream. I remain committed to that effort.

Both of these legislative achievements were the result of negotiation and compromise, and they directly addressed and provided concrete solutions to problems faced by American citizens. We should address such public policy issues through the legislative process so elected representatives make the decisions that affect Americans and are consequently accountable to them.

There is underway an effort to promote the rights and opportunities of persons with disabilities through a treaty rather than through legislation. Advocates of the U.N. Convention on the Rights of Persons With Disabilities—or CRPD—appear to believe that statutes and treaties are simply alternative means to accomplish the same end. Although I have labored with these advocates on disability legislation, I must respectfully but firmly disagree.

My record on disability legislation speaks for itself, but I cannot support the CRPD because the cost to American sovereignty and self-government clearly outweighs any concrete benefit to Americans.

When Alexander Hamilton explained the American system of representative self-government, he famously said that in America, ''The people govern; here, they act by their immediate representatives.'' Those words today are inscribed above an entrance to the House of Representatives in the Capitol, a building that Thomas Jefferson described as ''dedicated to the sovereignty of the people.''

That sovereignty certainly includes the authority to elect representatives and the authority of those representatives to enact laws. But it is much more than that. The American people also have authority to define our culture, express our values, set our priorities, and balance the many competing interests that exist in a free society. To put it simply, the American people must have the last word. The CRPD would undermine that sovereignty, compromise self-government, and give the last word to the United Nations. Let me explain how.

The CRPD is not a treaty with other nations but a treaty with the United Nations itself. Ratifying it would create a wide range of obligations for the United States and authorize the United Nations to determine whether we are meeting those obligations.

The U.N. Web site says the CRPD legally binds any nation ratifying it to adhere to its principles. The treaty applies those principles in more than two dozen areas of national life including education, health, employment, accessibility, and independent living, as well as participation in political, public, and cultural life. Article 8 even requires ratifying nations to ''raise awareness throughout society, including at the family level, regarding persons with disabilities.''

The treaty also spells out what adherence to its principles in these many areas will require. Ratifying nations must enact, modify, or abolish not only laws and regulations at all levels of government—Federal, state, and local—but also social customs and cultural practices. Ratifying nations must

refrain from engaging in any acts or practices that are inconsistent with the treaty as well as ensure that all public authorities and institutions act in conformity with it.

The heart of the CRPD is a committee of 18 experts elected by the nations ratifying the treaty that has authority to determine if those nations are in compliance. Each nation must submit to this committee periodic comprehensive reports on measures taken to meet the obligations imposed by the treaty. The U.N. committee dictates the content of these reports, evaluates whether a nation is in compliance, and makes whatever recommendations it so chooses.

I commend to Senators an article coauthored by our former colleague from Arizona Jon Kyl and published in the current issue of the journal Foreign Affairs. He explains well how international law can undermine democratic sovereignty. Of this particular treaty, the CRPD, he writes,

> If the treaty has a practical effect, it would be due in large part to interpretations made by foreign government officials and judges and by nongovernmental organizations, none answerable to American voters.

Under the U.S. Constitution, ratified treaties are the supreme law of the land. Since the United States has long had the most progressive disability laws and policies in the world, we likely are already doing much that the CRPD requires. But that is not the point, and instead highlights the real problem. Ratifying the CRPD would endorse an official ongoing role for the United Nations in evaluating virtually every aspect of American life. Ratifying the CRPD would say the United Nations, not the American people, has the final say about whether the United States is meeting its obligations in these many areas. It would impose this cost to American sovereignty and self-government with no real concrete benefit to Americans.

Ratifying the CRPD will not establish a single right for a single American. It will not provide for Americans with disabilities anything that American law has not or could not provide. It would not even help Americans with disabilities who travel overseas because their treatment depends on the laws and policies of other countries, not ours.

The CRPD's combination of obligations and U.N. oversight can help move nations that have not done so on their own toward protecting the rights and promoting the opportunities of persons with disabilities. That, I take it, is a strategic purpose of the treaty. But the United States is not only far down that road, we literally blazed the trail, and I was a significant part of blazing that trail.

Treaty advocates argue that the CRPD's impact on American sovereignty and self-government can be minimized by the many caveats that would accompany ratification. These are commonly referred to as reservations, understandings, and declarations. The legal status of these caveats, however, is unclear. The CRPD itself states that ''[r]eservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the [CRPD] shall not be permitted,'' a judgment reserved to the U.N. committee. No less an authority than Harold Koh, former State Department legal adviser and now Sterling Professor of International Law at Yale, has questioned whether such declarations have ''either domestic or international legal effect.''

Treaty advocates also emphasize that the U.N. committee will have no formal authority to interfere domestically in the United States. But as I explained, American sovereignty and self-government are not so narrow that they could be undermined only if we literally let the United Nations run our country. The United Nations and its components hardly need a treaty to opine on aspects of American life and public policy; they already do so—and we have seen it many times. It is, however, something else entirely for the United States formally to endorse the right of the United Nations to do so and subject ourselves to their evaluation.

Treaty advocates say that ratifying the CRPD would give the United States a ''seat at the table'' to promote the rights and opportunities of persons with disabilities around the world. Ratifying the CRPD will neither create, nor is necessary to maintain, America's global leadership on behalf of persons with disabilities. We had the most progressive laws in the world decades before the CRPD existed. Individual nations, as well as the European Union, are today modeling their laws after ours even without ratifying the treaty.

The only table in this arena at which the United States doesn't already have a seat is the U.N. disability committee. But do the math. The committee has 18 members who are elected by the CRPD's state parties, currently 132 nations. The chances of the United States having a seat at that table at any particular time are remote and will get even smaller as even more nations ratify the treaty. Besides, as I noted, advocates acknowledge that the U.N. committee has no formal authority anyway.

Finally, treaty advocates say the ratification by the United States will encourage other nations to do so. But at least 19 nations on four continents—from Norway and the Russian Federation to Barbados, Israel, and Liberia—have ratified the CRPD since it was received here in the Senate a little more than a year ago.

I have not addressed substantive issues with the CRPD as currently drafted, but I will mention one. For more than four decades, American disability law and policy have used an objective, functional definition of disability. A disability is an impairment that substantially limits a major life activity. The CRPD, however, states that ''disability is an evolving concept'' involving barriers that hinder ''full and effective participation on an equal basis with others.'' The threat to American sovereignty and self-government I have described would exist even if the CRPD utilized a similar concept of disability. But at least by the CRPD's terms, it appears the U.N. committee will use an evolving concept of disability to evaluate how the United States has implemented its objective concept of disability.

There exists virtually nothing that the United States could do after ratification that it could not or does not already do today. The truth is that every argument for ratifying the CRPD applies properly to other countries, not to the United States. The only real benefit of ratification that I can see would be to endorse the principles and policy statements in the treaty. The United States, however, either already does so by law or can do so in ways that do not undermine our sovereignty and self-government.

In the end, the most potent kind of leadership is the kind that America has exercised for decades—decades already, taking real action to protect the rights and promote the opportunities of persons with disabilities. I remain as committed as ever to that ongoing responsibility.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, what do you get when Congress passes a 2,700-page piece of legislation on a purely partisan basis that radically transforms one-fifth of our economy and impacts the lives of 319 million Americans? What do you get when you oppose the huge costs of this legislation, and this new bureaucracy that goes along with it, on an economy that is trying to recover from one of the biggest recessions our country ever experienced back in 2008? Well, two of the things you get for sure are higher unemployment and fewer jobs, and anemic economic growth. We have seen both of those in the daily news. I am afraid we now have a new normal when it comes to unemployment in America, which is at 7.6 percent, and that does not count the people who have quit looking for work.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has a ranking of how they rate the number of people actually looking for work, and it is called the labor participation rate. It is on their Web site. We have the fewest number of Americans in the workforce than we have had in the last 30 years.

We didn't get many of the benefits that were promised when ObamaCare was passed at a time when we were essentially told: We are from the government. Trust us. It will all turn out OK.

One of the most important numbers in the recent job report is the number 8.2 million. That is the number of Americans who are now working part time instead of full time because the full-time jobs are simply not available. In other words, there are 8.2 million workers who are working part time even though they want a full-time job, but they cannot find one.

To give some perspective, the number was 7.6 million in March. So between May and June we have seen that number increase by 300,000. There are 300,000 Americans who were unable to find full-time work, so they had to accept part-time work. When we talk about numbers such as these, I know it is tempting to think of those numbers as just abstractions, but these are the American people. These are moms, dads, brothers, and sisters. These are young adults who are looking for work but simply can't find work on a full-time basis.

I would suggest—and I think the evidence is compelling—that one of the reasons for that is ObamaCare. The law requires all businesses with 50 or more full-time workers to provide their employees with government-approved health care coverage, and if they don't, then they have to pay a financial penalty. This requirement was originally scheduled to kick in next year, but last week the Obama administration announced that this so-called employer mandate would be delayed until 2015. In other words, the administration has implicitly acknowledged that the mandate is discouraging the creation of full-time jobs and is actually reducing working hours, which is relegating many American workers—300,000 more between May and June—to part-time work even though they want to work full time. The irony is that the ObamaCare bill passed in the Senate—and I still remember this—on Christmas Eve of 2009 at 7 a.m. in the morning. It was later reconciled with the House legislation in 2010. But we have had two elections occur before the full implementation of this bill. What we are going to see now is moving the implementation off again until after the 2014 election. In my view, that is dangerous because it means there is no electoral accountability for the true impact of this legislation even though we are beginning to see some of it.

Of course, the basic problem is that the mandate won't magically disappear in 2015, even after it has been delayed by unilateral action of the administration. But what strikes me as pretty simple is that when you penalize full-time work, what you are going to get is part-time work in order to avoid the penalty.

Of course, the employer mandate isn't the only part of ObamaCare that is hampering job creation. The law also contains $1 trillion in tax increases—including a new medical device tax that has already prompted several large manufacturers to close existing facilities or cancel plans for new ones. I remember a few months ago I had a medical device company located in Texas tell me that they were going to be expanding their operations in Costa Rica instead of Texas in order to avoid this tax.

The medical device tax has also discouraged health-care savings and life-saving innovations. One of the great things about our country and our free enterprise system is that if somebody has a better way to do something, they can design it, build it, and consumers can benefit from it. In this case, this medical device tax has been destructive of each of those.

Indeed, this tax has been so counterproductive that 79 Members of this Senate—a supermajority on a bipartisan basis—rejected it during the vote on the budget resolution recently and effectively said that it should be repealed. A number of colleagues from across the aisle who supported this legislation initially have now seen that the way this is being implemented can be damaging and destructive not only to job creation but access to quality health care. The same thing can be said of the 81 Members who voted to abolish ObamaCare's IRS 1099 reporting requirement back in 2011. The more we have learned about the implementation of ObamaCare, the less popular it has become.

For that matter, the administration itself has had second thoughts about key provisions of ObamaCare. In 2010, the Department of Health and Human Services began granting a series of waivers from ObamaCare's annual limit requirements. It eventually granted more than 1,000. In other words, the administration unilaterally said to some people: You don't have to comply with the law, while the rest of us were stuck with it.

In 2011, Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius suspended all work on the so-called CLASS Act, a portion of ObamaCare that was formally repealed earlier this year. And, a few months ago, Health and Human Services announced that ObamaCare's basic health program would be delayed until 2015—again, after the next midterm congressional election. Just last week, in addition to delaying the employer mandate, the administration also delayed another important provision in the ObamaCare oversight. In other words, it said, You don't even have to prove that you are financially eligible for taxpayer subsidies to get insurance in the health exchanges.

This is an invitation to fraud and abuse. We saw in 2008 when the bubble burst after the financial crisis came to a head, one of the root causes of that was companies writing loans to people who couldn't qualify for those loans, but they didn't require any financial disclosure or verification. Those came to be known as liar loans.

We are essentially now refusing to learn from that experience in the health care field, on the part of the administration, to see as many people as possible signed up for the health care exchanges, but based only on their unilateral declaration that they are eligible, not any real verification or proof. That is an invitation to fraud.

To add it all up, notwithstanding its aspirations and notwithstanding the hopes and perhaps dreams of those who thought we were going to somehow transform health care with this legislation, it has now become clear to me, and I daresay millions of Americans, that ObamaCare has simply not lived up to its promises. It is not working as advertised. I think there is a growing bipartisan consensus to that effect. I have mentioned some examples and some reasons why, including as well that for the past 3 years we have witnessed a nonstop parade of fix-ups, fumbles, delays, and broken promises.

For example, during the 2008 campaign, President Obama pledged his health care law would transform health care; it would make health care costs for a family of four go down by $2,500. What has actually happened is the cost of family premiums has actually gone up by nearly $2,400 between 2009 and 2012. According to the Wall Street Journal, healthy consumers could see insurance rates double or even triple when they look for individual coverage under ObamaCare, and that will happen this fall. Some of it is so-called age-banding where young people, such as my two daughters who are 30 and 31 years old, are going to be forced to pay higher premiums to subsidize health care coverage for older people.

There are also other provisions such as mandatory issue. For example, if a person finds out that unfortunately they have a disease and are not covered, under ObamaCare they can go out and buy insurance which is not actually insurance anymore. Someone said it is akin to waiting until your house is on fire to buy fire insurance. That drives up the cost and it distorts the insurance market. What we are going to see, and what consumers are going to see, is their health care premiums go up as a result of the implementation of ObamaCare.

What about the promise that ObamaCare wouldn't raise taxes on anyone making under $200,000 a year? In fact, the law raised taxes on everyone, from young people with health savings accounts, to middle-class workers with families, to senior citizens living on a fixed wage.

President Obama also promised that anyone who liked their existing health coverage would be able to keep it. Do my colleagues remember that? He said: ''If you like what you have, you can keep it.'' I know people like hearing that because most Americans—up to 80 percent and maybe higher—are satisfied with the health insurance they have now. So when the President said, ''If you like what you have, you can

keep it,'' most Americans nodded and said that's good. The reality is, according to the Congressional Budget Office, at least 7 million Americans will lose their current health insurance because of ObamaCare.

A few months ago one of my constituents in Texas sent me a letter she received from her health care provider. The letter informed her that because of the new health care law—the so-called Affordable Care Act which is turning out to be more unaffordable than affordable—her current health policy would be terminated by the end of the year. The letter also said: ''Never have we experienced the uncertainty and immense challenges that confront the insurance industry during this time of health care reform.''

I don't think it is sufficient for people such as myself or anyone else to criticize this flawed legislation and to say: I voted against it; it is too bad it didn't work out; tough luck. That is not sufficient, and that is not doing our duty. There has to be a better way to reform our health care system, and indeed there is a better way, if we commit ourselves to five overarching principles.

No. 1: We must make health care more affordable. That was the promise of ObamaCare, but that is not the reality. It has made health care less affordable, not more affordable. But we must commit ourselves to policies that will make health care more affordable by reining in costs, and I have some ideas on how to do that which I will mention momentarily.

No. 2, the second principle: Individuals must have more choices in the health care market and they must be allowed to make their own choices and select whatever options fit their individual needs. The idea of ObamaCare was one-size-fits-all, but we know that one size does not fit all. Different families, different individuals have different needs. We need to restore the choices to individuals and not to the government dictating what those choices should be.

No. 3: We must ensure that all individuals, including people with preexisting conditions, have access to high-quality health insurance and to high-quality care. This was a problem in the preexisting system, where people with preexisting conditions found it hard to buy insurance, and this was one of the noble promises of ObamaCare. But we don't have to buy the whole package in order to fix this problem. Indeed, there are many high-risk pools at the State level that if the Federal Government would help support those high-risk pools, people would be able to find health care coverage even if they had preexisting conditions, which otherwise would make that difficult to find.

Principle No. 4: We have to protect the doctor-patient relationship. No one wants to have the bureaucracy telling them what health care they can have and whether they can have it. So we have to protect the doctor-patient relationship. This is a bond of trust that most of us have with the individuals we entrust our health care to—our own doctor. We have to make sure people are able to make health care decisions in consultation with their doctor and their family that suit their needs.

No. 5: This is the fifth principle for reform that I think we now need to begin the discussion about undertaking. We need to save Medicare.

What kinds of policy reforms might these principles generate? Well, for starters, I would suggest we need to equalize the tax treatment of health insurance for employers and individuals. This is something we have discussed time and time again. But why do we favor, through subsidies under the Tax Code, certain types of health coverage and discriminate against people who buy insurance in the individual market?

Secondly, from a policy perspective consistent with the principles I mentioned, we need to expand access to tax-free health care savings. There is a company in Texas—actually, it has franchises here in the Northeast—Whole Foods. It is a great grocery store. I had an occasion a couple of years ago to meet with a number of the employees. They vote every year on what their health plan should look like. Year after year after year, they choose a high-deductible health insurance plan along with a health care savings plan so that if they get sick they are protected by the catastrophic coverage, but otherwise they can save and budget for their ordinary health care needs using a health savings account. One of the most amazing things about that is people then begin to take some ownership—have some skin in the game—in terms of their health care choices, and they tend to do what we do generally as consumers, which is they shop around. They say, OK, I have my money. I need procedure X, I need this or that. Where can I get that for the best price and the best quality service? These tax-free health savings accounts transform the health care relationship so people don't only just have some third party paying the bills—like getting a credit card and never getting the bill under much of our current health care system—so expanding tax-free health savings accounts like the employees have at Whole Foods in Austin, TX, is one great policy that would improve our health care delivery system.

Third, we need to let people and businesses form risk pools in the individual market.

Fourth, we need to improve price and quality transparency. There has actually been some good work done by Health and Human Services recently to release health care expenditures for some of the most common procedures and reasons people are hospitalized. I think it is kind of eye-opening, because some people have found out that for the same procedure—in one instance a person might see $1,000 being charged and in another, a person might see $5,000 being charged for essentially the same practice or procedure. Providing transparency indeed helps to create an opportunity for a market, so market discipline can help normalize and bring down those costs. Improving price and cost and quality transparency are very important to creating a true health care marketplace.

Fifth, in Texas we have found ways to curb frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits which don't shut the front door to the courthouse for truly legitimate claims but which have made medical malpractice insurance more affordable because our civil justice system is more predictable.

Sixth, we need to eliminate all the unnecessary government mandates that drive up insurance costs. What happens in Austin, TX, and in State capitals across the country is legislators come together and say companies can't sell insurance in our State unless they cover X, Y, and Z. Well, the fact is not every consumer, not every patient needs X, Y, and Z coverage, but by those mandates they end up driving up the cost of that health insurance. What we need to do is eliminate the unnecessary mandates that many people don't use anyway, because those drive up costs. By eliminating those mandates, we can help bring down the costs and make health care more affordable.

Seventh, this is an old suggestion, but one that I think is still very important. Why is it that a person can only buy health insurance in their own State? If I want to buy car insurance I can buy it anywhere in the country and I can—if the company is in Oklahoma or New Mexico or Indiana, they can compete for my business. That gives the market an ability to hold down costs and that gives consumers access to lower costs and better quality by allowing that competition to occur across State lines.

We don't need another government takeover of our health care system. When the wheels fall off of ObamaCare or, in the language of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, if that train wreck of implementation that he predicted occurs, we don't need another big 2,700-page government program to substitute. We need to implement the types of reforms I talked about to give us lower costs, more accessibility, and greater fairness throughout our entire health care system.

Speaking of fairness and accessibility, we know the current Medicaid Program is broken when our most vulnerable citizens have a hard time finding a physician who will actually take a new Medicaid patient. This is one of the problems many of us had with the ObamaCare expansion of pushing a lot of people onto Medicaid which, in my State, is a broken program, where more than 60 percent of primary care physicians won't take a new Medicaid patient because the reimbursement

levels are about 50 percent of what private insurance would pay a doctor to treat a patient. So many physicians say, I can't afford to work for 50 cents on the dollar, so I am not going to see a new Medicaid patient.

So what you have is this strange dichotomy where people actually have coverage under Medicaid, but they do not have access to health care because they cannot find a doctor to take it at that price, and that actually, I believe, is sort of the dirty little secret about Medicaid. All of us support a safety net program of health care for our most vulnerable citizens—all of us—but Medicaid, as currently constituted, is not the answer for the reasons I mentioned.

Each State must have the flexibility to design a program that will actually meet the needs of its residents. What works best in New York, I guarantee, does not work the same way in Texas and vice versa. States should be appropriated a certain amount of money, and I am not suggesting it be drastically cut—which would deny the States an opportunity to provide health care in their own way—but we need to block grant these Federal funds, not micromanage them. We certainly need to eliminate as many Federal strings as we possibly can and provide the States the flexibility to use the same amount of money to provide access to more health care for low-income people.

Speaking of access to physicians, this is a big problem in Medicare too. Of course, Medicaid is for the economically disadvantaged. Medicare is for people 65 and older. But in my State, only 58 percent of physicians will see a new Medicare patient. That means 42 percent will not. In other words, if you live in a rural area or you live someplace where physicians will not take a new Medicare patient, you are pretty much out of luck. This is a problem again about the way the Federal Government tries to save money in health care, not by using the discipline of the market—transparency and competition and some of the other reforms I mentioned—but rather by whacking reimbursements to health care providers. The truth is, if you whack reimbursement rates to Medicaid providers and Medicare providers, as we currently do, then fewer and fewer people are actually going to be able to find a doctor who will see them, even though they have the promise of coverage under Medicaid or Medicare.

We know, of course, the financial problem Medicare is currently suffering. The fact is—and this is something I wish we would talk more about from the President to the Halls of Congress—for every $1 that an average person puts into Medicare, they take out $3. That is why Medicare, in the long run, is unsustainable. If we are going to keep the promise of Medicare—and we should—to future generations, we need to fix it.

But when it comes to treating patients, physicians, I believe, know better than Washington bureaucrats. This is another reason why I support repeal of another provision of ObamaCare which is called the Independent Payment Advisory Board, so-called IPAB. There is actually bipartisan support for repealing this provision in the House because what it would do is appoint a group of 15 bureaucrats who would decide what sort of health care was going to be reimbursed under Medicare and what would not. There would be no real recourse to Congress or anybody else because these people would be the so-called Independent Payment Advisory Board.

It is not hard to predict what would happen if IPAB, as it is called, were implemented. When doctors are forced to accept lower rates, they will reduce the number of patients they see or else they will drop out of the Medicare Program altogether or the types of treatment people will be able to get from their doctor will be determined by the Federal Government's willingness to pay for it rather than their true medical needs.

I think we have learned the lesson in Medicaid and Medicare, as elsewhere, that price controls simply do not work, and they will not save Medicare either. It is time to try a new approach that will protect the doctor-patient relationship and expand individual choice.

Under the current model, seniors are forced into a one-size-fits-all plan developed in Washington. Under an alternative supported by Republicans and Democrats in different contexts—the so-called premium support model—the Federal Government would pay a designated amount, and then people could use that money to buy their own private coverage. They could supplement it if they wanted to, if they wanted more generous coverage, but that would have to come out of their pocket.

But under the premium support model alternative, private plans would be allowed to compete against traditional Medicare, much as Medicare Advantage does now, and seniors could simply pick the plan they want that suits their needs the most. If someone picks a private plan that is cheaper than traditional Medicare, they can keep the savings. Then again, if they want more generous coverage, they can pay the difference.

How do we know this sort of approach will work? You do not have to take my word for it. All we have to do is look at what is working now. One of the most successful government health care programs I have seen since I have been in the Senate, and that I know about, is the Medicare prescription drug coverage program. A national survey released in October 2012 found that 9 out of 10 seniors are satisfied with their Medicare prescription drug plan.

Similar reforms could be made to other parts of Medicare to help save the program. If these reforms are not made, Medicare will go bankrupt. The great thing about Medicare Part D, the prescription drug program, is it has actually come in 40 percent under projected costs. It is not hard to figure out why. Because when different companies compete in the marketplace for the business of seniors who qualify for Medicare, they are going to compete—you guessed it—on price, so they are going to try to provide it at a less expensive cost, and they are going to compete based on quality of service. That is the great genius of our free enterprise system and of competition. But if we do not make these reforms, Medicare will go bankrupt. That is something none of us should look forward to.

