United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2013 No. 118

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 10, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN 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.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Congress returns to Washington this week after a month connecting with people at home, hopefully with a little time with family and friends.

Some think our overwhelming agenda was made nearly impossible with the Syrian question, which no one expected when we recessed—somewhat ironic—even though 100,000 Syrians have been killed and 2 million refugees are flooding into neighboring countries.

We face a looming budget showdown and a debt ceiling crisis. While we have futile votes to defund ObamaCare, the rest of the country is in the midst of a dramatic change in health care, perhaps the most profound in half a century. The health care reform train has left the station.

What if we took a break from sabotaging ObamaCare and creating a debt ceiling crisis to do our job as representatives of the people and as leaders?

What are we for?

We might start with Syria. I have deep reservations about the use of force, but as one of the people who called upon the President to involve Congress in this decision, I think we have an obligation to at least hear him out. Let's work to refine the Russian proposal, which appears to have had some American origins.

What about the 2 million refugees who need our help, to say nothing of their host countries?

Let's seize upon some of the promising signs out of Iran, from their new leadership, to make progress, both in Syria and with the Iranian nuclear question.

Domestically, let's spend our time rebuilding and renewing America, not just lamenting the poor shape of our infrastructure. Let's work together to support the vision and the resources to rebuild and renew the country and put Americans back to work.

Internationally—I see my good friend and colleague, Congressman TED POE, on the floor. Why don't we zero in on the efforts with our international Water for the World legislation to help deal with sanitation and safe drinking water for poor people around the globe?

Think about those 200 million hours women will spend in sub-Saharan Africa gathering water today, time that they won't spend in school or working for their families.

Let's use the fall to identify and move forward on the vast array of things where we actually agree we can work together and they won't cost very much. America will be the better for it, and so will Congress.

THE WAR ON SYRIA

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, Russia's diplomatic intervention in the Syrian crisis is indeed welcome news. But whether it is real or illusory, the President needs to step back from the dangerous precipice that he has brought us to.

Certainly, he's made his case for war with Syria very clearly, that the United States must punish the use of chemical weapons, and if we don't, they're more likely to be used again. He assures us that the strike will be limited and that it will aid moderates fighting the regime. He warns that American credibility is at stake. The case is quite clear: it is simply not convincing.

It's possible that an attack on Syria will convince Assad not to use chemical weapons in the future. But it is just as likely to convince him that, being in for a penny, he might as well be in for a pound and unleash his entire chemical arsenal.

It is just as likely that an American strike on Syria will produce a retaliatory strike, possibly by Hezbollah against Israel, requiring a retaliatory strike by Israel, possibly on Iran, in a catastrophic chain reaction.

We don't know where it will lead, but we can be sure that the morning after the attack we would confront a most uncomfortable irony. In retaliation for Assad killing Syrian civilians with chemical weapons, the United States will have killed Syrian civilians with

Printed on recycled paper.

conventional weapons, for civilian casualties are an unavoidable tragedy of war.

Well, who would be our new allies in this war?

They'd be the Islamic forces that are responsible for their own litany of atrocities, including the massacre of Syrian Christians, the beheading of political opponents, summary executions of war prisoners and acts of barbarity too depraved to be discussed in this forum. We would be aiding and abetting those forces.

We're told that al Qaeda's not more than a fourth of our new coalition and that the rest are moderates. Well, we were told the same thing about Libya. We were told the same thing about the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt.

The problem with moderates in the Middle East is that there aren't very many of them, and they're quickly overwhelmed in any coalition they attempt.

Nor can such an attack be limited in duration or scope. The fact is, once you have attacked another country, you are at war with that country and its allies, whatever you wish to call it, and whatever you later decide to do.

And wars have a very nasty way of taking turns that no one can predict or control. World War I began with a series of obscure incidents that quickly escalated into world war. And the Middle East today is a veritable powder keg compared to the antebellum Europe of a century ago.

Finally, we're told American credibility is on the line. Well, chemical weapons are barbaric, but this isn't the first time they've been used in modern times. They were used previously in Syria, in the Yemeni civil war, by Iraq against Iran, by the Vietnamese against the Cambodians, by Libya against Chad.

The only unique thing about this incident is that it is the first time an American President has declared their use to be a ''red line.'' Our credibility was harmed by a foolish and reckless statement by the President. Let us not further damage it with a foolish and reckless act by Congress.

Wars are not something to be taken lightly. From the podium right behind me, General MacArthur warned that, ''In war there is no substitute for victory.''

If you're going to start a war, you'd better be prepared to put the entire resources of the country behind it, to endure every setback along the way, to utterly annihilate every vestige of the enemy, and to install, by force, a government of our design and choosing, and to maintain that government until all opposition is ceased. If you are not willing to do that, then you have no business firing the first shot.

More than a decade of irresolute and aimless wars in Iraq and Afghanistan should have taught us this lesson: that victory, and not stalemate, must be the objective of any war. Yet, this would be a war whose avowed objective is stalemate. That is self-defeating. It is immoral.

The President has already made his case very clearly, and he is very clearly wrong.

THE SYRIAN CRISIS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank President Obama for his considered judgment in the matter of Syria, and for not headstrong rushing the United States to military action.

I thank him for his consultations with Members of Congress in both Chambers, and for allowing the American people time to express their views. We must all weigh the consequences and repercussions of unilateral U.S. action.

As the world's greatest military power, we must employ our power wisely, and only with good measure. I have every confidence that our U.S. military can perform any task to which they are ordered successfully, and we owe them our deepest respect and gratitude.

I also want to thank and acknowledge the government of Russia for early reports we are learning about regarding discussions under way to rid Syria of weapons caches of danger both to Syria as well as our global community.

Both Russia and the United States, as the world's premier nuclear powers, hold awesome responsibilities to move our world to a more peaceful and stable posture. Surely, we must focus that effort on the very unstable set of states across the Middle East.

Russia and our country both have suffered from terrorist attacks and well understand the consequences of unresolved conflict and terrorists preying on unstable states.

My hope is that the Russian initiative gains momentum. And let all nations of goodwill on our globe find a way forward to address the tragic consequences of the Syrian civil war, starting with greater humanitarian assistance to refugees that have flowed into adjoining nations like Jordan and Lebanon and Turkey, straining some of those nations' abilities to even hold their own internal affairs together.

Surely, our world can better address the human suffering that is evident to anyone who's paying attention. Surely, surely, all reasonable world leaders can find a better way forward for Syria and for us all.

THE NOBEL PEACE PRIZE PRESIDENT BEATS THE DRUMS FOR WAR

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the drums of war are being beaten by the President who, ironically, won the Nobel Peace Prize. The ''Peace President'' wants to fire missiles into Syria because tyrant Assad is violating the rules of war by allegedly using chemical weapons. The President's goal is not to remove Assad, not to destroy the chemical weapons, but to send Assad a message.

To be clear, there is no imminent national security threat or interest for the United States by us starting this war. And make no mistake, shooting rockets into another country is an act of war.

War has consequences. What if the outlaw Assad chooses then to use chemical weapons again or chooses to shoot back? He could retaliate against the United States, one of our embassies, the Navy that fired the rockets, or other U.S. military installations, or even specific troops, or retaliate against his neighbor, Turkey, or Israel, using our aggression as an excuse. In any of these situations, this limited war escalates with more U.S. response, intervention, and involvement.

Now, who are the players in this war that is taking place already? On one side you have Syria, tyrant Assad, with the aid of Russia, with the aid of Iran that news reports say has 10,000 Iranian troops in Syria, and Hezbollah. Hezbollah, as you remember, Madam Speaker, is a terrorist group.

Then, on the other side, you have the Free Syrian Army. You have patriots. You have mercenaries, paid soldiers from other countries. You have criminals that have come in to just pillage the land and use this as an opportunity. You also have al Nusra, an al Qaeda affiliate. You also have al Qaeda from Iraq. Now, last time I recall, the United States is already at war with al Qaeda. They are the enemy of the United States.

□ 1015

And it looks like now you've got the terrorist group Hezbollah on one side and the terrorist group al Qaeda on the other side. And we want to get involved in this civil religious war to send a message not to use chemical weapons?

Of course, you not only just have these players, but you've got Turkey, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar lined up on the side of the Free Syrian Army. Turkey is a next-door neighbor to Syria. A year ago, a Turkish F–4 built by the United States was flying along the Syrian border, and it was shot down. We don't know who shot it down.