So the reforms I have just outlined will give us a health care system with lower costs, a system with greater choice and greater access to high-quality care, a system that upholds fundamental values, such as fairness and consumer choice, and a system that will provide affordable health care for everyone. That is the kind of health care system we all want for our families, for our children, and grandchildren.

Three years ago, Congress took a swing at the health care issue but ended up striking out and missed an opportunity to enact necessary reforms. We are still learning that as the implementation of ObamaCare continues to unfold. But the health care debate is not over by any means. It is just beginning in a way. By replacing ObamaCare with patient-centered reforms that reduce costs, improve transparency, and expand access, we can make it easier for all Americans to get the affordable quality health care they deserve.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT OVERREACH

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to address an issue that is troubling to me and to my constituents back in the State of Nevada and to a growing number of Americans across the country. I am referring to the tendency of those who lead government agencies to abuse their power and deprive Americans of their constitutional rights.

We have seen examples of this alarming trend over the last several weeks: The NSA is reportedly confiscating private e-mails and phone records. The IRS is specifically targeting conservative groups seeking tax exempt status.

Constituents have flooded my office with phone calls, e-mails, and letters demanding to know why their government continues to encroach on their liberty. They have had enough and so have I.

Recently, the Federal court of Nevada ruled that the Federal Government has abused its power in my home State. The court ruled in favor of private cattle owners in Nevada, ranchers who came to the court because they felt the Federal Government was intentionally interfering with their grazing permits and their private property rights.

The court found that for more than two decades, Federal officials entrusted with the responsibility of managing public lands actively conspired to deprive Wayne Hage and his father's estate of their grazing permits and their water rights. In its decision, the court ruled:

> The government had abused its discretion through a series of actions designed to strip the Estate of its grazing permits and of the ability to use water rights.

The court described the actions of the government officials as an ''abuse of executive power'' and said it ''shocked the conscience of the court, and provided a basis for finding of irreparable harm.''

There seems to be a pattern emerging. The Federal Government is supposed to be entrusted with protecting fundamental rights, such as property rights and the right to privacy. Yet, sadly, the American people are left wondering if their own government is living up to that public trust.

The Framers of the Constitution believed that private property rights were sacred. The 5th and 14th Amendments specifically prohibit the government from depriving citizens of ''life, liberty or property without due process of law.'' Those amendments are there for a reason.

As the Nevada District Court wrote:

> Substantive due process protects individuals from arbitrary depravation of their liberty by government.

No question. The Federal Government has an obligation to help manage the Nation's resources, just like it has the duty to keep Americans safe and to enforce fairly the Tax Code. But these responsibilities require integrity, accountability, and impartiality. These powers cannot be used to push political or partisan agendas.

In a State such as Nevada, which is made up of land that is 87 percent federally controlled, and where resources such as water and vegetation are scarce, the role of the government in protecting private property rights is especially important and cannot be abused by overly zealous government officials.

The rights of cattle owners and ranchers to have their grazing permits honored is no less important than any other form of property right secured by law through permits and licensing. The government cannot be allowed to arbitrarily target certain groups for punishment and selectively enforce the law. That kind of behavior is precisely what the Framers wanted to guard against.

Whether it is the IRS targeting groups for their political views, the NSA confiscating mass amounts of private data, or the Federal Government interfering with property rights, the American people are fed up with this laundry list of examples of the Federal Government blatantly disrespecting their constitutional liberties.

Fortunately, the Federal courts remain open for Americans to defend themselves against government abuse. But I think it is a tragedy for American citizens to be subjected to costly, drawn-out litigation in order to make sure their liberties are secured against the very government they have entrusted to protect them.

The American people will not stand for an all-powerful government that ignores their constitutional rights. It is long past time that we end this culture of government bullying and harassment. The government derives its power from the consent of the governed. The consent depends on a fair, transparent, and reasonable enforcement of the law.

If we are to remain the greatest country on Earth and live up to the powerful ideals that inspired our Founders, then we must restore the trust of the American people in their government, and we must begin that process right away.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago the President gave a beautiful speech on global warming. He said that the world is coming to an end if we don't act; that it is our moral obligation to make sure our planet is safe for future generations; that it is all up to us. And to be successful we must regulate carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases.

For more than a decade environmentalists have been pressuring Democrats to do this—pressuring all of us to do this—and we all know why.

I can remember years ago—and this would have been back when I was in the House—that my first observation when I looked at liberals in the House was that there were four flawed premises on which they based their decisions. One was—and I am going from memory now because this was many years ago—that the Cold War is over, we no longer need a defense; another one was that deficit spending is not bad public policy; the third one was that punishment is not a deterrent to crime; and the fourth one—and this is the big one—was that government can run our lives better than the people can. That is exactly what we are talking about here.

The reason they have been wanting to regulate carbon is better articulated by a guy I don't think anyone will argue could be the most knowledgeable scientist in America. His name is Richard Lindzen, and he is with MIT. His quote was that regulating carbon is a ''bureaucrat's dream.'' He said, ''If you control carbon, you control life.'' You control life. And that is what bureaucrats want to do. That is what the environmentalists want to do. In controlling our lives, they want to determine what cars we drive, what kinds of houses we live in, how our cities are built, and all of that, and they can do all of this by regulating carbon dioxide.

Democrats—particularly in the Senate—have been unsuccessful in passing legislation to accomplish this. And this is the key. Way back during the Clinton administration, when Al Gore came back from the Kyoto Convention, he said we need to pass and ratify the Kyoto Convention. The Kyoto Convention would do exactly that—it would allow us in this country and others around the world to regulate carbon emissions. In doing this, they would be able to control lives. It was way back 13 years ago that this took place.

Anyway, they tried to pass legislation. The first bill actually was not necessarily a Democratic bill; it was the McCain-Lieberman bill, and it was one that was a cap-and-trade bill, quite frankly. At that time the Republicans were in the majority, and I chaired the committee called the Environment and Public Works Committee, so I was on the floor managing the opposition to that particular cap-and-trade bill. That was a carbon control bill. We won the debate, and as the years went by we continued to win over and over.

I guess what I am saying is that the reason the President is doing this right now is because he can't get this done through legislation, by those who are held accountable to the people. He can't get it done through legislation so he is trying to do it through regulation. The most recent attempt, in 2009, was the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill.

By the way, I congratulate Senator MARKEY for winning his election. It is going to be fun for us because we have debated each other on this issue now for years and years, but now we are in the same Chamber.

The bottom line is that in 2009 they did pass that bill in the then-Democratic-controlled House, but when it came over to the Senate, of course it

was not even considered here. But that particular piece of legislation would have regulated only the largest emitters, and this is the hardest thing to get across to people. Everyone understands, after 12 years of repetition and listening to me at this podium saying it over and over again, that if we were to pass any kind of a cap-and-trade bill, the cost to the American people would be somewhere between $300 billion and $400 billion a year. The reason I say that is the Wharton School came up with the figure of around $350 billion, MIT came out with the figure of about the same, and so no one for 10 years has debated that the cost of regulating through cap and trade would have been somewhere around $300 billion to $400 billion.

Now, as onerous as I think all these bills were in trying to do this through legislation, it wouldn't have been nearly as bad as what is happening today, for this reason. This gets into the weeds here, but it is important that we in this body understand what this is all about. The bills we killed, which would have cost $400 billion a year, would have regulated only the largest emitters—those emitters that emitted 25,000 tons of CO_2 a year. That would have cost the economy $400 billion. We rejected that, and we all know that is what the cost was, but because the President owes this environmental base and he can't pass his legislation, he is now taking unilateral regulatory action to regulate greenhouse gases and carbon dioxide.

Keep in mind that this is not the same as one of the bills we defeated. That would have only caused the emission control on those entities that emitted 25,000 tons of CO_2 or more in a period of a year. If it is done through regulation, then it has to be done under the Clean Air Act, and the significance of that is this would not just go after the big emitters, it wouldn't go after just those big emitters of 25,000 tons a year, it would catch people and individuals and organizations that emit 250 tons as opposed to 25,000 tons. That means it would apply not just to large emitters, such as powerplants, but every refinery, oil and gas well, every manufacturing facility, every plastics plant, the iron smelters and steel mills, every apartment building, churches, and every school. So that is everybody. So one thing that has never been calculated is what the cost of that would be. If the cost of just those emitting 25,000 tons would be $400 billion a year, then how much would it be if we applied this to everyone, all the way down to 250 tons?

I do something in Oklahoma each year. I get the total number of people who file Federal tax returns, and I kind of do the math. So I will take the amount of a tax increase—in this case, let's use $400 billion a year—and I will say: How much will this cost the average family in my State of Oklahoma who files a tax return? It works out to $3,000 a year. So we are talking about a major—by far the largest tax increase this country has ever seen.

So don't let the President fool you into believing he will stop at the powerplants. He is in an all-out war against fossil fuels and affordable energy. And legally, if he goes down this path, he will not be able to stop just at the large ones. This will apply to everybody out there under the Clean Air Act, and that would be those emitting 250 tons.

He is also doing this unilaterally just for the United States. If you believe man is causing global warming—I don't, but if you do—then you should be concerned about worldwide emissions because who cares if it is just the United States of America? It is not just what is happening in the United States of America, it is all over the world. That is really where the problem—if there is a problem—would be. If all we do is lower our emissions without convincing China, India, Mexico, and other countries to do the same, then U.S. manufacturers, out seeking the energy to run their operations, would have to leave the United States and go to those other countries where they do not have regulations. So this would have the effect actually of increasing, not decreasing, emissions.

I remember when Lisa Jackson was the Director of the EPA. She was my favorite liberal. I used to say I had three favorite liberals, and she was one of the three of them. And I liked her because even though I disagreed with her philosophically, she was always honest with me. I would ask her a question and she would answer it.

I remember when I asked her live on TV, in a hearing, this question. I said: You know, if we were to pass this legislation that would regulate CO_2 levels, would this reduce emissions worldwide? She said: No. Because this only affects the United States and it would not affect the other countries.

So you won't hear the President talking about this. You won't hear him talking about the cost, even though they will shrink from our economy by more than $400 billion a year. We know that, and no one refutes that. It requires the EPA to hire an additional 230,000 employees and spend an additional $21 billion to implement the regulatory regime. And these are not my figures, these are the EPA's figures. You won't hear him talking about it because he knows it is a losing argument. In fact, the day before the President gave this speech, he had his campaign send out talking points to all of the activists he had working on his behalf. They told—''they'' meaning the White House—these people exactly what to talk about, what to say and exactly what not to say.

We recovered this. We found these talking points the President sent out to people so this is what Americans would be listening to. I think it is worthwhile for us to go over this now.

On this first chart, we have his overarching three-point strategy. Point No. 1 is, we have an obligation to act. The memo continues: We have a moral obligation to future generations to leave them a planet that is not polluted and damaged by carbon pollution.

Notice that they are not talking about climate change anymore. They are not talking about global warming. The new words they are using now are ''carbon pollution.''

It is all the same thing. Global warming didn't work, so they discontinued that. They tried climate change. That didn't work. Now the new word is called carbon pollution.

These are the President's talking points. I think this kind of wordsmithing is actually smart, and I compliment them on going to professionals and seeing what kind of words they can use to make the public believe something that isn't true.

The second thing they have charged would be that communities all over America are already being harmed. The memo continues:

> Climate change is already harming Americans all over the country. Cleaning up after climate-driven disasters last year cost the taxpayer over $1,100. (Or cost taxpayers nearly $100 billion, one of the largest non-defense discretionary budget items in 2012.)

These are the words coming from the White House for people to use in their talking points. These figures come from the total cost of all natural disasters. I am from Oklahoma. I think we all know we have tornadoes in Oklahoma. We have had tornadoes as long as I have been living in Oklahoma—all my life.

So he is talking about that figure on all natural disasters that has nothing to do to with carbon whatsoever. He is attributing the cost of all natural disasters and its total costs to global warming or carbon pollution, as the President now says, even if you believe global warming is true.

The President's third talking point was to his climate plan. This is what he is telling his followers, in this body and elsewhere, to use:

> That's why we applaud President Obama's climate plan, which is full of common-sense solutions, starting with his call for the EPA to limit the carbon pollution.
>
> While we set limits for arsenic, mercury, and lead, we let power plants release as much carbon pollution as they want. It's time to set a limit on pollution that affects public health, and that's why it's so important that the President is rising to this challenge.

Those are his talking points that he wants people to say about his speech and about his program. What this demonstrates to me is that the President is no longer fighting greenhouse gases—which he says caused global warming—but is instead fighting against carbon pollution.

But if carbon pollution is simply carbon dioxide—or CO_2—and is dangerous to our health, what are we going to do about the air we breathe? Don't we emit CO_2 every time we exhale? Is this the pollution they are talking about?

Also in the memo the President's alarmists are given a concrete list of

things to talk about and things not to talk about.

This is something we received just a few hours ago, and we are very pleased to be able to get a copy of it. This was only supposed to go to alarmists. Alarmists, for the benefit of my colleagues, are people who believe the world is coming to an end and it is all man's fault. It says what to do and what not to do. Look at this. It is amazing, what you can say and what you can't say. We will highlight just a few items.

The first point is the instruction to not talk about the cost of regulations. The memo from the White House says, ''Don't lead with straight economic arguments.'' Why? Because global warming legislation will cost between $300 billion and $400 billion a year, and the regulations will cost much more than that.

Charles River Associates is a credible group that to my knowledge no one has challenged. Their study of the Waxman-Markey bill reported that the policies would cost the economy $350 billion a year in 2030 and $730 billion a year in 2050. Again, go back to the figures consistent with what the Wharton School, 10 years before, and MIT came out with.

The Heritage Foundation said the average family would see its direct energy costs rise by over $24,000 in the first 20 years following the bill's enactment. This is the Heritage Foundation said it is going to affect every family in America. The costs will be far higher under the President's unilateral regulatory action, thereby bypassing Congress, because they are talking about regulating down to much lower levels.

This memo also instructs the President's alarmists to talk about his actions being ''the latest in a series of steady and responsible steps the administration has taken'' to combat global warming. In that vein, however, the memo instructs them to not overstate the magnitude of the action being taken.

In other words, the President does not want his people talking about this as being the first of many steps in regulating every refinery, manufacturer, oil and gas wells, steel mills, plastics, and all the rest.

The next memo instructs alarmists to ''discuss the impacts—carbon pollution is bad for the health of our kids and our planet'' but to not ''debate the validity or consensus of the science that is already settled.''

In other words, don't debate the science. Just say it has been settled. Because we have more and more people now questioning the science, and it is far from being settled. They don't want to bring that up. They don't want people talking about it. The science is far from settled, and since when does carbon dioxide—which we all breathe out every day—hurt our kids?

The memo also instructs the alarmists to ''inform audiences about the nature of the problem, who is at fault, and what can be done,'' but to not ''debate the increase in electricity prices. Instead pivot to health and clean air messages.''

In other words, don't admit the truth; that is, overactive, unilateral regulation will do nothing more than increase electricity prices and unilaterally shut down our economy by imposing EPA regulations on every single industry and dramatically expand the Federal Government's role in our lives without doing anything to reduce global emissions. This is all instruction coming from the White House.

I have to repeat this. If it were done by legislation or by regulation, we have already shown clearly it would not reduce CO_2 emissions, even if that were your goal, because that is what Obama's Administrator of the EPA said. In answering the question, ''Is this going to reduce CO_2 emission,'' the answer, ''No, it won't.''

Richard Lindzen and other scientists have talked about:

> Controlling carbon is kind of a bureaucrat's dream. If you control carbon, you control life.

So keep that in mind. All this effort is being made, and we have made it very clear that it is not going to accomplish anything they want to accomplish in terms of reducing CO_2 emissions worldwide.

The last thing I will mention from the memo is that it says to ''discuss modernizing and retooling power plants and innovation that will create green jobs'' but to not ''try to suggest net job increases.''

In other words, don't mention this is going to shut down every coal, oil, and eventually natural gas powerplant we have in this country and kill thousands of jobs at manufacturers around the Nation. We don't want to talk about the job loss. The President only wants to talk about the benefits of his regulatory actions and not about the costs.

But what we have to remember is that even the benefits are overstated because they do not rely on the true costs of the regulations. But we should not be surprised, this coming from an administration that thinks more regulations means more jobs. These are talking points, but the mechanics of these new and future EPA greenhouse gas rules will be done by the EPA.

The reason I am here today is to first demonstrate in the speech he made how that relates now to the current EPA and perhaps the confirmation hearing vote that will be coming up.

Gina McCarthy is currently being considered to take the top job at the agency. Remember, I said Lisa Jackson had that job before and how much I thought of her. I like Gina. I like her very much. I have worked with her. She has had a different job for several years. She was the Assistant Administrator of the EPA for air issues.

It is very important people understand what we are looking at. We have a good personal relationship, but she is the one who is responsible for all of the worst regulations that have come from the EPA in the last 4 years under Lisa Jackson's leadership. Lisa Jackson was the director, but Gina McCarthy was the air director. It is from the air office, the Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, where she has the most expertise and where all of the worst regulations will come from in the future.

After President Obama's speech on global warming, it became clear that Gina McCarthy would be used as the tool of the administration for all these regulations that will destroy the American economy. I have listed these up here, and it is worth looking at.

In the last 4 years, we have had Utility MACT. MACT means the maximum achievable control technology. That means what technology is out there to control emissions. She was able to get that through, and $100 billion and 1.5 million jobs were lost. The next is Boiler MACT, $63.3 billion and 800,000 jobs lost. Regional haze—another regulation regulating the air—will increase the cost of Oklahoma's electricity bills by over $1.8 billion. These are all figures that are incontrovertible, so people don't disagree with.

In the next few years, even worse regulations are likely to come out. Greenhouse gas regulations may be the worst, but there are also the others listed. Greenhouse gas is the one we have been talking about, but you also have the ozone NAAQS regulations. Adjustments to that rule will put 2,800 counties out of attainment, including all of them in Oklahoma.

We have 77 counties in the State of Oklahoma. I can remember when I was the mayor of Tulsa, they came out with new regulations that put Tulsa County out of attainment. When you are out of attainment, that means you can kiss any energy development, new manufacturing opportunity, any other business expansion goodbye. They will not be able to get a permit from the EPA.

Gina McCarthy is the face of President Obama's overregulatory agenda that is threatening our energy independence and putting our economic future in peril. We can't allow these regulations to move forward. I think the key to that is the person who is responsible for all the regulations, all the costs, all the jobs I just enumerated, both during her tenure as the air boss of EPA and then these that would come in the future, that would be in her goal. She would be the tool that is being used by the administration.

Yesterday was kind of interesting because Heather Zichal is President Obama's climate czar and she was on the Hill huddling in a secret meeting with some of the chief alarmists such as BARBARA BOXER and the rest. In the meeting, they talked about the President's plan and presumably this memo—with wordsmithing talking points from the memo we talked about before. So the one we had up before is

the same thing they talked about yesterday: This is how you are going to have to word all this stuff.

Their goal is not to protect the American people; it is to control them. They want top-down control, and carbon dioxide regulations will give them this tool. Their talking points memo proves they are doing all they can to craft their message in a way that convinces Americans they are not trying to crush our economy but instead trying to help. But the truth is, their regulatory agenda will only cause more unemployment, lower economic growth, and lower take-home pay for the American people.

President Obama delivered a beautiful speech on global warming. That is how I started this. It was well thought out, and he is very gifted. He had a beautiful speech, and he is embarking on the most devastating surge in regulation that will cost hard-working Americans millions of jobs and tax increases to accomplish this.

Keep in mind, if you do all these things it is not going to lower CO_2 emissions. That is proven. No one has denied it. That even came from the Administrator of the EPA. It is going to be devastating to the American people.

This is big. It has a lot to do with the confirmation hearing of the very fine lady who has been a good friend of mine for a long time, but the one who is responsible for these air regulations that are killing jobs in America, and we cannot let that happen.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the controlled time be extended until 7 p.m., and that all the provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor from time to time to share thoughts from people in my State. All of us are hearing comments from college students, people who have finished college, and often from the parents of those who face a massive debt from going to 2-year and 4-year private-public schools. This situation can sometimes be even more tragic at for-profit schools where they haven't gotten much help in their job search. It can be even more tragic if they have not finished school and still face this debt.

My wife Connie Schultz graduated from Kent State University some number of years ago. Her father was a utility worker and carried a union card for more than 30 years. Her mother was a home care worker. She was the oldest of four and the first in her family to go to college. Her two younger brothers and sister also went to college.

Connie graduated from Kent State University 30-some years ago with a debt of only $1,200. That so starkly illustrates the difference from today and then. She had little privilege, little money, and parents who couldn't really put much money out, but with lower tuition, Pell grants, a few scholarships, Stafford loans, and working, she was able to get through school with little debt.

The stories we hear today are so different from that. I plead with my colleagues that we freeze interest rates at 3.4 percent. I know that will not solve anything close to all the problems of college tuition and costs of room and board, but it will help. We need to do much more than that.

Every year I convene 50 or 60 college presidents from Ohio's 2- and 4-year private and public schools, community colleges, and 4-year State universities. I invite all of them to come and discuss these issues. We have done it for 6 years in a row. It is helpful to try to find ways to keep higher education costs in check, but, again, it is not nearly enough.

I am hopeful that in the next 24 hours or so we can freeze interest rates at 3.4 percent and then get serious about what we are going to do about the $1 trillion aggregate debt that students, or former students, have in this country. We need to focus in part on the $150 billion of the $1 trillion which 2.9 million students are burdened with. That is debt from the private market for the $150 billion of the $1 trillion. Fifteen percent is in the private market where interest rates sometimes are as high as 12 or 15 or 16 percent. Few private banks are willing to renegotiate and refinance those loans.

My legislation with Senator HEITKAMP will help with a carrot-and-stick approach to encourage the private institutions—banks and private lenders—to refinance these loans.

Let me share a couple of letters from students and families because I think that speaks volumes better than I can.

This is a letter from Daniel from Centerville, OH. Daniel has been at the University of Dayton.

He said:

I currently have $100,000 in outstanding loans. Last summer (2012) I graduated with a Masters Degree in Middle Child Education and the previous summer I graduated with a Bachelors in Middle Child Education as well from Wright State University in Dayton, Ohio.

Starting in July of 2013, because of the high interest rates, my average monthly payment for all my student loans will be $600 a month.

I recently got one of my payments lowered; otherwise that total would be over $800 a month.

I have consolidated all I can, and even deferred (and still made payments while in deferment) other loans which will be due in February 2014; adding to the $600 a month payment.

I teach in a school in Cincinnati and LOVE THE WORK THAT I DO.

It was impossible to find a job in Dayton, so now I spend $200 a month in gas traveling over 40 miles (one way) to work.

Even though I have a part time job in the summer, while school is out, I still find myself struggling to pay bills.

Further down in the letter he says:

Afterall, I will be well over 65 years old before I am able to pay all of my college loans off.

This country needs to rethink its priorities.

That was Daniel from Centerville, OH.

Melinda, from Canton, OH, in northeast Ohio, writes:

After graduating from college, I had roughly $23,000 in student loan debt. My payments are $276 a month until I'm in my 30s, and I am very tightly budgeted.

While I am able to make this payment, which is my largest and most important bill each month (aside from rent), it puts me in a vulnerable situation when it comes to emergencies.

I recently had to have surgery for a chronic medical problem. I was in an auto accident and had to visit the ER.

Making that loan payment every month leaves very little extra to be saved for unexpected expenses.

I understand it's my responsibility to pay it, and I loved every minute of my education so it was well worth it, but at the end of the day a hike in my interest rates may be the difference between me saving a little money each month or saving no money each month.

Also, I fall asleep each night knowing that I am 24 years old and have yet to begin saving for retirement which will be a very important issue for my generation.

We are not getting into the issues of retirement, Social Security, and the effort by some of our colleagues to privatize that system—I will not even go into more detail there.