Meanwhile, the United States already has, along with its NATO parties, patriot batteries on the Syrian border facing Syria that are in Turkey. The Dutch, the Germans, and the Americans have manned those batteries. Why? To make sure that our NATO ally is protected from incoming rockets. If we escalate this regional conflict in one country, it may escalate to other regions, like Turkey. Then we've got real issues because Turkey is a NATO ally. We are obligated to help them if they get into a war with Syria.

And then about the terrorists. As I mentioned, they are really on both sides. And we hear from the administration, with all due respect, that the minority of fighters on the rebel side are al Qaeda. I respectfully disagree with the Secretary of State. What seems to be happening is the Free Syrian Army is going through Syria liberating Syrians, and al Qaeda is in the background, coming in and occupying the territory and imposing strict Islamic sharia law. We can see this play out. If the rebels eventually are successful, then we may have a second civil war between the Free Syrian Army and al Qaeda.

All of that may be down the road. And why would the United States want to get involved in this situation?

So today, Madam Speaker, I have filed a resolution stating that no U.S. funds will be used for this war with Syria. This religious civil war is not our war. So no money for the ''Peace President's'' war. And if he starts a war with Syria, I suggest the President return the Nobel Peace Prize. If he really wants to send a message, he should follow Samuel Goldwyn's advice: ''try Western Union.''

And that's just the way it is.

USDA FOOD INSECURITY FIGURES

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, last week, the United States Department of Agriculture released its annual report on food security in the United States. The report documents the levels of food security and insecurity in this country. In this report, the USDA measured the amount of food available or unavailable to households and individuals. In other words, Madam Speaker, the USDA measured the amount of hunger in the United States. It measured the ability of Americans to put food on their tables.

The good news is that hunger isn't getting worse. The bad news is that there are still 49 million people living in our great country who are food insecure; 49 million people who don't know where their next meal will come from; 49 million people who are forced to choose between basic needs like rent, utilities, and food; 49 million people who don't have the resources necessary to make ends meet; 49 million people who are hungry. That's one out of every six people living in this country who is food insecure—a figure that hasn't changed since 2008.

While it's a good thing that food insecurity isn't getting worse, that's simply not good enough. We must do more to ensure that healthy and nutritious food is available to everyone in America. We must ensure that 49 million people are not left behind when it comes to buying food.

The fact remains that millions of Americans are still struggling to make ends meet. Millions of Americans continue to feel the effects of the worst economic recession since the Great Depression. As a result of the staggering loss of jobs and reduced wages that came from the recession, millions of Americans were forced to turn to the Federal Government's preeminent anti-hunger program, SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, in order to put food on their tables.

SNAP participation rates skyrocketed precisely because of the recession. SNAP is a safety net. It's designed to increase in participation in times of need. That means the cost of the program goes up as more people need help buying food while they're either unemployed or struggling with lower wages. That's precisely what happened during the recession. And that's why there are so many people relying on SNAP today. These food insecurity numbers confirm that hunger is a problem in America; that there are millions of people—49 million—who don't know where their next meals are coming from and need helping buying food for themselves and their families.

This is a sobering report, Madam Speaker, and one that would normally result in congressional hearings on the problem and possible ways to reduce hunger in America. But we're not living in normal times. That's because, Madam Speaker, even with the release of this report showing that rates of food insecurity are unchanged since the end of the Bush administration, this Republican-controlled House is preparing to consider a bill that would cut at least $40 billion from the SNAP program. That's right. The response to this report is to make hunger in America even worse than it is today.

I want to remind my colleagues there is not one single town, city, county, or congressional district in America that is hunger free. For the life of me, I can't understand why the Republicans want to cut this program that provides food to millions of Americans. I cannot understand why the Republican leadership wants to balance the budget on the backs of the working poor.

SNAP is not only successful; it's efficient and effective. The error rate for SNAP is among the lowest, if not the lowest, error rates of any Federal program. That's right. Fraud, waste, and abuse in SNAP is at an all-time low, which means that SNAP dollars are going exactly where they should be going—to food-hungry Americans. On top of that, SNAP kept 4.7 million people out of poverty in 2011, including 2.1 million children. That means that cutting SNAP will also result in increased poverty in America. The irony is there are some Members of this House who are collecting millions of dollars in taxpayer-funded farm subsidies while at the same time they vote to take away food from hungry Americans.

Madam Speaker, hunger in America is real. It must be addressed. That's why I've called for a White House conference on food nutrition, a conference where we can explore hunger and nutrition and develop a plan to end this scourge once and for all. We will not end hunger by cutting the most efficient and effective anti-hunger program in the country. We will not end hunger through arbitrary, harmful, and spiteful budget cuts.

We can end hunger now if we decide to take that step. The USDA food security report provides evidence that we're not doing enough to end hunger now. The upcoming vote to cut the anti-hunger safety net shows how truly harmful the Republican leadership is when it comes to the working poor in America. We can do more. We can do better. We can—and we must—end hunger now.

MEDICARE DME–POS MARKET PRICING PROGRAM ACT OF 2013

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, on August 22, the United States Department of Health and Human Services Inspector General, Daniel Levinson, announced his decision to initiate an investigation into the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, aka Medicare, and its handling of the Competitive Bidding Program for durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies.

I initiated a request on June 20, 2013, following disclosures that CMS awarded contracts nationwide to suppliers that lacked the proper licensure and accreditation—clear violations of the agency's program guidelines for participation in the Competitive Bidding Program.

The so-called ''competitive'' bidding model is being used by the government to procure goods and services for our Nation's seniors and those facing life-altering disease and disability. While CMS makes claims the Competitive Bidding Program will increase market competition and lower costs, in practice it's shown to be anything but competitive. Over the past several years, we've seen the program negatively affect seniors and force small medical companies, many that are local and the only entity capable of providing quality goods and a high level of service, out of the market and out of business.

In 2011, more than 240 economists and market auction design experts wrote to President Obama concerning the flawed bidding model. The experts wrote:

> The current program is the antithesis of science and contradicts all that is known about proper market design.

These warnings have become reality over the past several years. The licensure and accreditation abuses are just the latest among a long list of program failures.

For many of these reasons, on June 12, 2013, 227 bipartisan Members of the House—a full majority—including 82

Democrats and 145 Republicans, sent a letter to CMS outlining the flaws and abuses in the program, requesting that the agency delay further implementation until such issues are fully addressed and fixed.

Despite the growing number of reported abuses under the program and strong congressional concern about the bidding design and a long overdue need for transparency and accountability, CMS moved forward with the program in 91 new bidding areas on July 1, 2013, bringing the total to 100 areas nationwide.

While CMS has admitted to the abuses, the agency has failed to detail how these failures occurred or offer a plan for corrective action. With any hope, the Office of Inspector General's efforts will shed light on how these failures occurred and impose a new level of transparency at the Medicare agency, CMS, and among the agency's administrators. In the meantime, it will be up to the House of Representatives to take corrective action.

With this said, I respectfully request that each of my colleagues join me in cosponsoring H.R. 1717, Medicare DME–POS Market Pricing Program Act of 2013. This commonsense measure, authored by my esteemed colleague from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, will apply real market principles to the highly flawed competitive bidding model. Madam Speaker, we owe as much to our constituents, the taxpayers, and our Nation's Medicare beneficiaries.

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 27 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Harmon E. Stockdale, Mt. Vernon Missionary Baptist Church, Rochester, New York, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we acknowledge You with adoration and humble gratitude. We pray for Your presence and guidance over this distinguished body before whom we stand.

We thank You for this great land in which we live, the United States of America. And we thank You for all who share in making the policies, laws, and decisions which guide and govern our Nation.

We ask Your blessings upon all of our elected and appointed leaders as they lead us to face the challenges of our day. Grant that we, as a Nation, may be mindful of Your providence and Your grace as we give moral and ethical leadership to the people of our world.

May justice, equality, and compassion always be the guiding principles for our way of life; and may we never forget that to whom much is given, much is required.

In Your Son's name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS 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-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

USE OF MILITARY FORCE IN SYRIA

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, this week, all eyes will be upon us as we debate the use of force in Syria. This decision is not one that should be made lightly, as ultimately there are many factors to be weighed.

Make no mistake that what is happening in Syria is truly a human tragedy. That nation has been torn apart by civil war. It is without a doubt that Assad is not a friend or ally of ours. But things are very complicated. A large number of those who oppose the Assad regime are affiliated with al Qaeda. In the case of Syria, Assad, and the rebels, it cannot be said that the enemy of my enemy is my friend. In this dangerous civil war, the enemy of our enemy is still and will always be our enemy.

It is this dynamic which has led to the overwhelming response of people throughout my district and our Nation to say without an imminent threat to national security, without a plan, without a goal, without unified international support from our allies, we must stay out of Syria.

NATION-BUILDING AT HOME

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Syria is that of a national civil war. It's a sectarian and ethnic conflict between two warring factions. This is not about democracy and freedom. There is no social contract. There is no constitution. There is no preamble. There is no unifying vision as to what Syria wants to become. This is a brutal battle between two bad sides for control. Assad is a brutal dictator, for certain; but the opposition's best fighters are al Qaeda and Islamic extremists bent on creating an Islamic state in Syria.

In the international community, 194 countries have said—but for Turkey and France—yes, the United States, go get them; just don't ask us to participate. So the American people will find themselves, once again, for the third time in a decade, in a region of the Middle East in South Asia in another civil war, essentially alone again.

The American people want nation-building. But they want it right here at home, in America.

ANOTHER SOLUTION IN SYRIA

(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, I rise today to oppose the President's action in Syria.

I just returned from the Middle East, meeting with heads of state in Qatar, Egypt, the United Arab Emirates, and our ambassador to NATO. I'm firmly convinced that any action on our part will further destabilize Syria and cause a collapse of the government. What will happen then? What will happen is that country will then fall in the hands of Hezbollah, Hamas, al Qaeda, and the Muslim Brotherhood.

At the end of the day, what's important, Mr. Speaker, is who has control of those weapons of mass destruction. While what Mr. Assad has done has been barbaric and evil, we will never forgive ourselves for the havoc that will be played upon this world if those weapons fall into the hands of Islamic extremists. We need to work together collectively to address the problem of identifying and finding those weapons of mass destruction and securing those for the future.

There are many people who are living outside of their country now as refugees. There are tens of thousands of able men who could be recruited to be a part of that solution.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD OBESITY AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, this week, I will reintroduce a resolution recognizing September as National Childhood Obesity Awareness Month. September marks an opportunity for Congress to raise awareness of the issue while also discussing ways we can engage our families and communities on how best to curb this unhealthy trend.

Over the past three decades, childhood obesity rates in the United States have tripled. Today, nearly one in three children are overweight or obese. These numbers are even higher in minority communities, where nearly 40 percent of African American and Hispanic children are overweight. Children today experience a different lifestyle from 30 years ago, when kids ate less and exercised more.

Many groups have stepped up to the plate to improve nutrition and physical activity for our children. Community partners like the Campaign to End Obesity, Cheer for a Healthier America, YWCA, and HealthCorps have taken the charge to achieve the healthiest lives we can give them.

Let us use the month of September to elevate the issue of childhood obesity and recognize our community partners.

VERIFICATION OF OBAMACARE SUBSIDIES

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, after 3½ years, the Obama administration has failed to make its hallmark legislation, ObamaCare, work. Instead, it has delayed or waived key portions, including the so-called ''verification system.'' This was ObamaCare's way of ensuring folks who received Federal assistance to buy health insurance met the criteria. Buried within 600 pages of red tape, the administration said it will no longer verify the information provided by individuals, but simply rely on self-reporting.

Mr. Speaker, this opens a wide door to further fraud and abuse in our health care system. This fraud could amount to $250 billion in taxpayer-funded payments. That's no pocket change.

That's why I urge my colleagues to support a commonsense bill, H.R. 2775, No Subsidies Without Verification Act, to protect taxpayer dollars and further chip away at this unworkable law. The American people want, need, and deserve better.

FIXING THE WAR POWER AUTHORITY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the President has come to Congress, as he should, to ask authority for a discretionary military action. The sad fact is he doesn't have to because of a defective law passed by Congress in reaction to Nixon's bombing of Cambodia in 1973. The bill that Congress passed is a shadow of our constitutional authority regarding war and peace.

This President has come to us. That's good. The result is not yet known. It has already resulted perhaps in a diplomatic breakthrough. That is also good. But in the future we need to make certain that each and every President comes to us when we're not defending against immediate interests of the United States or against imminent or real attack of our troops or our citizens.

So I'll be reintroducing legislation to fix the war power authority. In the future, in circumstances such as this, it will require that the President come to the Congress before launching a discretionary military action. We must fix this law. This is a good precedent this President has set. Let's make it the law of the United States of America.

OPPOSE MILITARY ACTION IN SYRIA

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the President and my colleagues to oppose any U.S. military action in Syria. Based on the evidence given to Congress, I have serious reservations about authorizing the use of military force in another Middle Eastern country. The President has not convinced me that we have vital national security interests at stake in Syria or a clear military objective. There are far too many unanswered questions and unclear objectives.

My constituents in the 24th District of Texas are deeply skeptical about the value of military intervention in Syria. I fully agree with their concerns. On behalf of my constituents and many concerned Americans, I respectfully urge my colleagues to weigh the evidence fully and to be realistic about what can be achieved in military intervention. Let us vote for what's best for the United States. Keep the U.S. military out of Syria.

THE ALTERNATIVE PLAN IN SYRIA

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Obama administration for its willingness to consider a new alternative proposal for dealing with Syria. The proposal is to hand over all—and I stress all—of Syria's chemical weapons under the oversight of the international community and to safely and verifiably destroy them. This could actually remove those weapons from the battlefield and peacefully prevent the further use of them against the people of Syria or her neighbors. This idea has gained support from U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki Moon, as well as Russia and France.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal needs to be vigorously pursued. The Syrian regime's attack against its own people using poisonous gas is morally reprehensible. If this plan is successful, it could produce an outcome that everyone desires: preventing the Assad regime from using chemical weapons.

□ 1215

WILL THE SENATE AND THE PRESIDENT ACT TO GET AMERICANS WORKING AGAIN?

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are still struggling with a shaky economy. During the August district work period, the number one question I heard from my constituents was: Where are the jobs?

Last week we saw the unemployment rate in August drop to 7.3 percent, but for all the wrong reasons. People didn't find jobs; they stopped looking for them altogether. Between July and August, that amounted to more than 300,000 people.

A smaller percentage of Americans is working or looking for work than at any time in the past 35 years. It is so discouraging to be told the recession is over, but then you look and you look but you can't find a job.

Employers around my district tell me the best stimulus for hiring is to reduce government regulations, cut taxes, simplify the Tax Code, and push for smaller government. Yet, what do they see ahead? More uncertainty as States race to meet the October 1 deadline to set up expensive and confusing ObamaCare exchanges. No wonder businesses aren't hiring; the ''Unaffordable Care Act'' doesn't give them the confidence that they need to be able to afford hiring new employees.

Let's restore their confidence to hire and train new workers. The House has passed numerous jobs bills to reduce regulations on businesses. Let's have the Senate act.

SYRIA

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on Syria.

The real issue is that the Assad regime gassed more than 426 children and their parents. Those who perished died a horrific, merciless, and completely unnecessary death. We must come together and act with the President to create a credible threat of force and, thereby, deter the future use of chemical weapons.

Now, I am somewhat optimistic that, as recently reported, Syria is willing to place its chemical weapons under international control. This solution could possibly bring a peaceful resolution. But we must remember that Iran is also watching. The Ayatollah is looking to see if the U.S. is willing to stand up against those who gas their own people. Will they really stand up then against the plan to build nuclear weapons?

We need to stand with the President and send a message to the world that we mean what we say: that we won't allow Assad to keep gassing his own people and that we won't allow Iran to develop a nuclear weapon.

UNIVERSAL LITTLE LEAGUE

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to honor, today, a group of hometown heros from Corpus Christi, Texas, the Corpus Christi Universal Little League team.

Universal made it to the Little League World Series this year in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, after they won the Southwest Regional Tournament. These young men showcased their talents on an international stage, defeating teams from Australia and Canada.

They received a grand welcome back to Corpus Christi along Shoreline Boulevard with a parade, where my district director, Bob Haueter, presented them with a flag flown over the United States Capitol and a letter of congratulations from me. They are an inspiration to young men and women throughout Texas and America.