Christie from Ashtabula, the community where my wife grew up, writes:

As a low-income individual, I was forced to decide on going to college by a measure of a few things—who could give the best education, and the most financial aid.

But there was a catch—I couldn't leave Ohio, and I couldn't live far away from home because I didn't have access to a car and my single parent mother (who works two jobs), would have no way to get me if there were any emergencies.

I chose Case Western Reserve University, a renowned university [ranked] at 37th in the country.

My financial aid package was hefty.

If I paid full tuition ($52,000) each year, I would be at an insane $200,000 by graduation.

Luckily, by the end I will only owe a quarter of that. Yes, that's still around $60,000—$60,000 in student loan debt. That's pretty much a house and a car.

The last letter I will read is from Linda, who is from my hometown of Mansfield, OH.

I have two children who are currently attending state colleges (Cleveland and Akron). We are a middle-class family working hard to make ends meet, and help our children to the best of our ability. Even after saving for them, and thinking we had plenty for them to get through without much debt, the market crashed in '08, and more than HALF of our hard-earned college savings for them disappeared. They have had to take out loans in order to be able to attend.

We do not have the money for them to ''borrow'' from us, or to pay the thousands that their college savings doesn't cover. Both of them are on the Dean's list every semester.

My son is an environmental science major, and my daughter minored in Spanish, and her major is exercise physiology and physical therapy. They are bright and intelligent and have worked extremely hard to get where they are. I implore you not to leave them with ridiculous amounts of debt by doubling the interest rate.

These stories are pretty consistent. These students are struggling. They already are thinking about buying a house, starting a business, and saving for retirement even though they are in their twenties. They know the challenges are greater in this generation than in previous generations.

Also, what is obvious from these letters is the impact this has on families and not just the student who is 25 or 22 or 19 or 28, facing years of paying off student loans. It has an impact on the family who maybe takes a second mortgage on their house to help their son or daughter, the family who faces foreclosure because of financial problems, the family who simply can't help their student—as broken-hearted as that makes a parent, they can't help their son or daughter because of their financial situation, to help them with their college education.

Again, I am hopeful we can freeze interest rates at 3.4 percent for 1 year and get serious about what we need to do about access to college and affordable higher education for our young people.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee and I be allowed to engage in a colloquy and speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSING FINANCE REFORM

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to be here today with my friend the Senator from Tennessee to talk about legislation that we and eight—actually now nine of our colleagues—bipartisan legislation that has been recently introduced to reform our housing finance system.

I came into office a couple of years later than the Senator from Tennessee, but I got here in January of 2009 when the entire future of our financial system was uncertain. We members of the Banking Committee rolled up our sleeves and tried to work together to prevent future crises. Well, history will determine whether we accomplished that goal.

The Senator from Tennessee and I worked strongly together on a couple of titles of what has subsequently become known as the Dodd-Frank legislation. While there are problems in that legislation, while there are problems still within our financial system, I think no independent observer would not say that our financial system today, in 2013, is stronger than it was after the crisis.

But one area that did not receive very much attention was the question of housing finance. We also know that in many ways our housing finance system, both from lack of underwriting, the process that then ended up allowing a lot of mortgages to get packaged off, securitized, with the assumption that there would never be a decline in housing prices or a significant decline in housing prices and that these securities would never be in jeopardy, in many ways led to part of that financial crisis. At the end of the day, those institutions—Fannie and Freddie—that had been the core of our housing finance system ended up acquiring $188 billion of taxpayer support to shore up those institutions so that the whole housing system would not collapse.

Well, it is now 5 years later, and we believe it is time to transform the failed model of Fannie and Freddie into a smarter, sustainable system with more private capital. We believe we can better protect the taxpayer and maintain broad access to affordable mortgage credit. But we need to act soon to prevent this issue from falling victim to election-year politics. And everyone—from the administration, to many of us here on the floor of this Senate, to many housing experts—knows the status quo is not sustainable.

So we have two important questions before we get into some of these principles about which I will engage my colleague the Senator from Tennessee: 1. Why do we need to take action now, and the second question is, why does Congress need to act?

I will take the first question. Why is the time now? Well, over the last 5 years since the housing and the overall financial crisis, we have seen—slowly, albeit—the housing market come back to life. Obviously this has been supported by a low interest rate environment that has permitted more refinancing and loan modifications. Rising home values have brought many home owners out from underwater mortgages. Housing prices have been a significant factor in Fannie's and Freddie's recent record profits. But now those very profits have somehow been wrapped into at least some of our colleagues' discussions about our debt ceiling debate.

I speak for this Senator and I think the Senator from Tennessee and, candidly, I think many Senators are not even engaged with us on this debate right now. The last thing we want is for Fannie and Freddie to virtually serve as a piggy bank for the pet projects of either side of the aisle. If we are not careful, that could happen.

Fannie and Freddie have been in conservatorship for 5 years. Before we become even more dependent upon this broken system, it is time for us to move forward. So I would like to ask my colleague the Senator from Tennessee, if now is the time, if he might share with us some of the ideas he feels and we feel about why it is important that Congress be involved in this process and not simply allow this conservatorship to go on ad infinitum into the future.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Virginia. I have thoroughly enjoyed working with him on this issue. We have been working on it since last fall. We spent a lot of time talking to various groups to try to get this right. We know that every bill can be improved, but we have done our best to present something to the Senate that we hope will be marked up in the Banking Committee, something that, as the great Senator from Virginia mentioned, has attracted numbers of people on both sides of the aisle. I again thank Senators TESTER, JOHANNS, HEITKAMP, HELLER, MORAN, HAGAN, and now KIRK for joining us in this effort. This is a diverse group of folks from diverse places around the country who have come together to solve this major problem.

All during the Dodd-Frank debate—and we were certainly in the middle of that—all people talked about it seemed was the fact that Fannie and Freddie were not included. Yet Fannie and Freddie were two of the biggest failures that occurred during that time. As the Senator from Virginia rightly mentioned, $188 billion of taxpayer money had to go into these entities.

We have dealt with most of the issues around the crisis. I know there are still some rules that are being promulgated. We had some that came out yesterday. But this is the last piece.

As the Senator mentioned, the housing sector has been growing and coming back. We understand the importance of the housing sector; therefore, we have designed a bill that transitions over time and moves us to a model that we hope and believe strongly is far more sustainable.

First of all, let me mention the five things we have worked on together. I know each of us is going to stress a lot of different things as we move through. I know we plan to come down here at multiple intervals as we move ahead. But No. 1, what does this bill do? First and importantly, it breaks up the GSEs and liquidates them. It does it over time, but our bill does that.

Secondly and very importantly—this is something we have talked about a great deal with industry and certainly people from all sides of the aisle—this bill puts 10 percent private capital in advance of any kind of government reinsurance. I want to say to the Senator that one of the reasons we looked at it this way is that if Fannie and Freddie just had 5 percent capital, there would have been no taxpayer losses. But putting this much capital in advance really is a buffer against the taxpayer needing to be involved in it. It fully privatizes a number of functions that are currently performed by Fannie and Freddie. It gets the U.S. Government out of the business of pricing credit, which is something we both have thought needed to occur.

It modernizes our system of mortgage-backed securities. But I think the thing we began with—and I so appreciate the Senator's involvement. We realized that one of the major flaws in our housing finance system in the past and even—well, it is not today because the government owns these two entities, but in the past has been private sector gains, public losses. I mean, when you have a situation where you have shareholders, you have the private sector doing well when times are good; they had an implicit guarantee; people figured that the government would come in and backstop these entities if they failed. Obviously their underwriting standards got really terrible. The organizations failed. What happened? The taxpayers came to the rescue, unfortunately, with $188 billion, which has not been paid back. We still have these entities in conservatorship. One of the flaws both of us, coming from the private sector, saw was that this is not right; there is no way we should have entities where there is private sector gains when things are going well and public sector losses.

I wish to thank the Senator for joining in, for all of the hours he and his staff have put into this to try to make this bill as good as we can possibly make it to bring it to the floor.

I look forward to the input of the entire Senate. I hope we have an opportunity for a markup and a presentation later this fall. But I could not be more grateful to the Senator for his efforts and his willingness to do this and obviously his willingness to work hard to see this go across the finish line.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to return the same compliments to the Senator from Tennessee. He brought a greater breadth of background in housing finance and the public finance sector than I did. But together, working with our other colleagues, I think we have all built a series of critical points.

Again, echoing what the Senator from Tennessee said, there are always ways to improve on legislation, but the first and foremost point was that we need to make sure there is taxpayer protection. We need to make sure the taxpayers are fully repaid that $188 billion. We need to make sure as well—and we spend a great deal of time working with industry and others—that there continues to be broad access to market credit.

I think one of the challenges we both felt with Fannie and Freddie was there was not only a combination of a private sector gain, public sector loss with this kind of hybrid model, but layered on top of that was a social purpose. I, for one, believe very strongly that we have to make sure there is affordable housing, that there is good access to market credit. But when you layer that on a quasi-private entity, as we did for years with Fannie and Freddie, you end up where you are not sure whether those entities are performing that necessary securitization and financing purpose to maintain the overall housing financing sector or whether they are allowing certain loans that maybe shouldn't have gone into this process because of the social purpose.

So we have said: Well, we have to make sure there is the appropriate private sector taxpayer protection: 10 percent capital—very important. We also said: Let's go ahead and split off that public sector role, clearly identify it, make sure that for those loans that get securitized, a small transaction fee—not a tax, a small transaction fee—is charged. Those funds are then set aside to promote rental housing, access to credit, low-income housing. Have that audited, stand alone, perform that important function.

As we said as well, doing this, as the Senator from Tennessee has mentioned—he has been quite strong on this—we are going to make sure the government role is clearly defined but much more limited. There are some who say we can do this totally on the private sector side. Well, we hope there can still continue to be the 30-year fixed-mortgage product that I think the American public has come to expect. We can privatize more, but not having the ability to have the government backstop would remove that very essential component of our current housing financing system. So a more limited government role but still the ability for our American consumer to have the kind of access to the financial products they have come to expect. Again, it has been mentioned—making sure that we expand private sector capital and make sure that they take care of that underwriting and credit assessment that, quite honestly, the old model did not really provide.

I would like to ask the Senator from Tennessee this because this is one on which we went around and around. I again thank him and his staff and my staff and the staff of our now nine cosponsors of this legislation. One thing that was quite important to us was that if you are going to create this new model, how do we make sure that—while we want more competition, private sector competition, while we want institutions to be able to go ahead and provide this important issuance and securitization function, how do we make sure that those small banks—that community-based bank or that credit union, that small bank in Knoxville or that small bank in Martinsville, VA—still gets access to the same kind of ability to issue mortgages, have those mortgages securitized, and not be at a disadvantage of some of the mega-institutions?

So I would ask my colleague, the Senator from Tennessee Mr. CORKER, why doesn't the Senator speak to that issue because it did take us a lot of work to try to get this right, and there may be even further refinement. But I think this is an area—again, with the reaction we have seen from the credit unions, the community-based banks—where I think we have made a great first step.

Mr. CORKER. One of the things, no question, that many banks and credit unions around our country have been concerned about, even though Freddie and Fannie are 90 percent of all home mortgages today—and very dominant, obviously, because of what has happened but also because of the tremendous market share they have had—is if we are going to wind these down, are they going to be assured access into this market. So we have created mechanisms for them to be able to come in through issuers to do this.

One of the things so many of the community banks and credit unions have complained about as a tremendous disadvantage with our system was that there was volume pricing. In other words, if you were a big user of Fannie and Freddie, they gave you a big volume discount—Wells Fargo, Bank of America, JPMorgan. As they tried to process loans through Fannie and Freddie and this whole system, they got big volume discounts, so they were more competitive.

These organizations I mentioned are, obviously, important, but the community bankers who mean so much are the ones who drive things back home. The community bankers are members of the Rotary Club, the Lions Club, and are involved in our communities, and they were constantly at a disadvantage as it relates to housing finance. So one of the components of this bill is not only to ensure they get equal access to the system—and we do that very eloquently in this bill—but in addition to that we ensure there is no mechanism that allows for volume pricing.

Everybody is treated the same, as it should be, because in this particular case we end up with an explicit government guarantee that is very different. We don't have a situation where we have private shareholders doing well when things are doing good and the public doing bad. But one of the reasons we felt confident in moving in this direction was the tremendous amount of upfront capital.

So we dealt with the smaller institutions. As a matter of fact, we sat down and worked through the many issues they have brought up. We know how

important they are to everyone here and everyone in the country. We dealt with that, but we also created enough upfront capital, as the Senator has mentioned, to protect the public.

I know, again, that every bill can be improved. We saw that most recently with the immigration debate. As a matter of fact, I think that is a good model. We have introduced something that I hope the Banking Committee will take up soon. It is almost unprecedented to have nine members of the Banking Committee cosponsoring a piece of legislation. Hopefully it will have the opportunity for a markup, for improvements, and we know the chairman and ranking member, obviously, are going to want to put their stamp, as will many members on the committee, on anything that occurs. But I think we have done some of the work that is important to establish a very good beginning place.

We tried to address, as the Senator mentioned, the many community banks around our country that are in here constantly and that are so important to the States we represent. We have done that. Again, I know to the Senator and his staff, and many of the cosponsors, that was something that was an ultimate threshold for them, was to ensure the community bankers and credit unions around our country had the appropriate access, and I think we have hit that good place in this bill.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I know our time is about up, but I want to close and then I will turn it back over to the final comments of my colleague, the Senator from Tennessee.

I want to say to my colleagues and their staff and those interested in this issue that this was the one piece of unfinished business in our financial system reform. While there are some today who say: Well, things have gotten better, we should allow the status quo to continue—well, I don't think, from the administration on down, there is anyone who thinks the status quo simply continuing—with private sector gain and public sector losses—is the right model.

We ought to take the lessons we have learned over the last 5 years—some of the very good work in terms of the standardization that is being done at the FHA right now—and set up a new model. As the Senator from Tennessee said, make sure we get that taxpayer protection.

I would simply add that housing is a critically important part of our overall economy, and on any piece of legislation—and let me not say all these groups have endorsed this legislation but they have all been generally supportive, they all have had areas they wanted to see improvement in—when you have realtors and homebuilders and mortgage bankers and large and small banks and community organizations and groups who are concerned about low-income housing and rental housing all saying we are in the ballpark in an area that is so important to our economy and so complex, I think we have taken a great first step. So I would urge colleagues to join with us.

The Senator and I will be happy to come and make presentations. We have found, as we have sat down with many Members and walked them through all the processes and all of the kinds of protections we have built into this legislation, that the presentations have been one of the reasons we have had such success with nine members of the Banking Committee—almost half of the Banking Committee, without all of them even having had a full presentation—pledging their support.

I again thank my colleague, the Senator from Tennessee, for his great work and leadership. He has been the lead sponsor. I am proud to be his wing man on this as we continue to work through it.

My sense, though, is this is the time. It is my hope the Banking Committee will take up this piece of legislation and make their improvements on it. It would be a huge mistake, with interest rates at this kind of record low, with this housing market coming back, and with us putting in place a 5-year appropriate transition time, not to act now. If not now, then when would be the right time to do the kind of meaningful housing finance reform that I think so many experts across the ideological spectrum have all called for?

I look forward to working with my colleague, the Senator from Tennessee, and I thank him for his good work, and I am happy for him to close out our comments today.

Mr. CORKER. I thank the Senator again for all the hours that have been spent. I think we have both realized this is a beginning point, meaning this is a piece of legislation that has a lot of bipartisan support among talented and wise Members—excluding the two of us—and I thank him for joining in and helping make this bill better. Obviously, this is something we think may be taken up sometime this fall, and I do hope we will have the opportunity to make presentations to people throughout the Senate very soon.

I want to make two points. The Senator from Virginia, because of his background, was probably more involved in the banking issues than most people here because he brought a lot of background and expertise. I felt fortunate to be involved in some way during that time, and he and I both remember—and I hope Members of this body will remember—back to the big issue that people felt during that time was not addressed were the two GSEs, Fannie and Freddie. Candidly, it was a pretty complex undertaking. There were a lot of other things happening. It was a fair criticism, but at the same time, there was a lot being dealt with. Time has gone by now, the housing market has improved, but we still haven't finished our work.

I think most people here understand that this last crisis brought such hardship to so many people across this country, with trillions and trillions of dollars of household wealth going down the tube because we had a system that wasn't stable, a system that was making bets on things it shouldn't have been making. It was excessive. As the Senator has mentioned, between the regulators and some of the rules that have been passed, the system is stronger now, but we still have not dealt with this.

I would ask my colleagues to consider later this year looking at something to finish that work so we can shore up the housing market and do everything we can to keep that from happening again. Because again, we know how important the housing industry is to us.

Secondly, I think the window is closing. For what it is worth, there are a lot of people throughout our country who have a personal stake in trying to keep the status quo in place, to keep the situation where we have, again, private shareholders the public believes have the government standing behind it and no matter what they do they are going to be bailed out or whatever, placed in conservatorship. People are beginning to see that maybe even though these entities haven't paid back a single dime yet, they haven't reduced the $188 billion—not one penny of capital for the indebtedness has been returned. Certainly, there have been dividend payments. But people are coming out of the woodwork now to try to reinforce the old system.

Next year we are going to be moving into an election cycle again. It happens every 2 years around here. We have had a pretty productive year this year so far. I am proud of a lot of work the Senate has done. This is a big and important piece of work, as we have mentioned, that is undone. The timing is right because of a lot of forces out there that, again, would like to keep the status quo. So I want to again thank the Senator from Virginia for his thoughtfulness, the other Members who have cosponsored this and gone through a complex issue and come up with a very elegant solution to this problem, and I hope we will have the opportunity to work together to actually do something that makes our country stronger and causes our housing finance system, which is so important to our economy, to be more sustainable.

I thank the Senator. I look forward to coming to the floor with him again and continuing the many meetings we are having with Senators on both sides of the aisle and, hopefully, with a lot of input from others, coming up with a solution the entire body addresses.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING WILLIAM H. GRAY III

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a colleague, a leader, a statesman, and a humanitarian, but most of all I rise to pay tribute to my friend, Bill Gray, who passed away last week.

Bill Gray and I served together in the House of Representatives during a time that was much different than the world we see today. From his early days in Congress, Bill Gray sought to aid and unify an extremely diverse caucus. This collaborative work ethic, along with a comprehensive understanding of the congressional budget process, helped him earn the respect of his colleagues. Bill Gray rose through the ranks to become the first African American to chair the House Budget Committee. Later, he would serve as chair of the House Democratic Caucus and go on to become the House majority whip, the first African American to do so in each position, and at that time, the highest ranking African American in congressional history.

From his first day in Congress, through his rise to leadership, Bill Gray fought for the people of Philadelphia as a tremendous advocate for fairness, equity, and democracy. Bill was willing to compromise to get to a balanced budget because he knew it was good for the entire country, both the rich and the poor. He once said, ''A balanced budget is good for the country, the affluent and poor alike. I seek a budget that doesn't sacrifice programs for the poor and minorities, one that is fair and equitable.'' Gray's advocacy for fairness was also evident at the international level, as he was an early leader in the drive to end U.S. investment in the apartheid government of South Africa.

Bill Gray's commitment to humanity and public service did not begin or end with his time in Congress. Prior to serving in the House of Representatives, Bill was pastor of Bright Hope Baptist Church in North Philadelphia and still ministered to his congregation while serving in Washington. After retiring from Congress, he served as president of the United Negro College Fund, and was later appointed by President Bill Clinton to serve as Special Envoy to Haiti.

Despite all of Bill Gray's historic achievements, he still managed to remember his friends. A few years ago, Bill and his son, Justin, visited my home State of Nevada. The people he met in Las Vegas knew all too well of his service to this Nation and, even more, they just appreciated him for coming to visit our town. I appreciated him, too.

I will always remember Bill Gray, not only as a trailblazer or public servant, but as my friend. My thoughts are with his family and I hope fond memories offer comfort during this time of grief.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

CALIFORNIA CASUALTIES

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to 21 servicemembers from California or based in California who have died while serving our country in Operation Enduring Freedom since I last entered names into the RECORD on September 11, 2012. This brings to 402 the number of servicemembers either from California or based in California who have been killed while serving our country in Afghanistan. This represents 18 percent of all U.S. deaths in Afghanistan:

CS2 Milton W. Brown, 28, of Dallas, TX, died August 4, 2012, from a noncombat related incident in Rota, Spain. Culinary Specialist Second Class Brown was assigned to Strike Fighter Squadron (VFA) 137, Lemoore, CA;

Sgt Camella M. Steedley, 31, of San Diego, CA, died October 3, 2012, while supporting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Sergeant Steedley was assigned to Combat Logistics Regiment 17, 1st Marine Logistics Group, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA;

SGT Thomas R. Macpherson, 26, of Long Beach, CA, died October 12, 2012, in Andar District, Afghanistan, from small arms fire while on patrol during combat operations. Sergeant Macpherson was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, U.S. Army Special Operations Command, Joint Base Lewis-McChord, WA;

SGT Clinton K. Ruiz, 22, of Murrieta, CA, died October 25, 2012, of wounds suffered when his unit was attacked by small arms fire in Khas Uruzgan, Oruzgan Province, Afghanistan. Sergeant Ruiz was assigned to the 9th Military Information Support Battalion (Airborne), 8th Military Information Support Group (Airborne), Fort Bragg, NC;

SPC Daniel L. Carlson, 21, of Running Springs, CA, died November 9, 2012, in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan. Specialist Carlson was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 25th Aviation Regiment, 25th Combat Aviation Brigade, 25th Infantry Division, Wheeler Army Airfield, HI;

SSG Kenneth W. Bennett, 26, of Glendora, CA, died November 10, 2012, in Sperwan Gar, Afghanistan, from injuries sustained when he encountered an improvised explosive device during combat operations. Staff Sergeant Bennett was assigned to the 53rd Ordnance Company (EOD), 3rd Ordnance Battalion (EOD), Joint Base Lewis-McChord, WA;

PO1 Class Kevin R. Ebbert, 32, of Arcata, CA, died November 24, 2012, while supporting stability operations in Uruzgan Province, Afghanistan. Petty Officer First Class Ebbert was assigned to an east coast-based Naval Special Warfare unit in Virginia Beach, VA;

Sgt Michael J. Guillory, 28, of Pearl River, LA, died December 14, 2012, while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Sergeant Guillory was assigned to 1st Marine Special Operations Battalion, Camp Pendleton, CA;

SSgt Jonathan D. Davis, 34, of Kayenta, AZ, died February 22 while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Staff Sergeant Davis was assigned to Headquarters Battalion, 32nd Georgian Liaison Team, Regimental Combat Team 7, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA;

CPO Christian Michael Pike, 31, of Peoria, AZ, died March 13 in Landstuhl, Germany, as a result of combat-related injuries sustained on March 10 while conducting stability operations in Maiwand District, Afghanistan. Chief Petty Officer Pike was assigned to a west coast-based Naval Special Warfare unit;

SFC James F. Grissom, 31, of Hayward, CA, died March 21 at Landstuhl Regional Medical Center, Germany, of wounds suffered from small arms fire March 18 in Paktika Province, Afghanistan. Sergeant First Class Grissom was assigned to the 4th Battalion, 1st Special Forces Group (Airborne), Joint Base Lewis-McChord, WA;

SGT Deflin M. Santos Jr., 24, of San Jose, CA, died April 6 in Kandahar, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when enemy forces attacked his unit in Zabul, Afghanistan with a vehicle-borne improvised explosive device. Sergeant Santos was assigned to the 5th Squadron, 7th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Armor Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division, Fort Stewart, GA;

Capt Reid K. Nishizuka, 30, of Kailua, HI, died April 27 near Kandahar Airfield, Afghanistan, in the crash of an MC–12 aircraft. Captain Nishizuka was assigned to the 427th Reconnaissance Squadron, Beale Air Force Base, CA;

SSgt Richard A. Dickson, 24, of Rancho Cordova, CA, died April 27 near Kandahar Airfield, Afghanistan, in the crash of an MC–12 aircraft. Staff Sergeant Dickson was assigned to the 306th Intelligence Squadron, Beale Air Force Base, CA;

SPC Trinidad Santiago Jr., 25, of San Diego, CA, died May 2 in Camp Buehring, Kuwait, of injuries sustained in a vehicle accident. Specialist Santiago was assigned to 4th Battalion, 42nd Field Artillery Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Carson, CO;

Capt Victoria A. Pinckney, 27, of Palmdale, CA, died May 3 near Chon-Aryk, Kyrgyzstan, in the crash of a

KC–135 aircraft. Captain Pinckney was assigned to the 93rd Air Refueling Squadron, Fairchild Air Force Base, WA;

TSgt Herman Mackey III, 30, of Bakersfield, CA, died May 3 near Chon-Aryk, Kyrgyzstan, in the crash of a KC–135 aircraft. Technical Sergeant Mackey was assigned to the 93rd Air Refueling Squadron, Fairchild Air Force Base, WA;

SFC Jeffrey C. Baker, 29, of Hesperia, CA, died May 14 in Sanjaray, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when enemy forces attacked his unit with an improvised explosive device. Sergeant First Class Baker was assigned to 766th Ordnance Company, 63rd Ordnance Battalion, 52nd Ordnance Group, Fort Stewart, GA;

SPC William J. Gilbert, 24, of Hacienda Heights, CA, died May 14 in Sanjaray, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when enemy forces attacked his unit with an improvised explosive device. Specialist Gilbert was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 41st Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 1st Armored Division, Fort Bliss, TX;

SPC Ray A. Ramirez, 20, of Sacramento, CA, died June 1 in Wardak Province, Afghanistan, from injuries sustained when his unit was attacked by an improvised explosive device. Specialist Ramirez was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 15th Infantry Regiment, 4th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division, Fort Stewart, GA;

SGT Javier Sanchez Jr., 28, of Greenfield, CA, died June 23 in Sar Rowzah, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when his unit was attacked with an improvised explosive device while on mounted patrol. Sergeant Sanchez was assigned to the Special Troops Battalion, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division, Fort Drum, NY.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID J. HAYES

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize David J. Hayes, who stepped down on June 28, 2013, from his position as Deputy Secretary of the Department of the Interior, and I ask consent that the following remarks about him and his service be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTED REMARKS ON THE WORK OF DEPUTY SECRETARY DAVID J. HAYES

ELECTED OFFICIALS AND CABINET SECRETARIES

President of the United States Barack Obama: ''David's leadership at the Department of the Interior has played an important role in my Administration's efforts to expand domestic energy production, including renewable energy as well as America's oil and natural gas resources. His expertise has helped shape our approach to conservation and our efforts to combat climate change, and as the Chair of the interagency working group on energy development in Alaska he has ensured that decisions we make regarding the Arctic are based on the best science. I am also grateful for David's work to help usher in important water rights and legal settlements that will help restore trust and strengthen our relationship with Indian Country.''