This summer they saw and demonstrated that hard work pays off. It's a feeling I know they will carry with them for many years to come.

Way to go, Universal.

SEQUESTER

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 5 weeks since the House recessed for a district work period and all of our problems that we put on hold remain right here in front of us. This long list of challenges includes repealing the sequester.

According to the nonpartisan CBO, sequestration will cost us about 750,000 jobs this year alone. Now is the time to act. Instead of messaging bills or playing procedural games in an attempt to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act, we should be addressing unfinished business.

Americans have sent us here to do a job: help put people back to work and grow our economy. I encourage House Republicans to work with Democrats to roll back these mindless, thoughtless sequester cuts. They are the worst way to save a bad program and the most foolish way to cut a good and vibrant one.

STOP OBAMACARE

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, hardworking Americans have called on Congress to stop ObamaCare. While they expect that Washington elites will deride their message and disparage their cause, they are here because they understand the consequences of ObamaCare's oppressive mandates.

Back home, over the month of August, I heard from parents who pay higher premiums only to have health coverage dropped for their spouse. I have talked with Hoosiers who make ends meet with two part-time jobs after their hours were cut. I have seen the discouragement of neighbors who hope this is finally the week they will find work.

Americans know that this isn't what a recovery looks like, but they wonder if Washington even cares. President Obama told them to trust the bureaucrats, the same bureaucrats who gave carve-outs to Big Business and kickbacks to Big Government. Republicans told them we had a different plan. We promised to stop ObamaCare and put patients ahead of politics. As ObamaCare's October 1 deadline approaches, those families wonder if we really mean it.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to keep that promise. Now, when it really matters, we must stop ObamaCare.

HONOR SYSTEM

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, because of ObamaCare, health insurance costs could be increasing more than 80 percent for young North Carolinians. Yes, those who pay just over $100 a month now may have to pay $185 for ObamaCare-approved coverage.

The administration has attempted to console us with promises that the blow of such sharp cost increases will be softened for the neediest Americans through income-based taxpayer subsidies. However, there's a problem: it's not just needy Americans who will have access. Because the Obama administration has decided to rely on an ''honor system'' for subsidy distribution to draw money, income won't have to be verified, and neither will one's access to ''affordable'' employer-provided health coverage.

We are told this honor system will be temporary, but we are not satisfied. Develop a verification system now or delay the subsidies. Better yet, give every American a break and repeal this law.

''NEW NORMAL''/VERIFICATION BILL I

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, last week we learned even more distressing news about our economy: the labor force participation rate is the lowest since 1979, during Jimmy Carter's Presidency.

We refuse to settle for a ''new normal.'' Americans deserve better. And how do the President and Democrats in Congress plan to make things better? Well, they still insist on the full implementation of ObamaCare, which its own authors already describe as a ''train wreck.''

But the House is working to dismantle this unworkable law, and we're taking another major step this week. We are introducing legislation that will prevent waste, fraud, and abuse in the distribution of ObamaCare subsidies.

House Republicans will continue to work to protect Americans from the harmful effects of this law. It's all part of our plan to foster a strong economy and a more structured and secure future for all.

''NEW NORMAL'' I

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I've spent the last few weeks back home listening to my constituents and hearing their stories of just how tough times are in the Obama economy. And what's the latest economic news? More of the same.

Another disappointing jobs report was issued by the Labor Department last week. We learned that far too many of our fellow Americans have simply given up looking for work—the labor force participation rate is at its lowest since 1979. Is this what Americans should come to expect? Is this the ''new normal''?

Americans deserve better than this mediocre economy. House Republicans remain committed to fostering a strong economy and more secure future. Our plan revolves around more jobs and expanding opportunity instead of stifling it. That's how we will get our economy back to work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS REFORM ACT OF 2013

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1155) to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1155

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. REESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title III of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6751 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

"SEC. 321. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers (referred to in this subtitle as the 'Association').

''(b) STATUS.—The Association shall—

''(1) be a nonprofit corporation;

''(2) not be an agent or instrumentality of the Federal Government;

''(3) be an independent organization that may not be merged with or into any other private or public entity; and

''(4) except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, be subject to, and have all the powers conferred upon, a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29–301.01 et seq.) or any successor thereto.

"SEC. 322. PURPOSE.

''The purpose of the Association shall be to provide a mechanism through which licensing, continuing education, and other nonresident insurance producer qualification requirements and conditions may be adopted and applied on a multi-state basis without affecting the laws, rules, and regulations, and preserving the rights of a State, pertaining to—

''(1) licensing, continuing education, and other qualification requirements of insurance producers that are not members of the Association;

''(2) resident or nonresident insurance producer appointment requirements;

''(3) supervising and disciplining resident and nonresident insurance producers;

''(4) establishing licensing fees for resident and nonresident insurance producers so that there is no loss of insurance producer licensing revenue to the State; and

''(5) prescribing and enforcing laws and regulations regulating the conduct of resident and nonresident insurance producers.

"SEC. 323. MEMBERSHIP.

''(a) ELIGIBILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any insurance producer licensed in its home State shall, subject to paragraphs (2) and (4), be eligible to become a member of the Association.

''(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF LICENSE.—Subject to paragraph (3), an insurance producer is not eligible to become a member of the Association if a State insurance regulator has suspended or revoked the insurance license of the insurance producer in that State.

''(3) RESUMPTION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Paragraph (2) shall cease to apply to any insurance producer if—

''(A) the State insurance regulator reissues or renews the license of the insurance producer in the State in which the license was suspended or revoked, or otherwise terminates or vacates the suspension or revocation; or

''(B) the suspension or revocation expires or is subsequently overturned by a court of competent jurisdiction.

''(4) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUIRED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An insurance producer who is an individual shall not be eligible to become a member of the Association unless the insurance producer has undergone a criminal history record check that complies with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General of the United States under subparagraph (K).

''(B) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY HOME STATE.—An insurance producer who is licensed in a State and who has undergone a criminal history record check during the 2-year period preceding the date of submission of an application to become a member of the Association, in compliance with a requirement to undergo such criminal history record check as a condition for such licensure in the State, shall be deemed to have undergone a criminal history record check for purposes of subparagraph (A).

''(C) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY ASSOCIATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall, upon request by an insurance producer licensed in a State, submit fingerprints or other identification information obtained from the insurance producer, and a request for a criminal history record check of the insurance producer, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(ii) PROCEDURES.—The board of directors of the Association (referred to in this subtitle as the 'Board') shall prescribe procedures for obtaining and utilizing fingerprints or other identification information and criminal history record information, including the establishment of reasonable fees to defray the expenses of the Association in connection with the performance of a criminal history record check and appropriate safeguards for maintaining confidentiality and security of the information. Any fees charged pursuant to this clause shall be separate and distinct from those charged by the Attorney General pursuant to subparagraph (I).

''(D) FORM OF REQUEST.—A submission under subparagraph (C)(i) shall include such fingerprints or other identification information as is required by the Attorney General concerning the person about whom the criminal history record check is requested, and a statement signed by the person authorizing the Attorney General to provide the information to the Association and for the Association to receive the information.

''(E) PROVISION OF INFORMATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Upon receiving a submission under subparagraph (C)(i) from the Association, the Attorney General shall search all criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including records of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Attorney General determines appropriate for criminal history records corresponding to the fingerprints or other identification information provided under subparagraph (D) and provide all criminal history record information included in the request to the Association.

''(F) LIMITATION ON PERMISSIBLE USES OF INFORMATION.—Any information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) may only—

''(i) be used for purposes of determining compliance with membership criteria established by the Association;

''(ii) be disclosed to State insurance regulators, or Federal or State law enforcement agencies, in conformance with applicable law; or

''(iii) be disclosed, upon request, to the insurance producer to whom the criminal history record information relates.

''(G) PENALTY FOR IMPROPER USE OR DISCLOSURE.—Whoever knowingly uses any information provided under subparagraph (E) for a purpose not authorized in subparagraph (F), or discloses any such information to anyone not authorized to receive it, shall be fined not more than $50,000 per violation as determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

''(H) RELIANCE ON INFORMATION.—Neither the Association nor any of its Board members, officers, or employees shall be liable in any action for using information provided under subparagraph (E) as permitted under subparagraph (F) in good faith and in reasonable reliance on its accuracy.

''(I) FEES.—The Attorney General may charge a reasonable fee for conducting the search and providing the information under subparagraph (E), and any such fee shall be collected and remitted by the Association to the Attorney General.

''(J) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as—

''(i) requiring a State insurance regulator to perform criminal history record checks under this section; or

''(ii) limiting any other authority that allows access to criminal history records.

''(K) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to carry out this paragraph, which shall include—

''(i) appropriate protections for ensuring the confidentiality of information provided under subparagraph (E); and

''(ii) procedures providing a reasonable opportunity for an insurance producer to contest the accuracy of information regarding the insurance producer provided under subparagraph (E).

''(L) INELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Association may, under reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to an insurance producer on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E), or where the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action, as described in paragraph (2).

''(ii) RIGHTS OF APPLICANTS DENIED MEMBERSHIP.—The Association shall notify any insurance producer who is denied membership on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E) of the right of the insurance producer to—

''(I) obtain a copy of all criminal history record information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) with respect to the insurance producer; and

''(II) challenge the denial of membership based on the accuracy and completeness of the information.

''(M) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'criminal history record check' means a national background check of criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(b) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.—The Association may establish membership criteria that bear a reasonable relationship to the purposes for which the Association was established.

''(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF CLASSES AND CATEGORIES OF MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP.—The Association may establish separate classes of

membership, with separate criteria, if the Association reasonably determines that performance of different duties requires different levels of education, training, experience, or other qualifications.

''(2) BUSINESS ENTITIES.—The Association shall establish a class of membership and membership criteria for business entities. A business entity that applies for membership shall be required to designate an individual Association member responsible for the compliance of the business entity with Association standards and the insurance laws, standards, and regulations of any State in which the business entity seeks to do business on the basis of Association membership.

''(3) CATEGORIES.—

''(A) SEPARATE CATEGORIES FOR INSURANCE PRODUCERS PERMITTED.—The Association may establish separate categories of membership for insurance producers and for other persons or entities within each class, based on the types of licensing categories that exist under State laws.

''(B) SEPARATE TREATMENT FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS PROHIBITED.—No special categories of membership, and no distinct membership criteria, shall be established for members that are depository institutions or for employees, agents, or affiliates of depository institutions.

''(d) MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association may establish criteria for membership which shall include standards for personal qualifications, education, training, and experience. The Association shall not establish criteria that unfairly limit the ability of a small insurance producer to become a member of the Association, including imposing discriminatory membership fees.

''(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—In establishing criteria under paragraph (1), the Association shall not adopt any qualification less protective to the public than that contained in the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (referred to in this subtitle as the 'NAIC') Producer Licensing Model Act in effect as of the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013, and shall consider the highest levels of insurance producer qualifications established under the licensing laws of the States.

''(3) ASSISTANCE FROM STATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Association may request a State to provide assistance in investigating and evaluating the eligibility of a prospective member for membership in the Association.

''(B) AUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION SHARING.—A submission under subsection (a)(4)(C)(i) made by an insurance producer licensed in a State shall include a statement signed by the person about whom the assistance is requested authorizing—

''(i) the State to share information with the Association; and

''(ii) the Association to receive the information.

''(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed as requiring or authorizing any State to adopt new or additional requirements concerning the licensing or evaluation of insurance producers.

''(4) DENIAL OF MEMBERSHIP.—The Association may, based on reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to any State-licensed insurance producer for failure to meet the membership criteria established by the Association.

''(e) EFFECT OF MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) AUTHORITY OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS.—Membership in the Association shall—

''(A) authorize an insurance producer to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance in any State for which the member pays the licensing fee set by the State for any line or lines of insurance specified in the home State license of the insurance producer, and exercise all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry out such activities, including claims adjustments and settlement to the extent permissible under the laws of the State, risk management, employee benefits advice, retirement planning, and any other insurance-related consulting activities;

''(B) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for purposes of authorizing the insurance producer to engage in the activities described in subparagraph (A) in any State where the member pays the licensing fee; and

''(C) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for the purpose of subjecting an insurance producer to all laws, regulations, provisions or other action of any State concerning revocation, suspension, or other enforcement action related to the ability of a member to engage in any activity within the scope of authority granted under this subsection and to all State laws, regulations, provisions, and actions preserved under paragraph (5).

''(2) VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to alter, modify, or supercede any requirement established by section 1033 of title 18, United States Code.

''(3) AGENT FOR REMITTING FEES.—The Association shall act as an agent for any member for purposes of remitting licensing fees to any State pursuant to paragraph (1).

''(4) NOTIFICATION OF ACTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when an insurance producer has satisfied the membership criteria of this section. The States (including State insurance regulators) shall have 10 business days after the date of the notification in order to provide the Association with evidence that the insurance producer does not satisfy the criteria for membership in the Association.

''(B) ONGOING DISCLOSURES REQUIRED.—On an ongoing basis, the Association shall disclose to the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC a list of the States in which each member is authorized to operate. The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when a member is newly authorized to operate in one or more States, or is no longer authorized to operate in one or more States on the basis of Association membership.

''(5) PRESERVATION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION AND MARKET CONDUCT REGULATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No provision of this section shall be construed as altering or affecting the applicability or continuing effectiveness of any law, regulation, provision, or other action of any State, including those described in subparagraph (B), to the extent that the State law, regulation, provision, or other action is not inconsistent with the provisions of this subtitle related to market entry for nonresident insurance producers, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency.

''(B) PRESERVED REGULATIONS.—The laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions of any State referred to in subparagraph (A) include laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions that—

''(i) regulate market conduct, insurance producer conduct, or unfair trade practices;

''(ii) establish consumer protections; or

''(iii) require insurance producers to be appointed by a licensed or authorized insurer.

''(f) BIENNIAL RENEWAL.—Membership in the Association shall be renewed on a biennial basis.

''(g) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall establish, as a condition of membership, continuing education requirements which shall be comparable to the continuing education requirements under the licensing laws of a majority of the States.

''(2) STATE CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS.—A member may not be required to satisfy continuing education requirements imposed under the laws, regulations, provisions, or actions of any State other than the home State of the member.

''(3) RECIPROCITY.—The Association shall not require a member to satisfy continuing education requirements that are equivalent to any continuing education requirements of the home State of the member that have been satisfied by the member during the applicable licensing period.

''(4) LIMITATION ON THE ASSOCIATION.—The Association shall not directly or indirectly offer any continuing education courses for insurance producers.

''(h) PROBATION, SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION.—

''(1) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—The Association may place an insurance producer that is a member of the Association on probation or suspend or revoke the membership of the insurance producer in the Association, or assess monetary fines or penalties, as the Association determines to be appropriate, if—

''(A) the insurance producer fails to meet the applicable membership criteria or other standards established by the Association;

''(B) the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action pursuant to a final adjudicatory proceeding under the jurisdiction of a State insurance regulator;

''(C) an insurance license held by the insurance producer has been suspended or revoked by a State insurance regulator; or

''(D) the insurance producer has been convicted of a crime that would have resulted in the denial of membership pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(L)(i) at the time of application, and the Association has received a copy of the final disposition from a court of competent jurisdiction.

''(2) VIOLATIONS OF ASSOCIATION STANDARDS.—The Association shall have the power to investigate alleged violations of Association standards.

''(3) REPORTING.—The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when the membership of an insurance producer has been placed on probation or has been suspended, revoked, or otherwise terminated, or when the Association has assessed monetary fines or penalties.

''(i) CONSUMER COMPLAINTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall—

''(A) refer any complaint against a member of the Association from a consumer relating to alleged misconduct or violations of State insurance laws to the State insurance regulator where the consumer resides and, when appropriate, to any additional State insurance regulator, as determined by standards adopted by the Association; and

''(B) make any related records and information available to each State insurance regulator to whom the complaint is forwarded.

''(2) TELEPHONE AND OTHER ACCESS.—The Association shall maintain a toll-free number for purposes of this subsection and, as practicable, other alternative means of communication with consumers, such as an Internet webpage.

''(3) FINAL DISPOSITION OF INVESTIGATION.—State insurance regulators shall provide the Association with information regarding the final disposition of a complaint referred pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), but nothing shall be construed to compel a State to release confidential investigation reports or other

information protected by State law to the Association.