Sally Jewell, Secretary of Interior: ''David has been a key architect for nearly every significant initiative undertaken at Interior over the last four years,'' said Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell. ''From his work on expanding renewable energy production on public lands and waters, to coordinating federal family energy activities in Alaska, to developing a landscape-scale approach to conservation and climate change, David has left an indelible mark.''

Ken Salazar, Former Secretary of Interior: ''Over the last 4 years, you have distinguished yourself as a key leader in implementing the President's agenda at the Department of the Interior. Your historic work on energy and climate change, conservation, Native Americans and water challenges have been at the heart of an Obama legacy and will last forever.''

''On the energy front, you have been one of the key players in the Administration, implementing the President's all-of-the-above energy strategy . . . You have played a key role in helping create a conservation legacy for the President. Your work has included helping define the future for the Atlantic and Arctic Circle, new urban parks, Gulf Coast Restoration, and the creation of a National Blueway System for America's rivers. The conservation community holds you in the highest regard.''

''As the Chief Operating Officer of the Department, you have led historic reforms in the organization of Interior including overhauling the agencies that oversee oil and gas production on public lands and implementing the numerous efficiency measures necessary for these tough fiscal times . . . ''

''Your results oriented approach to solving problems makes me very proud of you. In contributing to a lasting Presidential legacy, you have helped create a better world for humanity through your dedication, loyalty, and indefatigable energy.''

Congressman Tom Cole (R–OK): ''I note with deep regret the decision of Deputy Secretary of the Interior David Hayes to retire from public life,'' said Cole. ''David Hayes has been one of the most gifted and accomplished public servants of his generation. He served the Administration and, more importantly, the country with skill, integrity, vision and leadership.

''Among his many accomplishments, the most noteworthy is surely his settlement of the so-called Cobell lawsuit on terms that were not only beneficial to the government but fair to hundreds of thousands of Native Americans and to tribal governments. It was David who recognized a problem and turned it into a solution, not only in terms of just compensation to Indians for years of mismanagement of their trust accounts but for tribal governments as well. His proposal to use part of the settlement to purchase fractionated lands and return them to productive use will benefit individual Indians and tribal governments in perpetuity. Moreover, the addition of a scholarship fund for needy American Indian students, as a component of the settlement, will benefit generations to come.

''On countless issues, including the complex Oklahoma water issue, efforts to partner with Indian tribes for the management of federal properties and initiatives to foster and speed up the development of resources in Indian Country, David led with skill, finesse and innovation. Moreover, he did so in ways that were inclusive, bipartisan and transparent.

''I wish David every success in private life. However, I certainly hope at some time in the future, he returns to public service. He is simply too gifted and capable to remain on the sidelines as the great public issues of the day are discussed, debated and solved.''

U.S. Sen. Mark Begich (D–Alaska): ''David Hayes has been a good partner to Alaska. Together, we made significant progress on streamlining OCS permitting, and Alaska saw the first offshore wells drilled in decades. I know that without his commitment to the Alaska Interagency Working Group, we would not have seen that progress.''

Senator Dianne Feinstein (D–Calif.): ''I have long known David to be an ingenious problem solver who has demonstrated time and again that he can close the deal on solutions for the West's great battles over natural resources.''

''I will never forget David Hayes and Secretary Ken Salazar coming to my home in Washington on a Sunday morning to work on a solution that would dramatically improve the [water] allocation. David rolled up his sleeves and worked diligently until we had a workable solution.''

U.S. Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R–Alaska): ''I appreciate David's willingness to engage on difficult issues important to Alaskans, including contentious land management policies and offshore oil and gas development. The Alaska Interagency Working Group, which he headed, was central to improving the permitting process for offshore exploration. We did not always see eye to eye on what was best for Alaska, but David was effective and fair, and always brought honesty and integrity to what were sometimes tough discussions. I am sorry to see him leave.''

President Ben Shelly, Navajo Nation: ''Mr. Hayes has . . . tackled difficult topics with aplomb, including water rights settlements, energy development negotiations, and the non-renewable energy dependence of the Navajo Nation. He's demonstrated so with the utmost professionalism and understanding of the difficulty of the Navajo Nation . . .''

STAKEHOLDERS AND COLLEAGUES

Laura Crane, The Nature Conservancy: ''The Nature Conservancy commends David Hayes for his commitment to find workable solutions that support renewable energy goals and protect the needs of people and nature. The approach developed for solar development on federal land under Mr. Hayes' leadership represents an important step forward in how energy can be smartly developed on our public lands and should serve as a model for how the Bureau of Land Management addresses all forms of energy development.''

Helen O'Shea, NRDC: ''David Hayes has been a major leader of the Interior Department during the Obama Administration just as he was during the Clinton Administration. He has left a tremendous legacy, particularly in connection with the development of the Department's new program for managing solar resources of the public lands.''

Chris Wood, Trout Unlimited: ''David Hayes defines all that is good about public service . . . He understands the imperative of protecting special places such as Bristol Bay, Alaska—the world's most important salmon fishery—from industrial mining. Yet, in a demonstration of his balance, he also led Interior's push to expand renewable energy development on public lands while protecting fish, wildlife and water resources.''

''David is smart, hard-working and very responsive to constituents, regardless of what side of the aisle they sit. He is a strong advocate of using collaboration to resolve vexing natural resource problems such as on the Klamath and Penobscot rivers where dam removal will open hundreds of miles for migrating salmon and other ocean-going fish. He will be missed.''

John Podesta, Center for American Progress: ''Serving two presidents with honor and distinction, David Hayes has helped solve some of the nation's most complicated natural-resources challenges over the past two decades. He has brokered everything from water deals in California to the settlements of longstanding injustices in Indian country. He has been a leader in helping us prepare for the impacts of climate change on America's lands while ushering in a new era of smartly planned renewable-energy development in the Southwest and off our coasts. He has rightly earned a reputation as an honest broker, a tireless worker, a dedicated public servant, and an MVP when it comes to preserving America's great spaces.''

Greg Pensabene, America's Natural Gas Alliance: ''During a time when technological advances associated with natural gas production have created new opportunities for our country, David has emphasized the need for safe and responsible development, while recognizing the important role that this abundant, American fuel plays in improving national security, cleaning the air, and jumpstarting our economy.''

Jim Lanard, Offshore Wind Development Coalition: ''Since May 2009, when he was confirmed Deputy Secretary by a unanimous vote of the U.S. Senate, David Hayes has been a leader for offshore wind in the United States. While the industry is more than 20 years old in Europe, it is brand new here. Deputy Secretary Hayes understood this and impressively led his team to bring U.S. regulations into the 21st century. Under 'Smart from the Start,' he prepared federal and state governments to build a future for offshore wind energy.''

National Congress of American Indians: ''Deputy Secretary David Hayes will depart the Department of Interior having left an indelible mark on the federal trust relationship between the federal government and tribal nations. He has been a consistent presence in Indian Country working tirelessly to uphold our nation-to-nation relationship. As a key member of Secretary Salazar's team during the first term of the Obama Administration, David will be part of a legacy that has launched a new era in federal-tribal relations and set a new baseline for the Department of the Interior's engagement with tribal nations.''

Jamie Williams, The Wilderness Society: ''David leaves behind a tremendous conservation legacy at the Department of Interior, and we are deeply grateful for his work over the last four years.''

McKie Campbell, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee: ''I think whether you're agreeing with him or disagreeing with him on issues, David has established a good reputation as a square shooter . . . He listens, he communicates with people well, he's fair.''

Randall Luthi, National Ocean Industries Association: ''David Hayes was an experienced and often calm head through some very trying times both at the Department of the Interior and for the offshore oil and gas industry. He also made the effort to meet with industry officials, from large to small companies, to understand their concerns. Certainly decisions were made that may not have been industry's first choice, but he listened.''

Dean Elizabeth Magill, Stanford Law School: ''David has proven himself to be a visionary, effective, and wise policy maker.''

Paul Bledsoe, former Clinton Administration official: ''(A)mong the top three or four most important Democrats on natural resources issues in the last 20 years . . . Hayes has ridden point with Secretary Salazar on many critical issues, including offshore Alaska leases, siting of renewable energy on public lands and fracking regulations that allow for responsible shale development . . . It's hard to imagine anyone more expert in balancing the demands of resource protection, energy development and public uses of our national lands.''

Marilyn Heiman, Pew Center for the Environment: ''Few policymakers have the knowledge and the strategic capacity to navigate complex and challenging natural resource issues and reach successful outcomes as David.''

''I don't agree with all the decisions that have been made by the Department of Interior on offshore drilling, but I think they have been really well vetted and really thoroughly reviewed, and I have to say that I hadn't seen that kind of work in the past.''

''This is a complicated area with a lot of different constituencies. He has immersed himself in the nuts and bolts.''

Phil Taylor, E&E reporter: ''Hayes' work as a diplomat on Capitol Hill has been seen as an asset for the Obama administration as it tackles controversial land management challenges ranging from hydraulic fracturing to the management of sage grouse, wolves, wind power and national monuments on public lands.''

''Hayes, who also served as counselor and deputy secretary during the Clinton administration, had a hand in nearly every significant Interior policy over the past four . . . years He is credited with leading efforts to respond to and prepare for climate change at a landscape scale.''

''Under President Clinton, Hayes is credited with conserving old-growth redwoods in Northern California, pushing for the restoration of California's bay-delta ecosystem, and settling long-standing American Indian water rights disputes.''

''Hayes drew praise among conservation leaders and sportsmen's groups, which credited him with expanding renewable energy production on public lands while protecting valued habitats.''

''Described by some as a policy wonk, Hayes is known for his attention to detail and has been seen poring over stacks of binders in the Interior library. Sources say he reads many of the department's environmental impact statements, fat books that weigh the potential environmental outcomes of agency decisions.''

EXCERPTS FROM EMAILS TO DEPUTY SECRETARY HAYES

FROM CURRENT AND FORMER DOI EMPLOYEES

''Please know that your work never went unnoticed in the field, and we are very grateful to you for your support throughout the years.''

''I am simply writing to say thank you. Thank you from the bottom of my heart, and with the utmost sincerity, for placing the arctic on the national agenda. We are an arctic nation, and thank you so much for all of the tireless hours you have dedicated to the north, its people, and associated issues and concerns . . . I have developed a deep respect for you from a considerable lateral and vertical distance, and I want you to know that all of your hard work has meant a lot to at least one person in this wonderful state of Alaska.''

''I have appreciated your intelligence, your wit, and your thoughtful approach to managing the myriad of complicated issues here at the Department, and your work ethic has been nothing short of inspiring.''

''Your keen interest in Alaska and our multi-faceted (i.e. gnarly) issues has been particularly helpful to our work here. Your knowledge of all things big and small never ceased to amaze me. I hope that the many things that you started and shepherded will continue to their good end that you envisioned.''

''David, you've been such a mentor to me, and I credit a lot of my personal successes to your guidance and support. As for your time at the Interior Department, you always were the smartest person in the room, and an inspiring leader. And of course, and you've helped make history in overseeing DOI's incredible conservation and renewable energy work.''

''I know I speak for everyone who's had the chance to work closely with you over the past four years when I say that you will be very dearly missed here. I find it hard to imagine the Deputy Secretary's office, the Department and countless individual initiatives without your leadership and vision.''

''I learned much in my time at DOI and from you. One particular lesson was the importance of having a Deputy Secretary that understands DC and is willing to take the hits for the Secretary again and again. I know this was invaluable for the Secretary's agenda and for Interior.''

I want you to know that from my perspective as a career employee of almost 25 years, I can say honestly, and without any ulterior motives, that your legacy in Indian Country is one to be proud of and I think pretty darned unsurpassed. There are few thank yous in this business and I know that is not what motivates you. But I for one think you have done a great job and everyone is going to see how good it was once you are gone. I know that there are many others, tribal leaders included, who share my opinion.

FROM STAKEHOLDERS

''Selfishly, we are sad you are leaving the Department. It has been great working with you. As all the press reports say—you brought a very high standard to the Department and this will not be easy for the Secretary to replace . . . It has been a full term of work and so many challenges. We have appreciated your strong interest in Alaska and the Arctic, your dedication and hard work, your trust very much.''

''As you know, I'd feared this decision was coming for some time . . . Wanted you to know that I feel indebted to you for the continuing time, attention, expertise and consistent commitment that you've always made to elevate and address California-related conservation issues. You have made a real difference in your work at the Department—and beyond—over now two different Administrations.''

''I can't begin to fathom all the pressures and demands that have been placed upon you. Nevertheless, you were always willing to engage on issues of conservation concern, you were unfailingly gracious, you led the effort to bring appropriate attention to Arctic issues, and I am confident that you had a central role in securing the gains that have been made, in particular the balanced approach to management of the NPR–A, for which I am especially grateful.''

''I can't always agree with where we end up but the fact is you've been the highest ranking US official in 30 years to constantly give this Arctic part of the world attention, and that's worthy of recognition and gratitude.''

''No one has contributed more to the spirit of conservation and the wise use of our nation's resources than you have over the past 20 years.''

''I had the pleasure of working for over 30 years as a Federal employee and worked with many outstanding leaders. In my estimation your contributions elevate you to the top tier of leadership. I have always been impressed with your outstanding ability to listen, to remain positive, to be accessible and maybe most of all in these challenging times to be honest in your assessment and discussions about your views.''

COLLEAGUES

''We could not have made it without your support, your intervention at all the right

times, and your full participation . . . We owe you a debt of gratitude; and for me, personally, it has helped remind me yet again of what true public service looks like.''

''You are going to be sorely missed in the Department. Your record over the years is incredibly impressive. I hope that you will be able to look back in the years ahead and see how your work lives on in so many ways and for so many millions of people. I am proud to know you and to call you a friend and colleague.''

''This is a huge loss for our community . . . From the fiery speech you delivered at the Great Outdoors America reception in 2011 to your focus on regional energy issues in Alaska, it was refreshing to have such a strong friend of conservation at DOI.''

''I am sad for the public lands and great places in America that you are leaving the Department of the Interior . . . You have been the best possible advocate for everything that is most important to me.''

''It is a big loss for us today in the Obama Administration. We are all so sad to see you go . . . You have a big fan club and will be so sorely missed!''

''You have been a steady, smart, and fun ally and friend throughout. I appreciate you and will miss you during the rest of my time in the Obama Administration.''

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DR. CLINTON PATTEA

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to acknowledge the passing of longtime tribal leader Dr. Clinton Pattea, the president of the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation in Arizona.

Dr. Pattea was one of the longest serving Native American public officials in the Nation. Last year—coinciding with the State of Arizona's centennial celebration—we marked Dr. Pattea entering his 50th year of service to the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation's tribal council. While he held a variety of elected posts, including tribal councilman and vice president, most of his time in office was spent serving as the tribe's president.

President Pattea was a true visionary in his community and throughout Indian Country. He was a strong advocate for the principles of tribal self-governance and Indian self-determination, which over the years helped bring about positive change in the relationship between the Federal Government and all Native Americans.

He was among the first tribal leaders in Arizona to acknowledge the tremendous economic potential that Indian gaming offered his people. Dr. Pattea was a fierce advocate for developing a government-to-government relationship with the State of Arizona and worked tirelessly to spearhead a voter-approved tribal gaming compact that has made Arizona the pinnacle of regulated Indian gaming that we know today.

Over the past 30 years, I have personally witnessed the Fort McDowell Yavapai make tremendous strides as a community, and I attribute much of that success to Dr. Pattea's leadership. He directed his tribal government to develop business ventures to help take his community out of poverty; he successfully fought for the Nation's Federal water rights settlement; and he assembled a tribal government that is among the best examples of a sovereign governing body in the country. Today, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation stands as a leader in the Valley of the Sun as well as the United States.

We were fortunate to have been enriched by Dr. Pattea's passion for public service. His work with the tribal council brought him immense satisfaction. It is fitting that his legacy will continue on through the recently established Dr. Clinton M. and Rosiebelle Pattea Foundation, which will fund tribal scholarships for education, culture, health and wellness programs in his name.

I offer my deepest condolences to the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation on Dr. Clinton Pattea's passing. My thoughts and prayers are with his tribal members and his loved ones.•

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL KEVIN J. WILSON

• Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and pay tribute to COL Kevin J. Wilson for his exceptional contributions to the Nation as he concludes 30 years of service in the U.S. Army, culminating as commander of the U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center. Throughout his Army career, Colonel Wilson has displayed superior leadership, outstanding professional competence and initiative, dedication, and commitment to the welfare of soldiers, civilians, and their families. He has made significant and lasting contributions to the development, training, and leadership of the Army.

Colonel Wilson has performed with distinction in all of his assignments including as the group operations officer for the 555th Combat Engineer Group, the military assistant to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works while stationed at the Pentagon, the battalion commander of the 249th Engineer Battalion (Prime Power) at Fort Belvoir, VA, the U.S. Northern Command/J–4 Army engineer officer at Peterson Air Force Base, CO, the Commander of the Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and, most recently, as the commander of the Engineer Research and Development Center.

As commander of the Engineer Research and Development Center, the Department of Defense's largest multidisciplined engineering and research center, Colonel Wilson has taken the organization to the highest performance levels with a focus on human capital and positioning the center for dramatic increases in performance and effectiveness. His support of research and development is second to none, and he provides innovative pathways for technology transfer that speeds the integration of new ideas. Colonel Wilson has also supported the warfighter by equipping both deploying tactical units and the U.S. Army Engineer School with new combat systems and training on the Engineer Research and Development Center's capabilities.

Colonel Wilson was an extremely effective brigade-level commander in Afghanistan, responsible for all corps operations for Regional Command-South and Regional Command-West. His efforts focused on military construction in support of the buildup of U.S. forces, facilities for the Afghanistan National Security Forces, and water resources and infrastructure projects. While deployed, he coordinated with regional and battlespace commanders, North Atlantic Treaty Organization and coalition partners, Provincial Reconstruction Teams, U.S. Forces-Afghanistan, the U.S. Department of State, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and U.S. and Afghan government agencies and organizations at all levels. During this deployment, he focused on big picture projects such as electricity for Kandahar and critical road infrastructure for Regional Command-S, proving he could successfully integrate the operations of U.S. and coalition partners.

Colonel Wilson was commander of the Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, where he led 500 personnel, executing military construction, civil works, and environmental programs throughout the State. Due to his drive and foresight, Colonel Wilson's command was able to execute end-of-year funding to protect Alaska Native villages from coastal erosion. This tremendous feat was recognized by the Alaska Congressional delegation and the Alaska Native community. As commander of the largest geographic and perhaps most complex U.S. Army Corps of Engineers district, Colonel Wilson deftly weaved disparate units into a cohesive team driven to deliver excellent products to its customers, winning four Pacific Air Force Engineer awards and being named the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Project Delivery Team of the Year. Under his leadership, the Alaska District consistently improved its delivery of military construction, civil works, and environmental projects, ensuring they were on time and under budget, routinely winning accolades from customers.

As the U.S. Northern Command/J–4 engineer officer stationed at Peterson Air Force Base, Colonel Wilson was the subject matter expert on Army military construction capabilities, prime power, electrical power systems, and emergency support functions. He served as a trusted member of the Federal Emergency Management Agency disaster response team during several hurricanes, later leading a hurricane conference, from which a pre-scripted request for assistance was developed, to help local officials better understand the assets available during a disaster. As a part of the Joint Planning

Group, he was an integral part of long range homeland defense planning. He was also a member of the Current Operations Group and played a key role as the J–4 representative during crisis operations and exercises.

Colonel Wilson had the distinct honor of leading the 249th Engineer Battalion, the only Prime Power Engineer Battalion in the Army. He was responsible for contingency deployment of power production personnel, as well as power generation and distribution of equipment in support of Combat Commanders, Joint Task Forces, and Installation Commanders worldwide. His soldiers kept up an unbelievable operations tempo during Operation Iraqi Freedom and deployments to Afghanistan, Kuwait, Philippines, Kyrgyzstan, Guam, and Turkey. Support operations included major deployments in disaster relief. Colonel Wilson was also responsible for the Prime Power School, for its training program and for recruitment and retention. As a battalion commander, he was a proven professional who always accomplished the mission, took care of his soldiers, and planned, thought, and communicated as a leader.

I would like to extend my deepest thanks to Colonel Wilson for his many years of service to our Nation. I wish the absolute best to him and his family as they begin this next stage in their lives.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:06 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony honoring the life and legacy of Nelson Mandela on the occasion of the 95th anniversary of his birth.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2199. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Novaluron; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 98389–7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2200. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fenbuconazole; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9390–5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2201. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to balances carried forward at the end of fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2202. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, (2) two reports relative to vacancies in the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2203. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2013–0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2204. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prohibitions and Conditions on the Importation and Exportation of Rough Diamonds'' (RIN1515–AD85) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2205. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Streamlining Requirements Governing the Use of Funding for Supportive Housing for the Elderly and Persons With Disabilities Programs'' (RIN2502–AI67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2206. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Production of FHFA Records, Information, and Employee Testimony in Third-Party Legal Proceedings'' (RIN2590–AA51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2207. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Availability of Non-Public Information'' (RIN2590–AA06) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2208. A communication from the Administrator of the U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2209. A communication from the Management Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Definition of a Ski Area'' (RIN0596–AD12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2210. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''U.S. Department of Energy Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 3 Disposition Decision Analysis and Timeline Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2211. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2013 Annual Plan: Ultra-Deepwater and Unconventional Natural Gas and Other Petroleum Resources Research and Development Program''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2212. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Format and Content for Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report'' (Regulatory Guide 1.185, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 27, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2213. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Nuclear Material Control and Accounting Systems for Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 5.29, Revision 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 27, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2214. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: MAGNASTOR System'' (RIN3150–AJ22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2215. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Delegation of Authority to the Southern Ute Indian Tribe to Implement and Enforce National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants and New Source Performance Standards'' (FRL No. 9828–6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2216. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities

and Pollutants; District of Columbia; Control of Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerator Units'' (FRL No. 9829–6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2217. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Method for the Determination of Lead in Total Suspended Particulate Matter'' (FRL No. 9828–6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2218. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Final Integrated Section 203 Navigation Study Report and Environmental Assessment for the Canaveral Harbor, Brevard County, Florida project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2219. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, notification that the Administration has contracted with the National Academy of Public Administration to develop and submit a report proposing a long-range strategic plan for the Social Security Administration's consideration; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2220. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Croatian Per Se Corporation'' (Notice 2013–44) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2221. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Eligibility for Minimum Essential Coverage for Purposes of the Premium Tax Credit'' (Notice 2013–41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2222. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Applicable Federal Rates–July 2013'' (Rev. Rul. 2013–15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2223. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Appeals Settlement Guideline–New Qualified Plug-In Electric Drive Motor Vehicle Credit'' (UIL: 30D.00–00) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2224. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant Issue Revenue Procedure'' (Rev. Proc. 2013–32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2225. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Child Welfare Outcomes 2008–2011: Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2226. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to revoking the designation of a group designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization (OSS 2013–0968); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2227. A communication from the Acting Inspector General, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2228. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–033); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2229. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–065); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2230. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–099); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2231. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–086); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2232. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to amendment to parts 120, 121, 123, 124, and 125 of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Cynthia L. Attwood, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring April 27, 2019.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1271. A bill to direct the President to establish guidelines for the United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1272. A bill to provide that certain requirements of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act do not apply if the American Health Benefit Exchanges are not operating on October 1, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BEGICH, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1273. A bill to establish a partnership between States that produce energy onshore and offshore for our country with the Federal Government; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1274. A bill to extend assistance to certain private nonprofit facilities following a disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1275. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to issue a fishing capacity reduction loan to refinance the existing loan funding the Pacific Coast groundfish fishing capacity reduction program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1276. A bill to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management, strengthen the authority to terminate or debar employees and contractors involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of security clearance background investigations, enhance transparency regarding the criteria utilized by Federal departments and agencies to determine when a security clearance is required, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1277. A bill to establish a commission for the purpose of coordinating efforts to reduce prescription drug abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. Res. 193. A resolution honoring the fallen heroes of the Granite Mountain Interagency Hotshot Crew; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 194. A resolution congratulating the 1963 men's basketball team of Loyola University Chicago on its induction into the National Collegiate Basketball Hall of Fame, the 50th anniversary of the team's Division I National Collegiate Athletic Association men's basketball championship, and the team's historic NCAA tournament game against Mississippi State University; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 116

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 116, a bill to revise and extend provisions

under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 273

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 273, a bill to modify the definition of fiduciary under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to exclude appraisers of employee stock ownership plans.

S. 325

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 325, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 399

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 399, a bill to protect American job creation by striking the Federal mandate on employers to offer health insurance.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 429

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 484

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 484, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act relating to lead-based paint renovation and remodeling activities.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 742

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 742, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 759, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 825

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 825, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 855

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 855, a bill to increase the portion of community development block grants that may be used to provide public services, and for other purposes.

S. 871

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 871, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance assistance for victims of sexual assault committed by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 1009

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1009, a bill to reauthorize and modernize the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1068

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1068, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1123, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1143

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1159

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1159, a bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to prohibit discrimination on account of sexual orientation or gender identity when extending credit.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1217

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1217, a bill to provide secondary mortgage market reform, and for other purposes.

S. 1241

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1241, a bill to establish the interest rate for certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 193—HONORING THE FALLEN HEROES OF THE GRANITE MOUNTAIN INTERAGENCY HOTSHOT CREW

Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 193

Whereas, on June 30, 2013, 19 firefighters of the Prescott Fire Department's Granite Mountain Interagency Hotshot Crew (referred to in this preamble as the ''Crew'') gave their lives battling the Yarnell Hill Fire in Yavapai County, Arizona;

Whereas the loss of these 19 brave men makes the Yarnell Hill Fire the deadliest wildfire in the history of the State of Arizona and the worst wildland firefighter fatality incident in the United States in 80 years;

Whereas Eric Marsh, who was 43 years old and a native of Ashe County, North Carolina, served as the Crew's superintendent;

Whereas Jesse Steed, who was 36 years old and a native of Cottonwood, Arizona, served as the Crew's captain;

Whereas Clayton Whitted, who was 28 years old, was a native of Prescott, Arizona;

Whereas Robert Caldwell, who was 23 years old, was a native of Prescott, Arizona, and was the cousin of Grant McKee, who also perished battling the Yarnell Hill Fire;

Whereas Travis Carter, who was 31 years old, was a native of Prescott, Arizona;

Whereas Christopher MacKenzie, who was 30 years old, was a native of Hemet, California;

Whereas Travis Turbyfill, who was 27 years old, was a native of Prescott, Arizona;

Whereas Andrew Ashcraft, who was 29 years old, was a native of Prescott, Arizona;

Whereas Joe Thurston, who was 32 years old, was a native of Cedar City, Utah;

Whereas Wade Parker, who was 22 years old, was a native of Chino Valley, Arizona;

Whereas Anthony Rose, who was 23 years old, was a native of Zion, Illinois;

Whereas Garret Zuppiger, who was 27 years old, was a native of Phoenix, Arizona;

Whereas Scott Norris, who was 28 years old, was a native of Prescott, Arizona;

Whereas Dustin DeFord, who was 24 years old, was born in Baltimore, Maryland and raised in Ekalaka, Montana;

Whereas William ''Billy'' Warneke, who was 25 years old, was a native of Hemet, California;

Whereas Kevin Woyjeck, who was 21 years old, was a native of Seal Beach, California;

Whereas John Percin, Jr., who was 24 years old, was a native of West Linn, Oregon;

Whereas Grant McKee, who was 21 years old, was a native of Newport Beach, California, and was the cousin of Robert Caldwell, who also perished battling the Yarnell Hill Fire;

Whereas Sean Misner, who was 26 years old, was a native of Goleta, California;

Whereas the Granite Mountain Interagency Hotshot Crew was founded as a fuel mitigation crew in 2002, and, around 2008, became the first municipal hotshot crew in the United States;

Whereas the Granite Mountain Interagency Hotshot Crew was an elite ground firefighting crew, hailed from diverse backgrounds, and worked long hours in extreme environmental conditions while performing physically demanding fireline tasks; and

Whereas, on July 1, 2013, the Governor of Arizona declared a state of emergency because of the Yarnell Hill Fire, by which date the fire had already burned approximately 8,300 acres, threatened or destroyed hundreds of homes and other structures, and forced the evacuation of approximately 1,250 people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the memory of the fallen heroes of the Prescott Fire Department's Granite Mountain Interagency Hotshot Crew;

(2) extends its deepest condolences and sympathy to the surviving families of the 19 firefighters lost in the line of duty; and

(3) commends the bravery and sacrifice made by these fallen wildland firefighters in the service of their communities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 194—CONGRATULATING THE 1963 MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM OF LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO ON ITS INDUCTION INTO THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE BASKETBALL HALL OF FAME, THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TEAM'S DIVISION I NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION MEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP, AND THE TEAM'S HISTORIC NCAA TOURNAMENT GAME AGAINST MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 194

Whereas, in 1963, Coach George Ireland led the men's basketball team of Loyola University Chicago (referred to in this preamble as the ''Ramblers'') to the Division I National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the ''NCAA'') men's basketball championship;

Whereas the Ramblers lost only 2 games during the 1962–1963 season and led the Nation in scoring with an average of 91.8 points per game;

Whereas Coach Ireland and the Loyola University men's basketball teams of the early 1960s are considered by many to be responsible for ushering in a new era of racial equality in the sport by shattering major racial barriers in NCAA men's basketball;

Whereas, in 1963, the Ramblers shocked the Nation and changed college basketball forever by starting 4 African-American players in the NCAA tournament, as well as the championship game;

Whereas it is difficult to appreciate what Coach Ireland and his team went through, starting in 1961, in breaking what had been a longstanding ''gentleman's agreement'' to play not more than 3 African-American players;

Whereas, during the 1962–1963 season, Coach Ireland started 4 African-American players in every game, and, in December 1962, the Ramblers became the first team in NCAA Division I history to have an all-African-American lineup in a game against the University of Wyoming;

Whereas, despite their success during the 1962–1963 season, the players and Coach Ireland endured terrible bigotry, including racial taunts and abuse, and received countless pieces of hate mail from the Ku Klux Klan and other racist individuals, and all the while Coach Ireland tried to shield his team in every way possible;

Whereas the men's basketball team of Mississippi State University (referred to in this preamble as the ''Maroons'' and now called the ''Bulldogs'') won its second consecutive southeastern conference championship in 1963, but had been forced by the Governor of Mississippi not to accept NCAA tournament bids in the 3 previous seasons because of the inclusion of African-American players in the tournament;

Whereas, before advancing to the championship round, the Ramblers participated in the NCAA Midwest regional semifinal against the Maroons, a landmark game often referred to half a century later as the ''Game of Change'';

Whereas Mississippi State University president Dean Colvard and athletic director and men's basketball coach James Harrison ''Babe'' McCarthy bravely accepted the Maroons' 1963 NCAA tournament invitation against the wishes of the Governor of Mississippi;

Whereas, determined to play in the regional semifinal, the Maroons snuck out of Mississippi in the middle of the night to avoid an injunction, and the integrated Ramblers and the all-white Maroons met on the basketball court at Michigan State University on March 15, 1963;

Whereas, with police surrounding the sports complex in East Lansing, Michigan, the Ramblers went on to defeat the Maroons in a competitive game by a score of 61 to 51 in the regional semifinal, a game that changed race relations on the basketball court forever and was selected by the NCAA in 2006 as one of the 25 defining moments in the first 100 years of the organization;

Whereas the Ramblers went on to win games against the University of Illinois and Duke University before defeating the 2-time defending NCAA champion University of Cincinnati in overtime by a score of 60 to 58, the crowning achievement in Loyola University Chicago's nearly decade-long struggle with racial inequality in men's college basketball, highlighted by the tumultuous events of the 1963 NCAA tournament;

Whereas the Ramblers' 1963 NCAA title was historic not only for the racial makeup of the Ramblers, but also because the University of Cincinnati had started 3 African-American players, making 7 of the 10 starters in the 1963 NCAA championship game African American;

Whereas the city of Chicago has many storied sports teams, but the Ramblers basketball team of 1963 and Coach Ireland hold an exalted place because they are the only NCAA Division I Illinois basketball team to win a national championship and because they paved the way for the long overdue integration of races in college basketball before the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-352; 78 Stat. 241);

Whereas all 5 starting players from the national championship game graduated from Loyola University with a degree, and several went on to earn advanced degrees in law and business;

Whereas the journey of the Ramblers is not just the story of an underdog team overcoming great odds to beat the favored team from the University of Cincinnati, a much larger basketball program that held the number 1 ranking and had won the previous 2 national championships;

Whereas the real significance of Coach Ireland and the Ramblers is the lasting impact of their bravery in breaking the racial barrier in college basketball that had been allowed to prevail for decades; and

Whereas the 2013 Hall of Fame induction season will mark the 50th anniversary of the 1963 Ramblers' basketball championship, making the 1963 Ramblers the first whole team ever to be honored in the Hall of Fame: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Coach George Ireland and the 1963 Loyola University Chicago men's basketball championship team on their induction into the National Collegiate Basketball Hall of Fame;

(2) honors the 50th anniversary of the historic Division I National Collegiate Athletic Association championship of the Loyola University Chicago men's basketball team and the profound athletic and civil rights achievements of the 1963 team; and

(3) honors the 1963 Mississippi State University men's basketball team for their bravery and sportsmanship in rejecting racism and aiding in the civil rights movement in the State of Mississippi and the southeastern United States.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship will meet on July 17, 2013, at 3 p.m. in room 428A Russell Senate Office building to hold a roundtable entitled ''Small Business Tax Reform: Making the Tax Code Work for Entrepreneurs and Startups.''

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 10, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room SH–562 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 10, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Repealing the SGR and the Path Forward: A View from CMS.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 10, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 10, 2013, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Lessons Learned from the Boston Marathon Bombings: Preparing for and Responding to the Attack.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 10, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Judicial Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 10, 2013, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Diabetes Research: Reducing the Burden of Diabetes at All Ages and Stages.''

The Committee will meet in room G–50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building beinnging at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION, PRODUCT SAFETY, AND INSURANCE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 10, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will conduct a hearing entitled, ''Stopping Fraudulent Robocall Scams: Can More Be Done?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL VISITOR CENTER DONOR CONTRIBUTION ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message received from the House of Representatives with respect to H.R. 588.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a bill H.R. 588 to provide for donor contribution acknowledgements to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOUTH UTAH VALLEY ELECTRIC CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 85, H.R. 251.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 251) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 251) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BONNEVILLE UNIT CLEAN HYDROPOWER FACILITATION ACT

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H.R. 254.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 254) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 254) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 11, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, July 11, 2013; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that the majority leader be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, just so that is clear, I want the unanimous consent request to indicate that after we have done the morning hour, after the Journal of proceedings has been approved and the time for the two leaders has been used or reserved for their use later in the day, that I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that after I am recognized and after Senator MCCONNELL and I have finished our remarks, that the time until 12:30 be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first half hour and the majority controlling the second half hour; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 to 2:15 to allow for caucus meetings.

I ask the Chair if it is clear now, what I muddled through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is clear.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Further, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized at 2:15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:53 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 11, 2013, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MARGARET LOUISE CUMMISKY, OF HAWAII, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE APRIL S. BOYD, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MATTHEW WINTHROP BARZUN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND.

JOHN HOOVER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SIERRA LEONE.

CRYSTAL NIX–HINES, OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS THE UNITED STATES PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION.

JOHN R. PHILLIPS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SAN MARINO.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MICHAEL KEITH YUDIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE ALEXA E. POSNY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ACKNOWLEDGING ALEX FERREIRA'S SERVICE TO THE PLACER COUNTY WATER AGENCY

HON. TOM McCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alex Ferreira who will be retiring from the Placer County Water Agency after serving 17 years on the Board of Directors.

Mr. Ferreira began his long career of service as an infantryman of the U.S. Army during World War II. Ferreira celebrated his 19th birthday in May 1945 during the Battle of Okinawa. Rising to the rank of Sergeant, Ferreira was among the American forces that served in Japan to secure peace following the end of the war.

A life-long resident of Placer County, Ferreira returned home to Lincoln after the war to farm, raise a family, and continue his public service through local government.

Ferreira entered public office in June 1966 when he was appointed to the Nevada Irrigation District Board as the Placer County representative. He later was elected to the Placer County Board of Supervisors, a position he held for over 20 years. In 1997, Ferreira began serving on the Board of Directors of the Placer County Water Agency. He has been recognized by his peers at the water agency as having been instrumental in the formation of the "Western Placer Agriculture Water Service Zone 5" and the Middle Fork Project Authority.

Ferreira's dedication to his community is further exemplified by his service on the Placer County Grand Jury, the Gold Country Fair Board, membership in the Placer Farm Bureau, Tahoe Cattlemen's Association and other agricultural and community organizations.

After a career of public service that has spanned more than 6 decades, Ferreira is embarking on a well-earned retirement, at the age of 87, planning to spend time with his wife Bonnie on their Lincoln ranch.

It is my honor to rise today in appreciation and acknowledgement of his service to our country and community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LABORERS UNION LOCAL 165

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Laborers International Union of North America (LIUNA), Local 165 on the occasion of their 100th Anniversary.

LIUNA is a progressive, fast growing union of construction workers that are at the forefront of their industry, with over a half million members across the United States and Canada.

I understand and appreciate the important role that organized labor, and chapters such as Local 165, play in our communities here in the 17th Congressional District of Illinois and across the country. Organizations such as LIUNA have a tremendous positive impact on the working families of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to congratulate the Laborers Local 165 on this notable event, and am glad that organizations like theirs exist, and I thank them for their contributions to our community.

COMMENDING THE VENTURA COUNTY VETERANS FUND

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I commend the services provided to our nation's veterans through the Ventura County Veterans Fund.

In 2013, $75,000 will be awarded to various organizations that offer fundamental services to veterans and their family members through the Ventura County Veterans Fund. These organizations pay particular attention to those veterans who have returned from war and are transitioning to civilian life. This year's recipients of Ventura County Veterans Fund Grants are: California Lutheran University, California State University Channel Islands Foundation, Oxnard College, Reins of H.O.P.E., Turning Point Foundation, Ventura County Jewish Family Services and White Heart Foundation.

I am profoundly grateful for the service and sacrifices of our nation's veterans, members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and their families. As a member of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, I understand the struggles our heroes face when they return from war and transition to civilian life. The services that will be provided from the Ventura County Veterans Fund Grants will ease this transitional process and allow our veterans to become leaders in our communities.

I also wish to pay tribute to the hard work of the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation and the Ventura County Community Foundation. Their diligence for Ventura veterans is commendable and greatly appreciated. The grants being awarded this year through the Ventura County Veterans Fund would not be possible without the tireless work of these organizations.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting our nation's veterans through the valuable services that organizations like Gold Coast Veterans Foundation, Ventura County Community Foundation, and other Veteran Service Organizations provide our veterans on a daily basis.

HONORING SUPERVISOR PAUL TEIXEIRA

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I regrettably rise to honor the memory of San Luis Obispo County 4th District Supervisor Paul Teixeira from Nipomo, CA, who passed away June 26, 2013 at his home.

Supervisor Teixeira was elected in 2010, representing the communities of Arroyo Grande, Oceano and Nipomo and was the current Chairman of the SLO County Board of Supervisors. As a third generation Californian raised in southern San Luis Obispo County, Supervisor Teixeira graduated Arroyo Grande High School and attended Allan Hancock College and Cal Poly State University, studying agricultural management. After school, he went to work at Kaman Industrial Technologies in Santa Maria as an operations manager for 22 years.

Supervisor Teixeira was an example of a committed community member and leader, where he served on the Lucia Mar Unified School District Board and the San Luis Obispo County Parks Commission. He was involved with many community groups such as Rotary, 4–H, FFA, Dana Adobe Nipomo Amigos, Salvation Army of Santa Maria Valley and Jack Ready Park & Jack's Helping Hand. His honors include Lifetime Achievement Award from the Nipomo Chamber of Commerce, Distinguished Rotarian of the Rotary Club of Nipomo and Honorary Chapter Degree from Nipomo Future Farmers of America. Supervisor Teixeira is survived by his wife Deanna and five children.

On a personal note, Paul always extended a gracious hand when working together on issues of importance to our community. He was a kind man of character who cared for his constituents and I am honored to have worked with him.

Paul's passing will be felt deeply by the many people who knew and worked with him. The San Luis Obispo community will miss an invaluable leader and friend. I offer my most heartfelt condolences to Paul's family and friends. Please join me in honoring this exemplary American and San Luis Obispo County resident.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF KENZO KAMEI

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary man, Kenzo Kamei, who was born in Vacaville, California on August 28, 1931, and died on June 1,

2013. Kenzo Kamei spent his early years in Japan where he attended elementary and secondary school. He returned to California at the age of 18, and worked with his parents harvesting crops and working on farms. As a young man he met and married Ruth Kisa ''Kisako'' Nishimoto in Sunnyvale, California, and shortly thereafter the couple was interned at Heart Mountain, Wyoming.

Kenzo Kamei kept many mementos which documented his time at Heart Mountain . . . his daily work release pay stubs recording his earnings of $18 per month, the highest in the camp, and the receipt that he was given on his final release from the Camp, giving him $28, or $5 per day for five days of travel, and $3 for subsistence enroute. These artifacts are now part of an interpretive center built by the Heart Mountain Wyoming Foundation, a nonprofit group that has made it its mission to tell the many stories of internment, about triumph and tragedy, prejudice and friendship. After being released from internment, Kenzo and Ruth returned to Sunnyvale. Kenzo worked as a gardener and warehouseman, and he and Ruth saved enough money to launch Kamei Nursery, Inc., a grower of award-winning flowers, in Mountain View, California. They opened nurseries in Mountain View and Morgan Hill, and they were key in founding the Buddhist Temple in Mountain View.

Kenzo Kamei was a devoted husband who spent several years caring for his beloved wife of 70 years, who passed away on June 8, 2012. Kenzo leaves his son Kenneth; his daughters, Eileen (Robert) Eng, and Judy (Steve) Inamori. He also leaves his adored grandchildren, Ami, Ellen and Jonathan Kamei; Emily Eng Holbrook, Laura Eng Derdenger and Julia Eng; and Bradley, Gregory and Kathryn Inamori. He also leaves his great-grandson Davis Patrick Derdenger, and many nieces and nephews.

Mr. Speaker, Kenzo Kamei was an extraordinary American who will be greatly missed by his family and his community. I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our condolences to his family and friends who mourn his passing and honor his life which was lived in dignity and accomplishment.

CELEBRATING BILL GRAY

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the chorus of those honoring the late William Herbert Gray III. Congressman Gray's 21 years in the House saw him rise to the Chairmanship of the Budget Committee as well as being elected Democratic Whip. While many have honored Bill for his contributions to public affairs, I would like to recognize his distinguished service in the corporate world.

Following his career in the House, Gray served on the Board of Dell Inc. for 13 years and was an integral part of Dell's global success. In the corporate setting, Bill took his duties as a Board member very seriously. Not only did he actively participate in Board meetings, but he also brought his vast knowledge and experience to the daily workings of the company.

During his tenure at Dell, he regularly met with Government Affairs and Human Relations teams, among other employee groups, to provide insight, guidance, and counsel. As Dell grew globally, Bill underscored the importance of the company engaging in a dialogue with government leaders in markets from the US to Europe to China. He understood that corporate success globally meant more jobs in the United States.

Bill's passing was sudden and unforeseen, and a great loss to U.S. business and government. Michael Dell, the founder and CEO of Dell, shared that, ''Bill was a great friend and trusted advisor to me and our Board members. He brought a unique and distinctive perspective on our business and our industry. I valued his wisdom and insight on public policy matters, and benefitted greatly from his sage counsel for so many years.''

I appreciate the opportunity to pause for a moment to remember the many ways Bill Gray served his country. Erika and I extend our deepest sympathies to his family, friends, and colleagues.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for rollcall vote No. 316. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

HONORING THE LIFE OF WESTON ''BITZIE'' CONLEY OF MORATTICO, VA

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of a proud citizen of Morattico, Virginia, a man whose friendship I have valued for many years. The late Weston ''Bitzie'' Conley was truly a pillar of his community, and his legacy will undoubtedly live on in Lancaster County and across Virginia's Northern Neck.

During our time working together in both the seafood and the banking industries, Bitzie was a first-class Virginia gentleman, exhibiting the highest qualities of integrity, selflessness, and compassion for his neighbors. My thoughts and prayers go out to his wife, Dorothy Lee, his daughter, Connie, and to his many loved ones in this time of mourning. I would like to submit an article from the Rappahannock Record about Bitzie's life and his many passions.