''(j) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Association may—

''(1) share documents, materials, or other information, including confidential and privileged documents, with a State, Federal, or international governmental entity or with the NAIC or other appropriate entity referred to paragraphs (3) and (4), provided that the recipient has the authority and agrees to maintain the confidentiality or privileged status of the document, material, or other information;

''(2) limit the sharing of information as required under this subtitle with the NAIC or any other non-governmental entity, in circumstances under which the Association determines that the sharing of such information is unnecessary to further the purposes of this subtitle;

''(3) establish a central clearinghouse, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a central clearinghouse, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators), through which members of the Association may disclose their intent to operate in 1 or more States and pay the licensing fees to the appropriate States; and

''(4) establish a database, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a database, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators) for the collection of regulatory information concerning the activities of insurance producers.

''(k) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall take effect on the later of—

''(1) the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013; and

''(2) the date of incorporation of the Association.

''SEC. 324. BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a board of directors of the Association, which shall have authority to govern and supervise all activities of the Association.

''(b) POWERS.—The Board shall have such of the powers and authority of the Association as may be specified in the bylaws of the Association.

''(c) COMPOSITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall consist of 13 members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, of whom—

''(A) 8 shall be State insurance commissioners appointed in the manner provided in paragraph (2), 1 of whom shall be designated by the President to serve as the chairperson of the Board until the Board elects one such State insurance commissioner Board member to serve as the chairperson of the Board;

''(B) 3 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with property and casualty insurance producer licensing; and

''(C) 2 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with life or health insurance producer licensing.

''(2) STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Before making any appointments pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), the President shall request a list of recommended candidates from the States through the NAIC, which shall not be binding on the President. If the NAIC fails to submit a list of recommendations not later than 15 business days after the date of the request, the President may make the requisite appointments without considering the views of the NAIC.

''(B) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Not more than 4 Board members appointed under paragraph (1)(A) shall belong to the same political party.

''(C) FORMER STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If, after offering each currently serving State insurance commissioner an appointment to the Board, fewer than 8 State insurance commissioners have accepted appointment to the Board, the President may appoint the remaining State insurance commissioner Board members, as required under paragraph (1)(A), of the appropriate political party as required under subparagraph (B), from among individuals who are former State insurance commissioners.

''(ii) LIMITATION.—A former State insurance commissioner appointed as described in clause (i) may not be employed by or have any present direct or indirect financial interest in any insurer, insurance producer, or other entity in the insurance industry, other than direct or indirect ownership of, or beneficial interest in, an insurance policy or annuity contract written or sold by an insurer.

''(D) SERVICE THROUGH TERM.—If a Board member appointed under paragraph (1)(A) ceases to be a State insurance commissioner during the term of the Board member, the Board member shall cease to be a Board member.

''(3) PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—In making any appointment pursuant to subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), the President may seek recommendations for candidates from groups representing the category of individuals described, which shall not be binding on the President.

''(4) STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'State insurance commissioner' means a person who serves in the position in State government, or on the board, commission, or other body that is the primary insurance regulatory authority for the State.

''(d) TERMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under paragraph (2), the term of service for each Board member shall be 2 years.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(A) 1-YEAR TERMS.—The term of service shall be 1 year, as designated by the President at the time of the nomination of the subject Board members for—

''(i) 4 of the State insurance commissioner Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(A), of whom not more than 2 shall belong to the same political party;

''(ii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(B); and

''(iii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(C).

''(B) EXPIRATION OF TERM.—A Board member may continue to serve after the expiration of the term to which the Board member was appointed for the earlier of 2 years or until a successor is appointed.

''(C) MID-TERM APPOINTMENTS.—A Board member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the predecessor of the Board member was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

''(3) SUCCESSIVE TERMS.—Board members may be reappointed to successive terms.

''(e) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—The appointment of initial Board members shall be made no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013.

''(f) MEETINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall meet—

''(A) at the call of the chairperson;

''(B) as requested in writing to the chairperson by not fewer than 5 Board members; or

''(C) as otherwise provided by the bylaws of the Association.

''(2) QUORUM REQUIRED.—A majority of all Board members shall constitute a quorum.

''(3) VOTING.—Decisions of the Board shall require the approval of a majority of all Board members present at a meeting, a quorum being present.

''(4) INITIAL MEETING.—The Board shall hold its first meeting not later than 45 days after the date on which all initial Board members have been appointed.

''(g) RESTRICTION ON CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—Board members appointed pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (c)(1) shall not have access to confidential information received by the Association in connection with complaints, investigations, or disciplinary proceedings involving insurance producers.

''(h) ETHICS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—The Board shall issue and enforce an ethical conduct code to address permissible and prohibited activities of Board members and Association officers, employees, agents, or consultants. The code shall, at a minimum, include provisions that prohibit any Board member or Association officer, employee, agent or consultant from—

''(1) engaging in unethical conduct in the course of performing Association duties;

''(2) participating in the making or influencing the making of any Association decision, the outcome of which the Board member, officer, employee, agent, or consultant knows or had reason to know would have a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public generally, on the person or a member of the immediate family of the person;

''(3) accepting any gift from any person or entity other than the Association that is given because of the position held by the person in the Association;

''(4) making political contributions to any person or entity on behalf of the Association; and

''(5) lobbying or paying a person to lobby on behalf of the Association.

''(i) COMPENSATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no Board member may receive any compensation from the Association or any other person or entity on account of Board membership.

''(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PER DIEM.—Board members may be reimbursed only by the Association for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates consistent with rates authorized for employees of Federal agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from home or regular places of business in performance of services for the Association.

''SEC. 325. BYLAWS, STANDARDS, AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.

''(a) ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS.—

''(1) PROCEDURES.—The Association shall adopt procedures for the adoption of bylaws and standards that are similar to procedures under subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Administrative Procedure Act').

''(2) COPY REQUIRED TO BE FILED.—The Board shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, all proposed bylaws and standards of the Association, or any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, accompanied by a concise

general statement of the basis and purpose of such proposal.

''(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Any proposed bylaw or standard of the Association, and any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, shall take effect, after notice under paragraph (2) and opportunity for public comment, on such date as the Association may designate, unless suspended under section 329(c).

''(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to subject the Board or the Association to the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Administrative Procedure Act').

''(b) DISCIPLINARY ACTION BY THE ASSOCIATION.—

''(1) SPECIFICATION OF CHARGES.—In any proceeding to determine whether membership shall be denied, suspended, revoked, or not renewed, or to determine whether a member of the Association should be placed on probation (referred to in this section as a 'disciplinary action') or whether to assess fines or monetary penalties, the Association shall bring specific charges, notify the member of the charges, give the member an opportunity to defend against the charges, and keep a record.

''(2) SUPPORTING STATEMENT.—A determination to take disciplinary action shall be supported by a statement setting forth—

''(A) any act or practice in which the member has been found to have been engaged;

''(B) the specific provision of this subtitle or standard of the Association that any such act or practice is deemed to violate; and

''(C) the sanction imposed and the reason for the sanction.

''(3) INELIGIBILITY OF PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—Board members appointed pursuant to section 324(c)(3) may not—

''(A) participate in any disciplinary action or be counted toward establishing a quorum during a disciplinary action; and

''(B) have access to confidential information concerning any disciplinary action.

''SEC. 326. POWERS.

''In addition to all the powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, the Association shall have the power to—

''(1) establish and collect such membership fees as the Association finds necessary to impose to cover the costs of its operations;

''(2) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, procedures, or standards governing the conduct of Association business and performance of its duties;

''(3) establish procedures for providing notice and opportunity for comment pursuant to section 325(a);

''(4) enter into and perform such agreements as necessary to carry out the duties of the Association;

''(5) hire employees, professionals, or specialists, and elect or appoint officers, and to fix their compensation, define their duties and give them appropriate authority to carry out the purposes of this subtitle, and determine their qualification;

''(6) establish personnel policies of the Association and programs relating to, among other things, conflicts of interest, rates of compensation, where applicable, and qualifications of personnel;

''(7) borrow money; and

''(8) secure funding for such amounts as the Association determines to be necessary and appropriate to organize and begin operations of the Association, which shall be treated as loans to be repaid by the Association with interest at market rate.

''SEC. 327. REPORT BY THE ASSOCIATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, the Association shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, a written report regarding the conduct of its business, and the exercise of the other rights and powers granted by this subtitle, during such fiscal year.

''(b) FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) with respect to any fiscal year shall include audited financial statements setting forth the financial position of the Association at the end of such fiscal year and the results of its operations (including the source and application of its funds) for such fiscal year.