[From Rappahannock Record, June 13, 2013]

WESTON 'BITZIE' CONLEY, SEAFOOD INDUSTRY AND COMMUNITY LEADER, DIES

(By Audrey Thomasson)

MORATTICO.—He was known as ''Bitzie'' to his friends and family. But Weston Franklin Conley Jr. was a giant when it came to serving the community he loved. On Friday, the 78-year-old businessman and local philanthropist quietly passed away at his Morattico home with his wife of 56 years, Dorothy Lee Clark, and daughter, Constance Elaine, by his side.

Conley was a force of inspiration in this community and a motivator for others, according to community leaders.

''He was a tremendous asset in how to conduct business and was a great help to me on the YMCA board,'' said District 4 supervisor William Lee, who succeeded Conley as board chairman. ''I gained so much from just listening to him.''

Lee, who served on several community boards with Conley, noted he was a man of integrity and generosity in both his business and personal endeavors.

''He was not slanted or biased. He always gave his honest opinion. Once he said to me, 'Bill, I wouldn't have what I have now if it wasn't for the black community.' I think he was referring to all the men and women who worked for his seafood company picking crabs. Anybody that needed something could go to him. He gave of his time and talents beyond his resources,'' said Lee.

LEGACY

Part of Conley's legacy is evident in the growth and success of the Northern Neck YMCA.

Mark Favazza, branch executive of the YMCA, said Conley's fiscal wisdom, integrity, strategic thinking and coalition building made him an important leader in the development of the Kilmarnock facility, including heading the capital campaign that led to the Wiley Child Development Center.

''He wanted a place where children could be safe, families could find support, and everyone was welcome . . . He was the kind of man who worked privately and led behind the scenes . . . His humble service left an enduring impact on our YMCA, the Wiley Center . . . and me,'' said Favazza.

MORATTICO'S ''MAYOR''

Conley's devotion to his heritage and home town exemplified his all-in style when he purchased Morattico's General Store in 2003 and donated it to the community as the Morattico Waterfront Museum, which he helped establish. No doubt Conley wanted to preserve fond memories of growing up and working in the general store his parents owned and operated for 18 years beginning in 1935, a year after his birth in Baltimore.

Today, the museum also serves as a community center for the families of Morattico. The first floor remains much like the general store of his youth while the second floor pays homage to the town's watermen.

''Everyone here called him Morattico's unofficial mayor,'' said Liz Failmezger, a village resident and former member of the museum board. ''This is the saddest loss. He was one of the first people to welcome those of us who moved here. He was so genuine—and a true gentleman. He was our go-to guy for everything.''

MENTOR AND FRIEND

''The county has lost one of its most prominent and charitable citizens,'' said District 1 supervisor and board chairman Butch Jenkins, a longtime friend.

Jenkins was only five years old when he met the ''hard-charging'' Conley, a man he always knew as Bitzie.

''He treated me as a little adult,'' said Jenkins. ''I do not know when I became his friend, but he was my friend by the time I was six years old.''

Later, when Jenkins decided to run for supervisor, he sought his older friend's counsel. ''And good advice his proved to be,'' he said. ''Over my time on the board, I often sought his feelings on pending issues . . ., although we sometimes disagreed. ''When I persisted, he told me, 'Butch, you usually do all right,

but sometimes, you can be a little hard-headed.' ''

Jenkins described Conley as ''a gifted friend who cared enough to tell me exactly what he thought and, as my friend, forgave me anyway for doing what he believed to be wrong.

''My sense of loss, as strong as it is to me, must pale to that experienced by his widow, Dorothy Lee, and daughter, Connie . . . and all the members of the extended family he broadened so freely and gladly. I can only hope . . . that the mercy of our Savior will relieve us in time of the pain of our loss and allow us only to revel in the joy of... sharing in the life of this good, caring man,'' Jenkins said.

LEADER

Conley attended Lively High School and Richmond Professional Institute. After serving in the U.S. Army, he returned to the region, working in Richmond and Norfolk before moving back to Lancaster to begin a career in the seafood industry. He became co-owner of RCV (Richardson, Chase and Venable) Seafood Corporation, Smith Point Seafood Inc. in Reedville and Rappahannock Seafood Company in Kilmarnock, processing plants mostly for crabs shipped to national chains like Giant Food and Campbell Soup.

Conley proceeded to become a leading member of many industry and professional organizations, including the Virginia Marine Products Commission, Shellfish Institute of North America and National Blue Crab Industry Association. He was a long-standing member of many boards including 25 years with Bank of Lancaster, Bay Banks of Virginia Inc., chairing the loan committee for 20 years, Northern Neck Planning Commission, Lancaster-Middlesex Community Reinvestment Advisory and chairman of the Lancaster County Economic Development Authority (formerly the Industrial Development Authority).

He had perfect attendance at the Lancaster Ruritan Club for 50 years and was a 25-year member of the Chesapeake District Ruritan National Crab Feast Committee.

As a dedicated, lifelong member of Emmanuel United Methodist Church, he served the church in many leadership roles, including on the board of trustees.

Funeral services were held Tuesday. Memorial gifts may be made to the Norwood Baptist Church Cemetery Fund, P.O. Box 85, Morattico, VA 22523, Northern Neck Family YMCA, Morattico Waterfront Museum or Hospice of Virginia.

THE VIETNAMESE PEOPLE DESERVE BETTER

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, as one of four bipartisan co-chairs of the Congressional Vietnam Caucus I have witnessed a deteriorating human rights situation in Vietnam in recent years which has been met with a complete lack of urgency and priority on the part of the Obama administration.

In fairness this posture is not unlike that of the previous administration which also preferred a bilateral relationship defined almost exclusively by trade—unmarred by thorny matters such as human rights and religious freedom abuses.

I was critical then, too. I submit for the RECORD an April 2007 letter I sent to Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, citing several recent arrests and assaults carried out by the government of Vietnam against the Vietnamese people in which I urged the State Department, a request which fell on deaf ears, to consider cancelling the planned visit to the United States of the Vietnamese president and prime minister if the situation did not improve.

Sadly the situation in Vietnam has only worsened since that time. A July 8 ABC News story reported, ''Since the start of this year more than 50 people have been convicted and jailed in political trials.''

The government of Vietnam, which our own State Department describes as an ''authoritarian state ruled by a single party,'' continues to suppress political dissent and severely limit freedom of expression, association, and public assembly. Religious activists are subject to arbitrary arrest.

On May 5th, police violently broke up peaceful ''human rights picnics'' in several different cities in Vietnam where young bloggers and activists were disseminating and discussing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights documents. Human Rights Watch reported that, ''The police also employed other methods to prevent the human rights picnics from occurring. In Hanoi, youth delegations were sent to intimidate picnickers at Nghia Do Park, chanting slogans such as 'Long Live the Glorious Communist Party of Vietnam' and 'Long Live Ho Chi Minh.' ''

On May 16, 2013, Nguyen Phuong Uyen, 21, and Dinh Nguyen Kha, 25, were sentenced to 6 years and 8 years in prison respectively simply for handing out pamphlets that were characterized by the court as ''propaganda against the state.'' Radio Free Asia reported that the pair were ''convicted under Article 88 of the penal code, a provision rights groups say the government has used to muzzle dissent, and both will serve three years of house arrest following their prison terms.''

Police also violently broke up anti-China protests in Hanoi on June 2, 2013 and arrested more than twenty people en masse.

Last year, the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, which I co-chair, convened a hearing focused on human rights abuses in Vietnam. During the hearing Members of Congress heard testimony from Mrs. Mai Huong Ngo, the wife of Dr. Nguyen Quoc Quan, a Vietnamese-American democracy activist and U.S. citizen. Upon his arrival in Vietnam on April 17, 2012 he was arbitrarily detained and imprisoned. Then Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, Michael Posner testified at the Lantos Commission hearing and revealed that no one from the State Department had been in touch with Dr. Quan's wife since his detention. Only at my urging did U.S. ambassador to Vietnam David Shear initiate contact with Mrs. Ngo to update her on her husband's situation.

This is but one of many examples of the U.S. embassy, under the leadership of Ambassador Shear, failing to serve as an island of freedom in a sea of repression. This was all the more troubling given that Dr. Quan is an American citizen. The lack of urgency in securing Dr. Quan's release was stunning.

I spoke by phone multiple times with Ambassador Shear and expressed my deep concerns about the case broadly and the State Department's failure to bring about a swift resolution. I further urged the ambassador to host a July 4th celebration at the embassy and to invite prominent religious freedom and democracy activists in the country—as was frequently done under President Reagan during the dark days of the Cold War—thereby sending a strong message that America stands with those who stand for basic human rights. Ambassador Shear indicated his willingness to do so and the State Department confirmed this intention in subsequent correspondence.

Shockingly, I learned weeks later that many of the most prominent democracy and human rights activists in Vietnam had never received an invitation. When confronted with the seeming inconsistency, Ambassador Shear claimed that he had invited a few civil society activists but that he needed to maintain a ''balance.'' When I repeatedly requested a copy of the guest list, to ascertain who specifically had been invited and if the members of Vietnamese civil society were mere token representatives the State Department repeatedly refused to provide it.

Ultimately several other Members of Congress, upon learning of Ambassador Shear's posture and handling of the situation, joined me in calling for his removal and urged that an individual ''who will embrace the struggle of the Vietnamese people and advocate on their behalf' fill his spot.

A July 2012 Wall Street Journal editorial headlined, ''State Fumbles in Hanoi,'' echoed this call. The Journal described the State Department's posture in Vietnam and throughout the region in this way: ''This is a classic State Department maneuver, practiced throughout Asia-Pacific but especially in repressive countries in which the U.S. has economic interests. Diplomats say they care about human rights, but not so much that it creates a political uproar that they'd have to work to resolve. Thus when Secretary of State Hillary Clinton went to Vietnam this week, she made a generic statement about human rights and a 'Senior State Department Official' gave journalists a briefing. Vietnam's Party bosses must be shaking in their boots.''

After languishing for nine months in a Vietnamese prison, Dr. Quan once again breathed the fresh air of freedom. A local CBS affiliate in California interviewed him after his return home and he attributed his release to Congressional pressure. Pressing authoritarian regimes and repressive governments to respect basic human rights can yield positive results, but inexplicably that is almost never the instinct of the State Department or this administration.

Fast-forward to today. This week it had been expected that prominent Vietnamese dissident and lawyer Le Quoc Quan would face trial. A July 8 Wall Street Journal editorial highlighted that, ''Mr. Le was arrested after he wrote a column for the BBC's website in which he argued for a new constitution without a guarantee of a Communist Party monopoly on power . . . The supposed crime for which Mr. Le is being charged is tax evasion, an alibi Hanoi has used in the past to incarcerate dissidents. A tax-law conviction would allow Hanoi to jail this inconvenient man for up to seven years while claiming he is not a political prisoner. Hanoi may be particularly sensitive about preserving that fiction because Mr. Le also has a connection to Washington.''

That connection came in the form of a National Endowment for Democracy fellowship in 2006–07. Mr. Le was arrested just four days

after he returned to Vietnam and released only after intense U.S. pressure. He was rearrested late last year while taking one of his three children to school and has been jailed ever since.

Tuesday afternoon, Radio Free Asia reported that his trial had been abruptly postponed less than 24 hours before it was to get underway. RFA further reported that, ''According to Quan's relatives and fellow dissidents, hundreds of supporters—including Catholics—had planned to gather outside the court at the trial, which comes amid a wave of jailings in recent weeks of bloggers and activists speaking critically of Vietnam's one-party government.''

Indeed, amidst this wave of political repression, in the face of growing popular dissent is Vietnam, rather than being buoyed by strong statements of support and solidarity from Washington, and the U.S. embassy, has been met with virtual silence.

In the realm of religious freedom, the situation also remains dire. In its recently released report, the bipartisan U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) found that, ''The government of Vietnam continues to expand control over all religious activities, severely restrict independent religious practice, and repress individuals and religious groups it views as challenging its authority.''

Later in the report the Commission characterized the government's repression in the following way: ''The Vietnamese government continues to imprison individuals for religious activity or religious freedom advocacy. It uses a specialized religious police force (công an tôn giáo) and vague national security laws to suppress independent Buddhist, Protestant, Hoa Hao, and Cao Dai activities, and seeks to stop the growth of ethnic minority Protestantism and Catholicism via discrimination, violence and forced renunciations of their faith.''

Despite repeated congressional calls, including in House-passed legislation, and the recommendation of USCIRF to place Vietnam on the Countries of Particular Concern (CPC) list for ongoing, egregious violations of religious freedom, this administration has failed to do so. In fact the administration has not designated any CPC countries since August 2011—nearly two years ago—despite the Congressional mandate included in the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to annually make such designations.

This is but a snap shot of a deteriorating human rights situation in Vietnam—a situation which merits bold U.S. leadership, not mere lip-service.

I have repeatedly said that it would be fitting for a Vietnamese-American to serve as U.S. ambassador to Vietnam—someone who understands the country, the language and the oppressive nature of the government having experienced it themselves before coming to the U.S. Such an individual would not be tempted to maintain smooth bilateral relations at all costs. Such an individual would embrace, without apology, the cause of freedom.

The Vietnamese people and frankly millions of Vietnamese-Americans deserve better than what Ambassador Shear and this administration have given them. The Obama administration has failed every citizen of Vietnam and every Vietnamese-American who cares about human rights and religious freedom.

APRIL 18, 2007.

Hon. CONDOLEEZZA RICE,
Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State, Washington DC.

DEAR SECRETARY RICE: I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the worsening human rights situation in Vietnam in recent months. After joining the World Trade Organization in January 2007, the politburo of the Vietnamese Communist Party (VCP) has carried out a large-scale brutal campaign of arrest against the nascent movement for democracy in Vietnam. Ignoring all international criticism and strenuous protests of the Vietnamese people, inside Vietnam and abroad, the communist regime in Hanoi has shamefully pushed ahead with its crackdown. The following events were particularly disconcerting to me:

On February 18, 2007, the second day of the Lunar New Year, which is the most sacred time in Vietnamese culture, the communist security forces raided Father Nguyen Van Ly's office within the Communal Residence of the Hue Archdiocese. Father Ly was later banished to a remote, secluded area in Hue.

On March 5, 2007, security forces in Saigon told Mrs. Bui Ngoc Yen that they had an order to arrest her husband, Professor Nguyen Chinh Kiet, who is a leading member of the Alliance for Democracy and Human Rights in Vietnam. Professor Kiet was in Europe at the time campaigning for democracy and human rights in Vietnam.

On March 8, 2007, Reverend Nguyen Cong Chinch and his wife were brutally assaulted by security forces of Gia Lai Province in the Central Highlands, who then arrested Reverend Chinch on undisclosed charges.

Also on March 8, 2007, two prominent human rights activists and lawyers, Mr. Nguyen Van Dai and Ms. Le Thi Cong Nhan, were arrested in Hanoi and were told that they would be detained for four months as part of an undisclosed investigation.

On March 9, 2007, Mr. Tran Van Hoa, a member of the People's Democracy Party in Quang Ninh Province, and Mr. Pham Van Troi, a member of the Committee for Human Rights in Ha Tay, were summoned by security forces and threatened with ''immeasurable consequences'' if they do not stop their advocacy for human rights in Vietnam.

On March 10, 2007, Do Nam Hai, an engineer writing under the pen name Phuong Nam and one of the leading members of the Alliance for Democracy and Human Rights in Vietnam, was told by security forces that he could be indicted at any time for activity against the State.

Also on March 10, 2007, state security forces also raided the home of Ms. Tran Khai Thanh Thuy, a writer, on the grounds that she advocated for ''people with grievances'' against the government. They took away two computers, two cell phones, and hundreds of appeals that she had prepared for victims of the government's abuses.

On March 12, 2007, lawyer Le Quoc Quan, a consultant on local governance for the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, UNDP, and Swedish International Development Agency, was arrested in his hometown, Nghe An, less than a week after he returned from a fellowship at the National Endowment for Democracy in Washington, D.C. His whereabouts are unknown at this time.

On April 5, 2007, the Vietnamese authorities in Hanoi rudely prevented Congresswoman Loretta Sanchez (D–CA) from meeting with several dissidents' wives at a gathering organized at the U.S. Ambassador's home. The police reportedly used very hostile and undignified manners to intervene in the meeting.

Furthermore, the Hanoi communist regime is still imprisoning many political dissidents and labor advocates such as Nguyen Vu Binh, Huynh Nguyen Dao, Truong Quoc Huy, Nguyen Hoang Long, Nguyen Tan Hoanh, Doan Huy Chuong, the religious leaders of the Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam, Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, and more than 350 lay people of the Protestant churches in the Central Highland.

The Vietnamese-Americans in my district, as well as all across the country, are very angered and distressed by what they perceive as a new and aggressive plan of the Hanoi government to reverse the progress of human rights in Vietnam. They believe that Ambassador Marine and his staff are not doing enough to stop these blatant violations of human rights.

It seems to me that the Vietnamese government is conducting this crackdown on advocates of human rights and religious freedom because it believes that the U.S. has no further leverage in the region. Now that Vietnam has been admitted to the WTO, and met with the Holy See, they believe they can respond in this brutal fashion to supporters of democracy and freedom and we will not respond.

I hope that you will make clear to the Vietnamese authorities that we will not stand by while this violence and intimidation continues. I believe the State Department should consider putting Vietnam back on the list of Countries of Particular Concern, and perhaps also consider canceling the planned visit of the Vietnamese president and prime minister later this year if the human rights situation in Vietnam has not improved.

I appreciate the recent comments by Sean McCormack at Voice of America expressing deep concern about the March 30 trial and sentencing of Father Ly. I ask that you continue pressing these issues with the Vietnamese government, including the need to respect the basic human rights of all Vietnamese citizens, especially the freedom of information, freedom of expression, and freedom of religion. The Vietnamese people should be able to choose their own leaders through free and fair elections and to use the Internet freely without any censures or restrictions.

I also ask that you encourage the Vietnamese authorities to release all political prisoners and religious leaders who are currently imprisoned because of their peaceful expression of their ideas or to fight for their religious beliefs. Among these prisoners are Father Nguyen Van Ly, Pastors Nguyen Cong Chinh and Hong Trung, lawyers Nguyen Van Dai, Le thi Cong Nhan, Le Quoc Quan, Messiers Truong Quoc Huy, and Nguyen Hoang Lon.

Lastly, I believe the Vietnamese-American community, a young but energetic group comprised of more than one million citizens, should be included in future dialogues with U.S. government officials. They know the history, culture and values of Vietnam. They also have scrutinized the history and tactics of communism and the communist government's habits at the negotiating table. I sincerely believe that the history of Vietnam must inform our approach to this and all other aspects of foreign policy, and the Vietnamese-American community is a tremendous asset in this regard. I respectfully request that you invite a small representation of the Vietnamese-American community to join the U.S. delegation in next month's human rights dialogue.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 307, I was inadvertantly detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

CONGRATULATING 64 AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY MAKERS AT THE DEDICATION OF THE ''CHARLES HOUSTON MURAL AND HALL OF FAME'' IN ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA ON JUNE 22, 2013

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 64 African American history makers in Alexandria, Virginia on their induction into the Charles Houston Mural and Hall of Fame.

To walk through the streets of Alexandria is to walk through the annals of African American history in America from slavery to the Civil War to the Civil Rights era. The brick passageways chronicle the vast array of history makers and symbolic structures honored with the unveiling and dedication of the Charles Houston Ad Hoc Committee's "Charles Houston Mural and Hall of Fame" photographic exhibit.

''As an Alexandria History Maker, your legacy of service had added to the vitality and spirit of this community,'' the Committee wrote in honoring the contributions 64 inductees made to the historic city's African American heritage and culture.

It has been over 60 years since civil rights attorney Charles H. Houston passed away, but the good works recognized at this dedication show that the strength of his legacy has endured. Just like Mr. Houston, the honorees have played a major role in the City and have served as an integral part of the civic life of Alexandria and its citizens for generations.

The dedication ceremony was attended by 800 familiar Alexandria faces. Among the honorees present were Mr. Ferdinand Day, the first African American School Board Chairman for the state of Virginia, Police Chief Earl Cook, Mr. Eugene Thompson, former Director of the Alexandria Black History Museum, author Marie Bradby, journalist Judy Belk, athletic director and basketball coach James "Jimmy" Lewis, Minister Charles Hall, and community activist Dorothy Turner. Other honorees include athlete Earl Lloyd, John Naismith NBA Hall of Fame, educator Harry Burke, Dr. Thea James, Gen. Leo Austin Brooks Sr., and attorney Samuel Tucker who led what is believed to be the first public sit-in in the Nation, the 1939 protest of the Alexandria Library's ban on African Americans.

Historic structures on the mural include: Beulah Baptist Church, the Franklin & Arm filed Slave Office & Pen, the Freedman's Cemetery, Seminary School, Fort Ward, the Odd Fellows Hall, Alexandria Home Bakery, the Capital Theater, Out Cross Canal, Colored Rosemont, the Carver Nursery/American Legion, the Johnson Pool, the Robert Robinson Library and the Departmental Progressive Club.

The photographic mural will be permanently located at the Parker-Gray Way, the Wythe Street entrance to the Charles Houston Recreation Center. It establishes the African American footprint in the city and celebrates neighborhoods, schools, churches and businesses vital to Alexandria's African American community. The intent of the Hall of Fame is to honor and memorialize the achievements of African American history makers in Alexandria; document the contributions of Alexandria's African American community to the city's history; and foster appreciation for diversity of the African American experience in the City of Alexandria.

Besides the City of Alexandria's sponsorship, the project committee consulted with George Mason University faculty and received support from Hoop Academy International, Simpson Development, and the historic Alfred Street Baptist Church, among others.

Mr. Speaker, these 64 individuals honored by the Charles Houston Mural and Hall of Fame are a testament to the human spirit, an example for resilience and defiance in the face of hardship, and an inspiration given what they achieved in their lifetimes. Thank you.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $16,738,238,434,108.96. We've added $6,111,361,358,195.88 to our debt in 4 and a half years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE CHILDREN'S ADVOCACY CENTER OF SOUTHEASTERN INDIANA

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the wonderful work of the Children's Advocacy Center of Southeastern Indiana.

On July 15, 2013, the Region 15 Children's Advocacy Center, serving the families of Dearborn, Decatur, Jefferson, Jennings, Ohio, Ripley, and Switzerland Counties, will celebrate the completion of the Center's 1,000th forensic interview. These child-friendly forensic interviews are critical in identifying cases of mental or physical child abuse. Using non-leading and age-appropriate questions, a forensic interview uncovers the child's reality, in their own words, about the situation and is the most efficient means of providing support and accuracy to the criminal justice and child welfare systems in our State. For nearly a decade, my mother served as a court appointed special advocate for children in abuse cases, and I appreciate how important the child's perspective is to a positive court outcome.

In particular, I want to recognize the leadership of the Children's Advocacy Center of Southeastern Indiana. Executive Director Sarah Brichto and forensic interviewer Stephanie Back, both founding members of the Center, provide daily leadership and execution of the program's goals. I also want to extend special recognition for the vision of the Center to Board of Directors President Aaron Negangard and fellow board members Tom Baxter, Chad Lewis, Monica Hensley, Richard Hertel, Jennifer Tackitt, and Barbara Bowling. Their influential contribution to our local communities is truly inspirational.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in congratulating the Children's Advocacy Center of Southeastern Indiana for their continued leadership in developing safer communities for all Hoosier children.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 318, I inadvertently missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

IN RECOGNITION OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WILLIE WILLIAMS

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lieutenant General Willie J. Williams, our Nation's third-highest ranking Marine, for his distinguished service to the United States of America. For nearly 40 years, Lieutenant General Williams has served in the Marine Corps and today he will be retiring from his post as the Director of Marine Corps Staff and from the Marine Corps. He will be honored at a retirement ceremony on Wednesday, July 10, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at the Marine Barracks in Washington, DC.