''SEC. 328. LIABILITY OF THE ASSOCIATION AND THE BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall not be deemed to be an insurer or insurance producer within the meaning of any State law, rule, regulation, or order regulating or taxing insurers, insurance producers, or other entities engaged in the business of insurance, including provisions imposing premium taxes, regulating insurer solvency or financial condition, establishing guaranty funds and levying assessments, or requiring claims settlement practices.

''(b) LIABILITY OF BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.—No Board member, officer, or employee of the Association shall be personally liable to any person for any action taken or omitted in good faith in any matter within the scope of their responsibilities in connection with the Association.

''SEC. 329. PRESIDENTIAL OVERSIGHT.

''(a) REMOVAL OF BOARD.—If the President determines that the Association is acting in a manner contrary to the interests of the public or the purposes of this subtitle or has failed to perform its duties under this subtitle, the President may remove the entire existing Board for the remainder of the term to which the Board members were appointed and appoint, in accordance with section 324 and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, new Board members to fill the vacancies on the Board for the remainder of the terms.

''(b) REMOVAL OF BOARD MEMBER.—The President may remove a Board member only for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office.

''(c) SUSPENSION OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS AND PROHIBITION OF ACTIONS.—Following notice to the Board, the President, or a person designated by the President for such purpose, may suspend the effectiveness of any bylaw or standard, or prohibit any action, of the Association that the President or the designee determines is contrary to the purposes of this subtitle.

''SEC. 330. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

''(a) PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS.—State laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions purporting to regulate insurance producers shall be preempted to the extent provided in subsection (b).

''(b) PROHIBITED ACTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No State shall—

''(A) impede the activities of, take any action against, or apply any provision of law or regulation arbitrarily or discriminatorily to, any insurance producer because that insurance producer or any affiliate plans to become, has applied to become, or is a member of the Association;

''(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it pay fees different from those required to be paid to that State were it not a member of the Association; or

''(C) impose any continuing education requirements on any nonresident insurance producer that is a member of the Association.

''(2) STATES OTHER THAN A HOME STATE.—No State, other than the home State of a member of the Association, shall—

''(A) impose any licensing, personal or corporate qualifications, education, training, experience, residency, continuing education, or bonding requirement upon a member of the Association that is different from the criteria for membership in the Association or renewal of such membership;

''(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it be licensed, registered, or otherwise qualified to do business or remain in good standing in the State, including any requirement that the insurance producer register as a foreign company with the secretary of state or equivalent State official;

''(C) require that a member of the Association submit to a criminal history record check as a condition of doing business in the State; or

''(D) impose any licensing, registration, or appointment requirements upon a member of the Association, or require a member of the Association to be authorized to operate as an insurance producer, in order to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance for commercial property and casualty risks to an insured with risks located in more than one State, if the member is licensed or otherwise authorized to operate in the State where the insured maintains its principal place of business and the contract of insurance insures risks located in that State.

''(3) PRESERVATION OF STATE DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit a State from investigating and taking appropriate disciplinary action, including suspension or revocation of authority of an insurance producer to do business in a State, in accordance with State law and that is not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, against a member of the Association as a result of a complaint or for any alleged activity, regardless of whether the activity occurred before or after the insurance producer commenced doing business in the State pursuant to Association membership.

''SEC. 331. COORDINATION WITH FINANCIAL INDUSTRY REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

''The Association shall coordinate with the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority in order to ease any administrative burdens that fall on members of the Association that are subject to regulation by the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, consistent with the requirements of this subtitle and the Federal securities laws.

''SEC. 332. RIGHT OF ACTION.

''(a) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person aggrieved by a decision or action of the Association may, after reasonably exhausting available avenues for resolution within the Association, commence a civil action in an appropriate United States district court, and obtain all appropriate relief.

''(b) ASSOCIATION INTERPRETATIONS.—In any action under subsection (a), the court shall give appropriate weight to the interpretation of the Association of its bylaws and standards and this subtitle.

''SEC. 333. FEDERAL FUNDING PROHIBITED.

''The Association may not receive, accept, or borrow any amounts from the Federal Government to pay for, or reimburse, the Association for, the costs of establishing or operating the Association.

''SEC. 334. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this subtitle, the following definitions shall apply:

''(1) BUSINESS ENTITY.—The term 'business entity' means a corporation, association,

partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or other legal entity.

''(2) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term 'depository institution' has the meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

''(3) HOME STATE.—The term 'home State' means the State in which the insurance producer maintains its principal place of residence or business and is licensed to act as an insurance producer.

''(4) INSURANCE.—The term 'insurance' means any product, other than title insurance or bail bonds, defined or regulated as insurance by the appropriate State insurance regulatory authority.

''(5) INSURANCE PRODUCER.—The term 'insurance producer' means any insurance agent or broker, excess or surplus lines broker or agent, insurance consultant, limited insurance representative, and any other individual or entity that sells, solicits, or negotiates policies of insurance or offers advice, counsel, opinions or services related to insurance.

''(6) INSURER.—The term 'insurer' has the meaning as in section 313(e)(2)(B) of title 31, United States Code.

''(7) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS.—The term 'principal place of business' means the State in which an insurance producer maintains the headquarters of the insurance producer and, in the case of a business entity, where high-level officers of the entity direct, control, and coordinate the business activities of the business entity.

''(8) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF RESIDENCE.—The term 'principal place of residence' means the State in which an insurance producer resides for the greatest number of days during a calendar year.

''(9) STATE.—The term 'State' includes any State, the District of Columbia, any territory of the United States, and Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(10) STATE LAW.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'State law' includes all laws, decisions, rules, regulations, or other State action having the effect of law, of any State.

''(B) LAWS APPLICABLE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—A law of the United States applicable only to or within the District of Columbia shall be treated as a State law rather than a law of the United States.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act is amended by striking the items relating to subtitle C of title III and inserting the following new items:

''Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

''Sec. 321. National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers.
''Sec. 322. Purpose.
''Sec. 323. Membership.
''Sec. 324. Board of directors.
''Sec. 325. Bylaws, standards, and disciplinary actions.
''Sec. 326. Powers.
''Sec. 327. Report by the Association.
''Sec. 328. Liability of the Association and the Board members, officers, and employees of the Association.
''Sec. 329. Presidential oversight.
''Sec. 330. Relationship to State law.
''Sec. 331. Coordination with regulators.
''Sec. 332. Right of action.
''Sec. 333. Federal funding prohibited.
''Sec. 334. Definitions.''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 1155, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important piece of insurance regulatory reform legislation today.

The most serious regulatory challenges facing insurance agents and brokers are redundant, costly, and sometimes contradictory requirements that arise when they seek licenses on a multistate basis. It has become clear that the main cause of these problems is the failure of many States to issue licenses on a truly reciprocal basis.

On average, multistate agents sell insurance in eight States. That means eight different applications, eight different procedures for admittance, eight separate background checks, and a multitude of inconsistent standards and duplicative processes. These requirements are not only costly and inefficient, but they hinder the ability of insurance agents and brokers to effectively address the needs of their consumers.

Congress recognized the need to reform the insurance industry's licensing system back in 1999 when it incorporated the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers subtitle into the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act. The Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act did not provide for the immediate establishment of NARAB and instead included a series of provisions to encourage States to simplify the licensing process.

Unfortunately, the original NARAB that was passed in 1999 did not work. National nonresident licensing reciprocity has not been achieved, and the burden on insurance agents and brokers and the impact this burden directly has on consumers remains. Despite the best efforts of many stakeholders at making State-level improvements, it has become clear that true licensing reciprocity can be achieved only through additional congressional action.

The bill we are considering today, H.R. 1155, the NARAB Reform Act—or as it is commonly referred, NARAB II—modifies the original NARAB provisions in Gramm-Leach-Bliley and immediately establishes NARAB as a private, nonprofit entity managed by a board composed of eight insurance regulators and five marketplace representatives. NARAB II provides for nonresident insurance agent and broker licensing while preserving the rights of States to supervise and discipline insurance agents and brokers. Overall, this legislation would benefit policyholders by increasing marketplace competition and consumer choice, and by enabling insurance producers to more quickly and responsively serve the needs of their consumers.

I'd like to thank my colleague from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) who introduced this piece of legislation with me earlier this year.