Lieutenant General Williams was born to the late Herman Jones and the late Ella Mae "Bolden" Hill in Livingston, Alabama but grew up in nearby Moundville, Alabama. After graduating from Moundville Public High School, he attended Stillman College in Tuscaloosa, Alabama after his high school teachers, seeing his talent and high potential but limited financial means, helped him obtain a scholarship. Faced with many difficult decisions about his future, he reflected on his life growing up in the segregated South and he was enticed by a Marine Corps recruiter to join an institution where he would be evaluated based on merit and not the color of his skin. Lieutenant General Williams was commissioned in the Marine Corps in May 1974 and began his career with the 11th Marine Artillery Regiment in May 1975, serving as a Battalion Supply Officer and later as the Regimental Supply Officer/Assistant S4 Officer.

In October 1977, he served as the Officer-In-Charge of the 3rd Force Service Support Group in Iwakuni, Japan. After a year, he returned to the U.S. to serve as the Ship's Detachment Supply Officer, Pacific Ocean Area/Marine Barracks Supply Officer and Barracks Executive Officer at Marine Barracks, North Island, San Diego, California. In June 1982, he reported to Quantico, Virginia for duty as Platoon Commander, Officer Candidate School, and subsequently attended the Amphibious Warfare School.

In May 1983, he became the Supply Officer, Mountain Warfare Training Center, Bridgeport, California and from August 1985 to June 1989, he was assigned to the 3rd Marine Division in Okinawa, Japan as the Assistant Division Supply Officer before attending the Armed Forces Staff College. While serving with the 3rd Marine Division, Lieutenant General Williams deployed as the Logistics Officer, Contingency Marine Air Ground Task Force 3–88 during its Persian Gulf Deployment from May to December 1988.

After completing Armed Forces Staff College, Lieutenant General Williams was assigned to joint duty with the Department of Defense Inspector General's Office in January 1990. From 1993–94 he studied at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and upon graduation assumed command of the 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit (Special Operations Capable) MEU Service Support Group from September 1994 to September 1996. He then served as the Assistant Chief of Staff G4, 3rd Force Service Support Group. In June 1997, he departed Okinawa for duty with the 1st Force Service Support Group first as the Assistant Chief of Staff, G3 and in 1998, as the Commanding Officer of Brigade Service Support Group 1. In July 2000, he returned to Okinawa, Japan as the Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Smedley D. Butler until June 2001 and then served as the Commanding General, 3d Force Service Support Group, III MEF until 2003. From October 2003 to May 2005, Lieutenant General Williams served as the Assistant Deputy Commandant, Installations and Logistics (Facilities), Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps.

The Second Congressional District of Georgia gained a respected and compassionate leader when Lieutenant General Williams moved to Albany, Georgia in June 2005 to take command of the Marine Corps Logistics Base, a focal point of the service's worldwide supply chain and equipment maintenance efforts. He became a close friend and confidant as he served in my district for the next four years, throughout the height of the Iraq War and one of the service's busiest periods.

In 2009, Lieutenant General Williams returned to Washington to pin on a third star and ultimately become the Director of Marine Corps Staff. In addition to his Bachelor of Arts Degree from Stillman College, Lieutenant General Williams holds a Master of Arts Degree from National University in San Diego, California and a Master of Science Degree from National Defense University, as well as an Honorary Doctorate of Law from Stillman College, and an Honorary Doctorate of Philosophy from Albany State University.

Lieutenant General Williams' personal awards and decorations include the Legion of Merit with gold star, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal, the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, the Humanitarian Service Medal, the National Defense Service Medal and the Department of Defense Service Badge.

Lieutenant General Williams has certainly accomplished many things in his life but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of his wife of 40 years, Bobbie, and their late daughter, Yolanda, who sadly passed away in 2008.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, and the nearly 700,000 people in Georgia's 2nd Congressional District, and all Americans, in extending our sincerest appreciation to Lieutenant General Willie Williams, an innovative leader who, in addition to his selfless service and instrumental role in supporting operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, has the respect, admiration, and affection of his fellow Marines and leaves behind an outstanding legacy of service and leadership in the Marine Corps of the United States of America.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this Energy and Water Appropriations bill, which is a poster child for why this House needs to get serious about replacing the sequester with a balanced, long-term budget agreement that keeps faith with our values and funds critical to national priorities.

According to data compiled by Bloomberg New Energy Finance for the Pew Charitable Trusts, China overtook the United States in the 21st century's clean energy race last year, attracting $65.1 billion in clean energy investment compared to just $35.6 billion in the U.S. Rather than responding aggressively to this challenge, today's legislation effectively proposes to throw in the towel and slashes clean energy funding by 60 percent. As a result, America's families and businesses will be forced to pay more than they otherwise would on their utility bills as fewer homes are weatherized, deployment of cost-effective clean energy technologies is delayed and smart grid modernization is postponed.

The Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, or ARPA–E, faces an even more devastating 81 percent cut. This early stage, high-impact program created by the bipartisan America Competes Act has already leveraged more than $450 million in private sector investment from $70 million in funding to game-changing opportunities in areas like energy storage, advanced biofuels and smart grid technology. ARPA–E—and the transformational breakthroughs it is driving—would be all but shut down under this legislation.

From basic research at DoE's Office of Science to environmental cleanup at our nation's nuclear defense sites to tackling the current $60 billion backlog at the Army Corps of Engineers, this legislation shrinks from America's challenges and shortchanges America's future.

We can and should do better.

CELEBRATING BILL GRAY

SPEECH OF

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 2013

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize former Congressman William H. Gray III, who suddenly passed away last week in London. As politicians, we all have certain people that we looked up to as role models and mentors so that we could carry out our duties in a dignified manner. For myself, I had my father, former Congressman Bill Clay, and Mr. Gray. During my youth, I served as a doorman for the House of Representatives where I had the opportunity to speak with Mr. Gray on numerous occasions. Over time, I had developed profound respect for Mr. Gray. He was a man that had a sincere interest in the concerns of his constituents and a man that fought for minorities across the country during a time when racial tensions were still high.

Mr. Gray was elected to the Congress in 1978, representing Pennsylvania's 2nd Congressional District. Many remember Mr. Gray for his quick rise within the Democratic Party. From 1985 to 1989, Mr. Gray was the chairman of the House Budget Committee—the first African American to do so. He used his power as chairman to influence legislation and economic sanctions against the apartheid regime of South Africa, which sparked a close friendship between him and Nelson Mandela. In 1989, he was the first African American to serve as the Majority Whip and many saw this as his stepping stone to becoming the first African American Speaker of the House.

Aside from the powerful roles that he assumed in Congress, Mr. Gray is remembered most for his contributions to the city of Philadelphia, through his preaching and leadership. Since 1972, Mr. Gray served as the pastor at Bright Hope Baptist Church in Philadelphia. Even while serving in Congress, Mr. Gray never lost sight of his role as the spiritual leader of his community. On numerous occasions, Mr. Gray would say, "First and foremost, I am a Baptist preacher." Through his leadership in Congress, Mr. Gray secured needed funding for Philadelphia's transportation and school systems. His success in Congress was secured by his ability to reach across party lines in order to build strong bipartisan coalitions.

Mr. Gray's story began at Simon Gratz High School in Philadelphia. One day, Mr. Gray's father was invited to speak to the students. Before taking the stage, the principal told Mr. Gray's father, "Don't worry, you can keep it short; these kids aren't going anywhere." His father replied, "I don't know about these other kids, but I know one kid who is going somewhere." His father's intuition proved to be more than accurate. A gifted basketball player,

Mr. Gray accepted a scholarship to play at Franklin and Marshall College. After receiving his bachelor's degree, he went on to receive master's degrees from Drew Theological Seminary and Princeton Theological Seminary as well as spending time abroad studying at Oxford University in England. Education was held in a high regard to Mr. Gray. During the prime of his political career, Mr. Gray resigned from Congress to assume a ''higher calling'' as president of the United Negro College Fund. While many politicians abruptly resign in light of scandal, Mr. Gray resigned in order to ''open the door to higher education for a million more black men and women.'' During his time as president, Mr. Gray successfully raised over $2 billion for the UNCF.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus and on behalf of Congressmen, past and present that were influenced by Mr. Gray's leadership, I would like to express my gratitude for his service to minorities, Congress, and to the United States of America. Thank you.

KAILEY CHAPMAN SPOKANE HIGH SCHOOL TRACK AND FIELD STATE CHAMPION

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Spokane High School's Kailey Chapman for winning the 300 meter hurdles at the 2013 Missouri Class 2 State Track and Field Championships.

Through her hard work and dedication, Kailey placed first in the 300 meter hurdles with a time of 44.62 seconds. Throughout the season, Kailey worked to perfect her technique and was able to reset four school records from her previous season and was All State in all four of her events. She credits her family, coaches, teammates, Spokane community, and our Heavenly Father for the support that enabled her to complete an outstanding season.

Kailey hopes to come back her senior year to repeat as the 300 meter hurdles champion and become Missouri's 100 meter hurdles champion, as well. Kailey plans to compete in the Junior Olympic Regionals and at the college level, as well as completing a degree in nursing.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kailey Chapman, winner of the 300 meter hurdles at the Missouri Class 2 State Track and Field Championships.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN PERCIN, JR.

HON. KURT SCHRADER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of John Percin, Jr. one of the 19 Granite Mountain Hotshot firefighters killed June 30th while fighting a wildfire near the town of Yarnell, Arizona. A funeral mass to honor his life will take place, July 12th, for family, friends, and parishioners at Our Lady of the Lake Church in Lake Oswego, Oregon.

John Percin Jr. grew up in West Linn, Oregon among a community that witnessed a young man active in his school, excelling at numerous sports, and demonstrating a strong compassion for others. After graduating from West Linn High School, Mr. Percin pursued a career with the Granite Mountain Hotshots, an elite firefighting force based in Prescott, Arizona. Hotshots demand only the most physically fit candidates to face the most strenuous firefighting tasks. Through rigorous physical and mental training each Hotshot gains the skills and attributes necessary for this demanding and dangerous work. A Hotshot needs to be a problem solver, able to make difficult decisions in stressful situations, and work as part of a team; I think we witnessed these attributes on display June 30th from Mr. Percin and each of the courageous crewmembers who put their lives on the line to protect others.

John Percin Jr. demonstrated a level of courage and bravery that belies his young age. At only 24 years of age Mr. Percin had the drive and passion to perform the critical work of fighting fires and I am humbled by his commitment to our country. We in Congress express our gratitude to Mr. Percin and convey our deepest respect and sympathy to his family; their son's sacrifice for others will not be forgotten.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT H. AMDT. 227 TO H.R. 1947, THE ''FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013''

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 20, 2013, I inadvertently voted against the Pitts-Davis amendment to H.R. 1947, the ''Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013'' which was designed to reform the United States' national sugar policy. However, I rise today to clarify my position concerning this amendment and to state that I fully support the Pitts-Davis amendment and will continue to support and cosponsor H.R. 693, the ''Sugar Reform Act of 2013.''

It is unfortunate that the failed FARRM Bill proposed reforms for every commodity program except the sugar program, the most intrusive and outdated of them all. Our focus in Congress should be geared toward balancing the needs of all Americans. Instead, our current sugar policy's one-sided approach favors sugar processors and growers over American consumers and businesses. Under current law, the sugar industry is able to reap record profits when domestic sugar supplies are tight because of government restrictions. Yet, the cost of the sugar program is then passed on to taxpayers when surplus sugar burdens the market. As a result, American families have to spend additional money on their grocery bills and American companies are placed at a competitive disadvantage. We must limit these government restrictions and allow for a competitive marketplace that will balance the needs of all Americans.

COMMEMORATING NEOSHO NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY'S 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 125th anniversary of the Neosho National Fish Hatchery.

Established in 1888, the Neosho National Fish Hatchery is truly one of a kind. It is the oldest operating federal fish hatchery in the United States and has raised over 130 different species of fish since its creation. With a mission to conserve and protect our nation's fishery resources, the Neosho National Fish Hatchery continues to produce high quality fish year after year.

The Neosho National Fish Hatchery is responsible for a long list of various operations to enhance the fish industry. The hatchery is responsible for producing high quality rainbow trout to stock Lake Taneycomo for recreational fishing, helping the local economy. The hatchery also continues to support and protect the conservation of the endangered Ozark Cavefish, and raises Freshwater Drum Fish to serve as host fish for rearing Neosho Mucket Mussels. All of this is done while over 45,000 annual visitors travel to Neosho to tour and learn about America's longest running national fish hatchery.

I am honored to recognize the Neosho National Fish Hatchery for their excellent work over the past 125 years. By working to conserve, protect, and enhance our fishing industry, the Neosho National Fish Hatchery continues to serve for the benefit all Americans.

MINNESOTA LISTENING SESSION ON THE CUTS TO FOOD ASSISTANCE IN HOUSE GOP FARM BILL

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 2013, Congressman ELLISON and I hosted a listening session at the Minnesota State Capitol. We heard from Minnesotans affected by the House Farm Bill's proposed cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Below is testimony delivered by Dale Simonson and Patricia Lull.

TESTIMONY FROM DALE SIMONSON, MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

Here is a brief overview of the demographics of the SNAP recipients statewide. There are about 554,000 adults and children on SNAP in approximately 259,700 cases. Children make up almost 48% of the SNAP population.

There are 77,417 SNAP family cases.

66% of the family cases reported income from work

Average age of adults with children is 35 years

There are 39,671 senior cases on SNAP.

Average age is 70 years

61% had income from Retirement, Survivors Disabilities Insurance (RSDI)

There are 88,942 disabled cases on SNAP.

There are 62,477 cases that are categorized as ''other'' adults.

Within this category are able bodied adults without dependents (ABAWDs)

These people are disconnected from employment compared to other SNAP participants as 56% have no other reported income sources than SNAP.

The average benefit per recipient is $118 and per case is $245.

Race/ethnicity demographics of SNAP cases are 59% white, 24% black, 7% Asian, 4% Hispanic, 4% American Indian with multiple races comprising the rest.

That is a very brief overview of the SNAP population in MN. The data being used today comes from the Characteristics of People and Cases on Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program in December 2012 as well as the Family Self-Sufficiency Report. Both of these reports are available on the DHS public website.

The biggest impact on SNAP recipients in MN would come from the proposed restriction in the House bill on the state ability to use categorical eligibility.

Broad based categorical eligibility is a policy that makes most households categorically eligible for SNAP because they qualify for a non-cash TANF funded benefit. This allows states to raise the income limit up to a maximum of 200% Federal Poverty Guideline (FPG) and raise or eliminate the asset limit.

The MN legislature passed a bill effective Nov., 2010 allowing expansion of broad based categorical eligibility to all SNAP cases by increasing the income standard from 130% to 165% of FPG and eliminating the asset limit.

Sec. 4005 of the House bill would remove this state option.

DHS estimates that 6.4% of the caseload or 16,700 cases with over 32,000 people would be made ineligible because their income is above 130% FPG yet below 165% FPG. Of these cases, over 8,000 are family cases that will be ineligible due to over income. The children on these cases would no longer be automatically eligible for free or reduced school lunch.

DHS no longer collects asset information for SNAP. Therefore, we do not have data on the number of cases that would be ineligible due to being over the asset limit.

The House bill provides a permanent reduction in funding for SNAP-Ed. This proposed cut comes on the heels of the program's fiscal year 2013 budget cut of 28 percent that was included in the fiscal cliff agreement, resulting in decreased program activity.

Minnesota's share of SNAP-Ed has been approximately 2.5% of the federal allocation.

Minnesota's current allocation for SNAP-Ed is about $7,000,000 (cut included).

Further cuts will impact the reach and impact that SNAP-Ed has on Minnesota's population in poverty.

SNAP-Ed is delivered by community nutrition educators from the University of Minnesota Extension Service and Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. They use evidence-based, behaviorally-focused curriculum to help Minnesotans with limited financial resources stretch food dollars and make healthy choices.

In FY 2012, the U of M Extension offered SNAP-Ed programming in 84 of 87 counties directly serving approximately 65,000 persons (unduplicated).

In FY 2012, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe offered SNAP-Ed programming on six reservations (Bois Forte, Fond du Lac, Grand Portage, Leech Lake, Mille Lacs, and White Earth) directly serving 6,778 persons (unduplicated).

U of M Extension program evaluation outcomes point to positive SNAP-Ed results. Over half of SNAP-Ed participants engaged in healthy eating and physical activity behaviors by the final course session. In addition, participants indicated an average of greater than 1/3 cup increased intake of both fruits and vegetables per day over the span of a course.

These are the two major provisions that will have the greatest impact on low income Minnesotans on SNAP if these cuts are adopted.

Thank you for your time.

TESTIMONY SUBMITTED BY PATRICIA LULL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE SAINT PAUL AREA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Thank you for this opportunity to address the difference that SNAP benefits make in our community.

I serve as Executive Director of the Saint Paul Area Council of Churches, a non-profit representing 125 local communities of faith. We come from Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Unitarian, and Quaker backgrounds but every one of our faith traditions agrees with this conviction—No more hungry neighbors!

I am here to say that as a person of faith and a citizen. No more hungry neighbors! In recent years we have made great strides in addressing domestic hunger and SNAP has been an important part of what we have done well as a country. It serves our most vulnerable neighbors—children, seniors, and working families. It serves them in a way that supports local economies (grocery stores and farmers markets) and energizes our children to succeed in school and in life.

While it is important to balance our federal budget, cutting SNAP benefits to our most vulnerable neighbors should be the last option we exercise. The proposed cuts will negatively impact all of us who work with families in poverty. Let me illustrate that.

The Saint Paul Area Council of Churches hosts an emergency food shelf for the American Indian community in Ramsey County. We provide food to 500 individuals a month—enough for 6,000 meals. Use of our food shelf has increased by 30% since last August. More families. More need. More demand on us to do what all of us as citizens are asked to do—provide for those who are most at risk.

Some of our food shelf participants are also volunteers. A couple of months ago, Larry and I worked side-by-side unloading a delivery from Second Harvest, our food bank. Larry is a father and grand-father. He is also a hard worker, carrying in three times as many boxes as I did. When the truck was unloaded and all the food was put away, I thanked him for all he had done. Larry looked me squarely in the eye, pointed to his heart, and said—I do this for the community.

Those who receive SNAP benefits—and those who will be excluded from benefits if cuts are made—they are our community, too. On behalf of them I say, No more hungry neighbors!

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AURORA COLONY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HON. KURT SCHRADER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Aurora Colony Historical Society on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. The Aurora Colony Historical Society, through its wonderful Old Aurora Colony Museum, has dedicated itself to preserving the memory, architecture, and treasures of Oregon's unique Aurora Colony since 1963.

The Aurora Colony's unique history predates Oregon's statehood. This communal Christian society was established in 1856 by a group of German and Swiss followers of Dr. Wilhelm Keil. Dr. Keil's vision of a utopian society produced this bustling community that became well known for its craftsman built furniture, fine textiles, and Old World traditions.

54 families and nearly 600 people would eventually live and work communally to support the Aurora Colony. The agricultural skills and manufacturing prowess of the colonists allowed the colony to flourish for nearly 30 years on the banks of Oregon's Pudding River. The community of Aurora still bears the name of Dr. Keil's oldest daughter today.

Descendants of the Aurora Colonists organized a celebration in 1956 to mark the Colony's centennial and to celebrate the community's uncommon history. From this celebration came a desire to preserve the history of the Colony and its remaining artifacts and architecture. The Aurora Colony Historical Society was founded in 1963 and set out on a mission of preservation that survives today—50 years later.

Today the Aurora Colony Historical Society's Old Aurora Colony Museum welcomes tourists, students, researchers, and others to explore its extensive grounds and exhibits. The complex of five preserved buildings offers revolving exhibits, Colony artifacts, and a historical archive of residents' letters and other written documents. The Old Aurora Colony Museum has become an invaluable resource in preserving an important period in Oregon's history. Indeed, Oregon's history books and today's Aurora would both be incomplete were it not for the essential work of the Aurora Colony Historical Society.

With a strong sense of its history and an eye toward the future, I am confident that the Aurora Colony Historical society will continue to thrive for at least another 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be the representative of the fine community of Aurora, Oregon. I congratulate the Aurora Colony Historical Society on its 50th anniversary, and I look forward to sharing in the celebration.

HONORING THOMAS DOUGLAS, MISSOURI SMALL BUSINESS PERSON OF 2013

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Thomas H. Douglas, the Missouri Small Business Person of 2013.

Thomas is the current President and CEO of JMARK Business Solutions, Inc. JMARK has made its name by providing outstanding technology consulting services for small to medium sized businesses looking to streamline IT operations to enhance employee performance and increase customer satisfaction.

Founded in 1988, JMARK started as a small computer company in Cabool, and is now headquartered in Springfield, Missouri. In 1997, Thomas joined the company after serving in the US Navy. The leadership skills he developed in the Navy ensured a quick rise as the company's level one engineer to president and majority owner in 1999.

Under Thomas' guidance, JMARK has seen tremendous growth combining an incredible customer-friendly business philosophy with a

full array of support services. He has taken JMARK from a small team of experts in a single office to a group of over 60 employees with offices in three states.

As a leader of one our nation's successful small businesses, I am honored to recognize Thomas for his outstanding service to JMARK Business Solutions and the community. The leadership, innovation, customer service, and hard work exemplified by Thomas is properly recognized through this exceptional award. It is an honor to recognize Thomas H. Douglas as the Missouri Small Business Person of 2013.

HONORING LIFE AND SERVICE OF KEVIN WOYJECK

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and service of a young man who lost his life battling the recent wildfires in Arizona. Kevin Woyjeck was a member of the Granite Mountain Hotshot Squad of Prescott, Arizona, whose life was tragically lost along with 18 of his colleagues while fighting to protect those in danger from this blaze. He, and his entire squad, bravely put their lives at risk, and all but one paid the ultimate price.

Kevin, the son of Captain Joe Woyjeck of the Los Angeles County Fire Station, was only 21 years old when he lost his life. Growing up in Southern California, he was passionate about one day becoming a professional firefighter, a dream realized by serving as a member of such an elite squad. He and his colleagues trained hard to be the first line of defense against dangerous fires, and during the recent blazes they fought in brutal conditions to stop the advancement and destruction of the wildfire. For days they fought to contain the flames, but on Sunday, June 30, the fire surrounded them and proved impossible to escape.

We recognize the lives and bravery of Kevin and his team. Our hearts and thoughts go out to his family and all those affected by the loss of these brave men. We know that while they are no longer with us, their work and courage will never be forgotten.

Kevin's life was taken too soon, but he made his family and his country proud. He accomplished so much in his 21 years, and we will always remember his sacrifice.

GARRETT METSCHER REPUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL HIGH JUMP STATE CHAMPION

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Republic High School's Garrett Metscher for winning the high jump at the 2013 Class 4 State Track and Field Championships.

Through his hard work and dedication, Garrett placed first in the high jump with a new school record of 6'7½". Throughout the season, he dominated the field and his effort resulted in the event's top seed heading into the state championship. In the state championship event, Garrett did not disappoint, besting the 15-man field and taking the title.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Garrett Metscher, winner of the high jump at the Missouri Class 4 State Track and Field Championships.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MAJOR GENERAL RAYMOND F. REES

HON. KURT SCHRADER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the Adjutant General for the State of Oregon, Major General Raymond F. Rees, for his steadfast service to this Nation. On Saturday, July 13, 2013 Major General Rees will conclude over 50 years of dedicated service to the United States of America.

General Rees began his career as a West Point Cadet in 1962. Prior to his current assignment as the longest serving wartime Adjutant General in Oregon history, Major General Rees had numerous active duty and Army National Guard assignments to include: service in the Republic of Vietnam as a cavalry troop commander; commander of the 116th Armored Calvary Regiment; nearly nine years as the Adjutant General of Oregon; Director of the Army National Guard, National Guard Bureau; over five years service as Vice Chief, National Guard Bureau; 14 months as Acting Chief, National Guard Bureau; Chief of Staff (dual-hatted), Headquarters North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) and United States Northern Command (USNORTHCOM). NORAD is a binational, Canada and United States command.

Major General Rees has demonstrated a level of competence, confidence, courage and commitment to the State of Oregon and the United States of America that bring great credit upon himself, the Oregon National Guard and the United States Army. We in Congress express our gratitude to a great American warrior and wish the General and his wife Mary Len a happy and well-earned retirement to their ranch in Helix, Oregon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding one missed vote on July 9, 2013. Had I been present for rollcall 316, on the amendment offered by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee to H.R. 2609, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, I would have voted "nay."

HONORING CHRIS LAHM'S 500TH CAREER VICTORY

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ozark Christian College Men's Basketball Coach Chris Lahm on his 500th career victory.

Chris achieved his 500th win after a 78–68 victory over Hillsdale Baptist in the Association of Christian College Athletics Tournament 3rd place game. Not only did Chris lead his team to 3rd place in this tournament, Chris and his team finished another tremendous season with a 3rd place finish in the 2013 National Christian College Athletic Association (NCCAA) Division II National Tournament, as well. With these accomplishments, Chris was named the 2013 NCCAA Division II Southwest Regional Basketball Coach of the Year.

Chris' 27-year career as head basketball coach at both Nebraska Christian College and Ozark Christian College translates to thousands of hours of practice, games, and travel in addition to the hundreds of players he has helped throughout his time serving as head coach and mentor.

Through his hard work and dedication, Chris has left a positive impact at Ozark Christian College and the community. Chris should be proud of his accomplishments in recruiting, coaching, and guiding a phenomenal group of young men throughout the past 27 years. I commend him on a job well done.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ozark Christian College Men's Basketball Coach Chris Lahm on his 500th career victory.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 11, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 15

3 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine strategic sourcing, focusing on leveraging the

government's buying power to save billions.

SD–342

JULY 16

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To receive a closed briefing on the situation in Syria.

SVC–217

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

Business meeting to markup proposed legislation making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies.

SD–192

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the ''Defense Production Act'', focusing on issues and opportunities for reauthorization.

SD–538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold an oversight hearing to examine how United States gasoline and fuel prices are being affected by the current boom in domestic oil production and the restructuring of the United States refining industry and distribution system.

SD–366

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine S. 980, to provide for enhanced embassy security.

SD–419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight

To hold hearings to examine implementation of wartime contracting reforms.

SD–342

2 p.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To receive a briefing on growing authoritarianism in Azerbaijan, focusing on current events in Azerbaijan and the prospect for a free and fair election.

SVC–201–00

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Water and Power

To hold hearings to examine the Bureau of Reclamation's Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study.

SD–366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine pooled retirement plans, focusing on closing the retirement plan coverage gap for small businesses.

SD–430

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Katherine Archuleta, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

SD–342

JULY 17

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To receive a closed briefing on the major threats facing Navy forces and the Navy's current and projected capabilities to meet those threats.

SVC–217

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Missile Defense Agency.

SD–192

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection

To hold hearings to examine the consumer debt industry.

SD–538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance

To hold hearings to examine the expansion of internet gambling, focusing on assessing consumer protection concerns.

SR–253

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador and the Representative in the Security Council of the United Nations, and to be Representative to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative to the United Nations.

SD–419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Department of Homeland Security at 10 years, focusing on harnessing science and technology to protect national security and enhance government efficiency.

SD–342

2 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine working together to restore the protections of the ''Voting Rights Act'', focusing on Selma and *Shelby County*.

SD–226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

SH–216

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold closed hearings to examine revisions to the nuclear employment strategy.

SVC–217

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine E–Rate 2.0, focusing on connecting every child to technology.

SR–253

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 235, to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, and S. 920, to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land.

SD–628

3 p.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine small business tax reform, focusing on making the tax code work for entrepreneurs and startups.

SR–428A

JULY 18

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of General Martin E. Dempsey, USA for reappointment to the grade of general and reappointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Admiral James A. Winnefeld, Jr., USN for reappointment to the grade of admiral and reappointment as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, both of the Department of Defense.

SH–216

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

JULY 25

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Water and Power

To hold hearings to examine the issues associated with aging water resource infrastructure in the United States.

SD–366

AUGUST 1

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the November 6, 2012 referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico and the Administration's response.

SD–366

SEPTEMBER 11

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2014 for the Federal Communications Commission.

SD–138

Daily Digest

Highlights

The House passed H.R. 2609, Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5583–S5624

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1271–1277, and S. Res. 193–194. **Page S5620**

Measures Passed:

Honoring the Granite Mountain Interagency Hotshot Crew: Senate agreed to S. Res. 193, honoring the fallen heroes of the Granite Mountain Interagency Hotshot Crew. **Pages S5602–03**

South Utah Valley Electric Conveyance Act: Senate passed H.R. 251, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District. **Page S5623**

Bonneville Unit Clean Hydropower Facilitation Act: Senate passed H.R. 254, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project. **Page S5623**

Measures Considered:

Keep Student Loans Affordable Act: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1238, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans. **Pages S5584–S5602, S5603–15**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 171), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S5595**

Subsequently, Senator Reid entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S5595**

House Messages:

Vietnam Veterans Donor Acknowledgment Act: Senate concurred in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 588, to provide for donor contribution acknowledgments to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center. **Page S5623**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Margaret Louise Cummisky, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Matthew Winthrop Barzun, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

John Hoover, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Sierra Leone.

Crystal Nix-Hines, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

John R. Phillips, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Italian Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of San Marino.

Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education. **Pages S5623–24**

Messages from the House: **Page S5619**

Executive Communications: **Pages S5619–20**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S5620**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5620–21**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S5621–22**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5618–19**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Page S5622

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S5622–23

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—171) Page S5595

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:53 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, July 11, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5623.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SMITHFIELD FOODS

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Smithfield, focusing on foreign purchases of American food companies, after receiving testimony from Matthew J. Slaughter, Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth, Hanover, New Hampshire; Usha C. V. Haley, West Virginia University Robbins Center for Global Business, Morgantown; Daniel M. Slane, U.S. Chamber of Commerce U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, Washington, D.C.; and C. Larry Pope, Smithfield Foods, Smithfield, Virginia.

STOPPING FRAUDULENT ROBOCALL SCAMS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance concluded a hearing to examine stopping fraudulent robocall scams, focusing on if more can be done, after receiving testimony from Lois Greisman, Associate Director of the Division of Marketing Practices, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission; Eric J. Bash, Associate Chief, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission; Kevin Rupy, United States Telecom Association, and Michael Altschul, CTIA-The Wireless Association, both of Washington, D.C.; Matthew Stein, Primus Telecommunications Inc., Toronto, Ontario, Canada; and Aaron Foss, Nomorobo, Mt. Sinai, New York.

REPEALING THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine repealing the Sustainable Growth Rate and the path forward, focusing on a view from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, after receiving testimony from Jonathan Blum, Acting Principal Deputy Administrator and Director, Center of Medicare, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services.

BOSTON MARATHON BOMBINGS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine lessons learned from the Boston Marathon bombings, focusing on preparing for and responding to the attack, after receiving testimony from Richard Serino, Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Kurt N. Schwartz, Undersecretary for Homeland Security and Homeland Security Advisor, and Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency Director, Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety and Security, and Edward F. Davis, Boston Police Department Commissioner, both of Boston Massachusetts; and Arthur L. Kellermann, The RAND Corporation, Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 815, to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, with an amendment in the nature of a subsitute; and

The nomination of Cynthia L. Attwood, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Patricia Ann Millett, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, who was introduced by Senators Warner and Kaine, Gregory Howard Woods, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Elizabeth A. Wolford, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, and Debra M. Brown, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi, who was introduced by Senators Cochran and Wicker, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

DIABETES RESEARCH

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine diabetes research, focusing on reducing the burden of diabetes at all ages and stages, after receiving testimony from Griffin P. Rodgers, Director, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services; Jeffrey Brewer, JDRF, Ray Allen, and Jean Smart, all of New York, New York; and Quinn Ferguson, JDRF Children's Congress, Poland Spring, Maine.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 16 public bills, H.R. 2637–2652; and 2 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 45; and H. Res. 296 were introduced.

Page H4369

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4370–71**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 2218, to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–148) and

H. Res. 295, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–149).

Pages H4368–69

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Amodei to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4313**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:38 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4317**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H4318, H4367**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of the 19 firefighters lost in the wildfires of Yarnell, Arizona on June 30, 2013.

Page H4335

Recess: The House recessed at 3:04 p.m. and reconvened at 5:15 p.m. **Page H4336**

Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014: The House passed H.R. 2609, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, by a yea-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 198 nays, Roll No. 345. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, July 9th. **Pages H4322–67**

Rejected the Schneider motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 195 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 344. **Pages H4365–67**

Agreed to:

Burgess amendment (No. 17 printed in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2013) that prohibits funds from being used to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations or to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(I)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps; **Pages H4322–23**

Meadows amendment that prohibits funds from being used to pay the salary of individuals appointed to their current position through, or to otherwise carry out, paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 5503(a) of title 5, United States Code;

Pages H4323–24

Scalise amendment that prohibits funds from being used within the borders of the State of Louisiana by the Mississippi Valley Division or the Southwestern Division of the Army Corps of Engineers or any district of the Corps within such divisions to implement or enforce the mitigation methodology, referred to as the "Modified Charleston Method"; **Pages H4324–25**

Blackburn amendment that prohibits funds from being used by the Department of Energy to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Energy Conservation Standards Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits" and identified by regulation identification number 1904–AC87; **Pages H4326–28**

Higgins amendment (No. 31 printed in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2013) that prohibits funds from being used to relocate or consolidate general and administrative functions, personnel, or resources of the Buffalo and Chicago Districts of the Corps of Engineers Great Lakes and Ohio River Division; **Pages H4328–29**

Walberg amendment (No. 32 printed in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2013) that prohibits funds from being used to carry out section 801 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007;

Page H4329

Grayson amendment (No. 14 printed in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2013) that prohibits funds from being used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if that offeror has, within a three-year period preceding this offer, been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of a fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false

statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; **Pages H4329–30**

Scalise amendment that increases funding, by offset, for construction activities of the Army Corps of Engineers by $2,000,000; **Pages H4330–31**

Lynch amendment that increases funding, by offset, for construction activities of the Army Corps of Engineers by $20,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 217 ayes to 206 noes, Roll No. 338); **Pages H4325–26, H4339**

Gosar amendment that prohibits funds from being used by the Department of Energy for any program, project, or activity required by or otherwise proposed in the memorandum from Steven Chu, Secretary of Energy, to the Power Marketing Administrators with the subject line ''Power Marketing Administrations' Role'' and dated March 16, 2012; **Pages H4339–40**

Turner amendment that prohibits funds from being used to reduce the active and inactive nuclear weapons stockpiles of the United States in contravention of section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act; **Pages H4342–44**

Engel amendment that prohibits funds from being used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011; **Pages H4345–46**

Garcia amendment that increases funding, by offset, for construction activities of the Corps of Engineers by $1,000,000; **Page H4346**

Luetkemeyer amendment that prohibits funds from being used for the study of the Missouri River Projects authorized in section 108 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009; **Pages H4348–49**

Luetkemeyer amendment that prohibits funds from being used to continue the study conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to section 5018(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007; **Pages H4349–51**

Noem amendment that prohibits funds from being used to issue rules or regulations to establish a fee for surplus water from Missouri River reservoirs; **Pages H4351–52**

Kelly (PA) amendment (No. 20 printed in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2013) that prohibits funds from being used to develop or submit a proposal to expand the authorized uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund described in section 9505(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; **Pages H4356–58**

LaMalfa amendment that prohibits funds from being used to regulate activities identified in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 404(f)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; **Pages H4358–59**

King (IA) amendment that prohibits funds from being used for sediment or soil dumping into the Missouri River; **Pages H4359–60**

Flores amendment that prohibits funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order No. 13547 of July 19, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 43023, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes); **Pages H4360–61**

Flores amendment that prohibits funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007; and **Page H4361**

Fleming amendment that prohibits funds from being used to pay the salary of any officer or employee to carry out section 301 of the Hoover Power Plant act of 1984, added by section 402 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (by a recorded vote of 230 ayes to 194 noes, Roll No. 340). **Pages H4346–47, H4363**

Rejected:

Barrow amendment (No. 26 printed in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2013) that sought to prohibit funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce any authority, in any preceding provision of this Act, to use funds for the purchase or hire of motor vehicles; **Page H4330**

Hastings (FL) amendment that was debated on July 9th that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Science activities of the Department of Energy by $223,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 156 ayes to 266 noes, Roll No. 328); **Page H4332**

Garamendi amendment that was debated on July 9th that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy by $329,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 155 ayes to 266 noes, Roll No. 329); **Pages H4332–33**

Broun (GA) amendment that was debated on July 9th that sought to eliminate funding for the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program and apply the $6,000,000 in savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 165 ayes to 252 noes, Roll No. 330); **Pages H4333–34**

Jackson Lee amendment that was debated on July 9th that sought to increase funding for Departmental Administration by $1,000,000 and reduce funding for Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration by $1,200,000 (by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 331); **Page H4334**

Quigley amendment that was debated on July 9th that sought to reduce funding for Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration

by $23,700,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 196 ayes to 227 noes, Roll No. 332); **Pages H4334–35**

Heck (NV) amendment that was debated on July 9th that sought to increase funding for Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration by $14,000,000 and reduce funding for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation by $16,546,000 (by a recorded vote of 86 ayes to 338 noes, Roll No. 333); **Pages H4335–36**

Bass amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce, with respect to hydraulic fracturing operations in the Inglewood Oil Field (1) the exclusion in section 1421(d)(1)(B) of the Safe Drinking Water Act; (2) section 261.4(b)(5) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; or (3) the limitation in section 402(l)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (agreed by unanimous consent to withdraw the request for a recorded vote to the end that the amendment stand rejected in accordance with the voice vote thereon); **Pages H4323, H4336**

Polis amendment that was debated on July 9th that sought to reduce funding for Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration by $13,072,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 182 ayes to 243 noes, Roll No. 334); **Pages H4336–37**

Burgess amendment that was debated on July 9th that sought to reduce funding for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation by $48,000,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 114 ayes to 308 noes, Roll No. 335); **Page H4337**

Burgess amendment that was debated on July 9th that sought to strike language allowing the Secretary of Energy to make not more than $48,000,000 available for the purpose of carrying out domestic uranium enrichment research, development, and demonstration activities (by a recorded vote of 131 ayes to 291 noes, Roll No. 336); **Pages H4337–38**

Titus amendment that was debated on July 9th that sought to strike section 509, which prohibits funds from being used to conduct closure of adjudicatory functions, technical review, or support activities associated with the Yucca Mountain geologic repository license application, or for actions that irrevocably remove the possibility that Yucca Mountain may be a repository option in the future (by a recorded vote of 87 ayes to 337 noes, Roll No. 337); **Pages H4338–39**

Ben Ray Luján amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for construction activities of the Corps of Engineers by $15,000,000; **Pages H4344–45**

Grayson amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies by $10,000,000; **Page H4353**

Whitfield amendment that sought to prohibit funds under the heading Renewable Energy, Energy Reliability, and Efficiency from being used for wind energy programs (by a recorded vote of 94 ayes to 329 noes, Roll No. 339); **Pages H4340–42, H4362–63**

Garamendi amendment (No. 28 printed in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2013) that sought to increase funding, by offset, for construction activities of the Corps of Engineers by $100,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 170 ayes to 253 noes, Roll No. 341); **Pages H4347–48, H4363–64**

Speier amendment that sought to reduce funding for Fossil Energy Research and Development by $30,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 342); and **Pages H4352, H4364**

Chabot amendment that sought to reduce the funding levels for the ''Appalachian Regional Commission'', the ''Delta Regional Authority'', the ''Denali Commission'', the ''Northern Border Regional Commission'', and the ''Southeast Crescent Regional Commission'' to $0 (by a recorded vote of 147 ayes to 273 noes, Roll No. 343). **Pages H4353–55, H4364–65**

Withdrawn:

Nugent amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used to bring an action against the United States. **Page H4345**

Point of Order sustained against:

Butterfield amendment that sought to express the sense of Congress that the Army Corps of Engineers should take into consideration and prioritize emergency operations, repairs, mitigation activities, and other activities in response to or in anticipation of any flood, hurricane, or other natural disaster when evaluating construction projects and **Pages H4355–56**

Bridenstine amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used by the Corps of Engineers to set water storage prices for municipal use for a non-hydropower lake constructed by the Corps above the price that was set at the time of the completion of the lake. **Page H4361**

H. Res. 288, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to yesterday, July 9th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, July 11th. **Page H4367**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:34 p.m. and reconvened at 11:11 p.m. **Pages H4367–68**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and 17 recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4332, H4332–33,

H4333–34, H4334, H4334–35, H4335–36, H4336–37, H4337, H4338, H4338–39, H4339, H4362, H4363, H4363–64, H4364, H4365, H4366–67, H4367. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 11:12 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a markup on appropriations for Financial Services and General Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014. The bill was forwarded without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science and Related Agencies held a markup on appropriations for Commerce, Justice, and Science and related agencies. The bill was forwarded without amendment.

EXAMINING THE LABOR DEPARTMENT'S PROPOSED REFORMS TO THE FECA PROGRAM

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Labor Department's Proposed Reforms to the FECA Program''. Testimony was heard from Scott Szymendera, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Gary Steinberg, Acting Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor; Andrew Sherrill, Director of Education, Workforce and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power continued markup on the following: H.R. 1582, the ''Energy Consumers Relief Act of 2013''; H.R. 1900, the ''Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act''; and H.R. 83, to require the Secretary of the Interior to develop an action plan to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States. The following bill was forwarded, without amendment: H.R. 1900. The following bills were forwarded, as amended: H.R. 1582; and H.R. 83.

REDUCING BARRIERS TO CAPITAL FORMATION, PART II

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled ''Reducing Barriers to Capital Formation, Part II''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TERRORIST THREAT IN NORTH AFRICA: BEFORE AND AFTER BENGHAZI

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade; and Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a joint hearing entitled ''The Terrorist Threat in North Africa: Before and After Benghazi''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ABU DHABI PRE-CLEARANCE FACILITY: IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. BUSINESSES AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, hearing entitled ''The Abu Dhabi Pre-Clearance Facility: Implications for U.S. Businesses and National Security''. Testimony was heard from Kevin K. McAleenan, Acting Deputy Commissioner, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

ASSESSING ATTACKS ON THE HOMELAND: FROM FORT HOOD TO BOSTON

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee began a hearing entitled ''Assessing Attacks on the Homeland: From Fort Hood to Boston''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses. The committee voted to close the hearing and recessed to reconvene at 9 a.m. tomorrow, July 11, 2013, in a closed session in HVC–301.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law held a markup on H.R. 1493, the ''Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2013''; and H.R. 2542, the ''Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2013''. The bills were forwarded, without amendment.

UNACCOUNTABLE GOVERNMENT GAO REPORTS SHOW FEDS STRUGGLING TO TRACK MONEY AND PERFORMANCE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Unaccountable Government GAO Reports Show Feds Struggling to Track Money and Performance''. Testimony was heard from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States.

COMBINED FEDERAL CAMPAIGN: MAKING EVERY DOLLAR COUNT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service, and the Census held a hearing entitled ''The

Combined Federal Campaign: Making Every Dollar Count''. Testimony was heard from Representative Reichert; Mark Lambert, Associate Director for Merit System Accountability and Compliance, Office of Personnel Management; and public witnesses.

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

The Committee on Rules: granted, by a record vote of 9–4, a closed rule for H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Testimony was heard from Chairman Lucas.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space held a markup on committee print of the ''NASA Authorization Act of 2013''. The committee print of the ''NASA Authorization Act of 2013'' was forwarded, without amendment.

STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR NATIONAL MANUFACTURING COMPETITIVENESS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Strategic Planning for National Manufacturing Competitiveness''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BEYOND THE BELTWAY: SUCCESSFUL STATE STRATEGIES FOR SMALL BUSINESS GROWTH

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Beyond the Beltway: Successful State Strategies for Small Business Growth''. Testimony was heard from Jim Cheng, Secretary of Commerce and Trade, Virginia; Pat Costello, Commissioner, South Dakota Office of Economic Development; Aaron Demerson, Executive Director, Economic Development and Tourism, Texas; and Nick Jordan, Secretary, Kansas State Department of Revenue.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a markup of the following: H.R. 1848, the ''Small Airplane Revitalization Act of 2013''; H.R. 2576, to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes; H.R. 2612, the ''Public Buildings Savings and Reform Act of 2013''; H.R. 2611, to designate the United States Coast Guard Headquarters the ''Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building''; H. Con. Res. 44, concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run; and a General Services Administration Resolution. The following bill was ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 1848. The following bills were ordered reported without amendment: H.R. 2576; H.R. 2612; H.R. 2611; and H. Con. Res. 44. The Committee approved the General Services Administration Resolution.

COLLABORATION TO ASSIST SERVICE MEMBERS RETURNING TO CIVILIAN LIFE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee, and Full Committee on Armed Services held a joint hearing entitled ''DOD and VA Collaboration to Assist Service Members Returning to Civilian Life''. Testimony was heard from Frank Kendall, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense; and Stephen W. Warren, Acting Assistant Secretary for Information and Technology, Department of Veterans Affairs.

DELAY OF THE EMPLOYER MANDATE

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on the Obama Administration's decision to delay the employer mandate and the employer information reporting requirements under the Affordable Care Act. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

BUILDING JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR VETERANS

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine building job opportunities for veterans, after receiving testimony from Kyle Mitchell, and Shawn Deabay, both of the Texas Veterans Commission, Austin; Ryan M. Gallucci, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Washington, D.C.; and Ben Fowke, Xcel Energy, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 11, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to mark up proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, and the Legislative Branch, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Armed Services: to receive a closed briefing on Department of Defense operations conducted pursuant to the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force and the presidential policy guidance on counterterrorism, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine mitigating systemic risk through Wall Street reforms, 11 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine S. 1237, to improve the administration of programs in the insular areas, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine assessing the transition in Afghanistan, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Victoria Nuland, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for European and Eurasian Affairs, Douglas Edward Lute, of Indiana, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and Daniel Brooks Baer, of Colorado, to be U.S. Representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador, all of the Department of State, 2:15 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and Stuart F. Delery, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, both of the Department of Justice, Todd M. Hughes, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, Colin Stirling Bruce, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois, Sara Lee Ellis, and Andrea R. Wood, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, and Madeline Hughes Haikala, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, 11 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, hearing entitled ''Regulation of New Chemicals, Protection of Confidential Business Information, and Innovation'', 9:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled ''Improving FCC Process'', 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''The State Department 2013 Trafficking in Persons Report'', 11 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, continued hearing entitled ''Assessing Attacks on the Homeland: From Fort Hood to Boston'', 9 a.m., HVC–301. This portion of the hearing is closed.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing on the ''Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development (RAPID) Act of 2013'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled ''America's Helium Supply: Options for Producing More Helium from Federal Lands'', 9:30 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulations, hearing entitled ''Wildfire and Forest Management'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled ''Oversight and Management of Department of Energy National Laboratories and Science Activities'', 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities'', 9 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, July 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: The Majority Leader will be recognized, and the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees. At 2:15 p.m., the Majority Leader will be recognized.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, July 11

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 2642—Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1039
Brownley, Julia, Calif., E1035
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E1035
Capps, Lois, Calif., E1035
Carter, John R., Tex., E1036
Clay, Wm. Lacey, Mo., E1040
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1039
Cole, Tom, Okla., E1036
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1041
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1035
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E1043
Long, Billy, Mo., E1041, E1041, E1042, E1043, E1043
McClintock, Tom, Calif., E1035
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1041
Messer, Luke, Ind., E1039
Moran, James P., Va., E1039
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E1043
Schrader, Kurt, Ore., E1041, E1042, E1043
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E1039, E1039
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1040
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E1036
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1037

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.