This bill has almost 90 bipartisan cosponsors and is supported by groups such as the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors, the Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers, and major insurance company trades. The legislation has passed this Chamber by voice vote twice before, and the Senate Banking Committee unanimously approved an identical companion legislation.

I ask that my colleagues support this practical and needed insurance regulatory reform by voting for the NARAB Reform Act.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2013.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING, I am writing concerning H.R. 1155, the ''National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act,'' which was referred to your Committee.

As you know, H.R. 1155, contains provisions within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 1155, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert its jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2013.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter of even date herewith regarding

H.R. 1155, the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act.

I am most appreciative of your decision not to assert jurisdiction over H.R. 1155 so that it may be considered under suspension of the Rules this week on the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Judiciary is in no way waiving its Rule X jurisdiction over any subject matter contained in the bill. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I shall be pleased to include your letter and this letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1155.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

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

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to just say I join many people across this Nation and around the world who are prayerful and who are hopeful that this breakthrough—this window of opportunity that we have dealing with the Syrian situation—works.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't tell you what a great joy this is for me. I have worked on this bill for the past 6 years. We have been dealing with many areas to fix our financial system to make it work. We have a very complex and complicated financial system. There is no industry that has the challenges that are being faced today as the insurance industry.

□ 1230

And the economy, its demands are rapidly changing because of advances in technology, mobility, the narrowing and making the world much smaller.

Essentially, what we have here is a long overdue fix to help these small business owners, because that's what our insurance agents are. H.R. 1155, the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act, or what we affectionately call NARAB, as my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) has just stated, is very dear to us.

Many of us in the Financial Services Committee have spent years toiling on this issue. So have many in the Senate. As my colleague, Mr. NEUGEBAUER has said, we passed one House in 1999, but look what has happened. We've had terrorist strikes. We've had all kinds of things that have happened. We've had an economy almost on the verge of depression. Standing there in the middle of this storm dealing with the wants and the needs of the American people in all the areas—property damage, health, car insurance, you name it—has been our agents.

I want to just briefly take you through exactly what we are proposing here. H.R. 1155, first of all, creates a streamlined agent and broker licensing system. That's very important. That strengthens the competitive insurance market while maintaining those ever important consumer protection items. It strengthens the business, it strengthens the competitive insurance market—it doesn't weaken it—and at the same time strengthens and protects our consumers.

NARAB will allow agents and brokers to more efficiently operate on a multistate basis. Now, that's so important. Business is no longer conducted around the corner or down the street or just in the next town; it is all over the country. And our insurance agents and brokers need the flexibility and the smoothness in our system to be able to negotiate in the best interest of not just the insurance industry but, most importantly, for the benefit of consumers who move from State to State to city to city.

Next, NARAB would allow our agents and brokers to also address the increasing concern and greater importance of our technological and mobile-connected world. As we know, we are all connected.

Next, our NARAB Reform Act will be a one-stop licensing compliance mechanism for insurance agents and brokers operating out of their home States. Each will have a home State. But NARAB will work as a one-place clearinghouse to satisfy that, while at the same time preserving the longstanding authority of States to supervise and discipline the insurance producers.

Nothing is being taken from State control in this bill. As a matter of fact, it strengthens State controls. That is why all of the State insurance commissioners support this legislation.

Through a nonprofit board for insurance agents and brokers to obtain approval to operate on a multistate basis, the NARAB Reform Act deals only with marketplace entry and will not impact the day-to-day State regulation of insurance agencies. We sat down, we brought the State insurance agencies in and the commissioners to work with us so that we could have a joint understanding on this bill.

NARAB will be governed by a board dominated by State regulators—again, dominated by State regulators—and would establish standards for the membership that exceed the existing requirements of any State. Again, exceeds the requirements of any State. A prospective NARAB member will be required to be fully licensed in his or her home State and satisfy rigorous membership criteria. An approved NARAB member could utilize the association to obtain the regulatory approval necessary to operate in any other selected jurisdiction.

This is a crucial piece of legislation, an excellently drafted piece of legislation. For those of us who are concerned about small government, it is very important to note that NARAB would not—would not—be a part of a report to any Federal agency and would not have any kind of Federal regulatory power. We are out of the business. Once we pass this bill, it is in the hands, where it belongs, of the State and local level.

The legislation is supported by nearly the entire insurance industry, including all the major agents and brokers associations, as well as the major insurers associations. Additionally, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, NAIC, which represents all State insurance commissioners, has formally—formally—endorsed this version of the legislation.

The State-based reform benefits our consumers first, and that is at the head of the line of our concerns. It benefits our consumers through increased competition among agents and brokers and leads to greater consumer choice at lower prices. That is what the consumer is looking for.

This bill also will assist in an important sector of our economy—small businesses—by streamlining nonresident licensing regulation. The House has twice recognized the need for this commonsense reform by passing nearly this identical legislation, as I said before, subsequent to suspension rules.

Once again, we ask for your support.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the chairman of our Capital Markets Subcommittee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership on this legislation today.

I rise in support of H.R. 1155, which is the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act.

This bill is, as we like to say, a commonsense step that will create a clearinghouse, if you will, for insurance agents and brokers alike to obtain approval to operate on a multistate basis.

Under current law, an insurance agent who has clients in more than one State has to obtain licenses in each and every one of those States. The regulatory process, as you can imagine, varies from State to State. Obtaining and maintaining a license is both time-consuming and very expensive.

Having to complete this process over and over and over again basically compounds the difficulty and often proves daunting, quite honestly, to smaller agents who are just trying to do their job and to serve their clients and meet their needs.

What we have here is the NARAB clearinghouse. This would allow the agents to complete the process only twice—once in their home State and then once again for NARAB. Then they would be eligible to sell basically in all the States.

Here is an important point: NARAB is supported by all the stakeholders, including, as the gentleman just said, by the State insurance regulators. It does so because it brings much-needed efficiency to a multistate licensing process.

While doing this, the legislation would also preserve—and to me this is very important—State-based insurance

regulation and also consumer protections.

Finally, this legislation would not—as was just pointed out—create a brand new Federal insurance regulator in its place. By law, NARAB would not be a regulator or a part of any Federal agency. It would have no regulatory authority.

With 56—56—different approaches to life insurance, this bipartisan bill would reduce needless red tape and complexity that is out there, and it would help insurance agents better serve their clients.

I urge this House to adopt this legislation today.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER).

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor in support of H.R. 1155, the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013.

As mentioned, this important legislation strikes the appropriate balance between easing the licensing requirements for insurance agents and preserving State authority to supervise and discipline insurance producers for their actions.

Through this legislation, I hope all consumers, especially the citizens of Tennessee, will benefit from a more competitive insurance market. NARAB is supported by all insurance industry stakeholders, including State insurance regulators, regional and national insurance companies, and trade associations.

H.R. 1155 is seen as the most effective, efficient way to enable insurance agents and brokers to be licensed on a multistate basis while retaining State regulatory authority.

While today's legislation speaks to insurance agents and brokers, similar issues exist for claims adjusters. To address these issues when consumers present a claim, I have introduced the CLAIM Act, H.R. 2156, to streamline the licensing requirements for insurance adjusters operating outside their home States.

My bill would preserve State authority to supervise and discipline adjusters for their actions, while streamlining State licensing regulations.

As we join together today to support H.R. 1155, I call upon my colleagues to similarly support and enact the CLAIM Act to ensure consumers receive the same excellent service when they need their insurance.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) for his hard work on this very well-thought-out legislation. I hope it will help the citizens of this country receive excellent insurance products and services.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL).

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill introduced by my colleague Representative NEUGEBAUER.

This bill reduces costs for homeowners and renters not only in my home State of Florida, but for everyone throughout the entire country.

Today, insurance brokers and agents face hurdles when they try to work across State lines. What this bill does is make it easier and less expensive for them to get licensed in multiple States. The best part about this is ultimately it saves you, the consumer, money.

This legislation streamlines the Federal role in real estate licensing while allowing States to continue setting standards for the work that best fits their States because, after all, we know what's best for our States and our communities.

Lowering costs for insurance agents and brokers means more options and lower prices for consumers. I am glad to support this bipartisan legislation.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for the NARAB Reform Act.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. If the gentleman has no more speakers, I will close and then yield back the balance of my time.

I just want to say what a distinguished pleasure it has been to work with the gentleman from Texas, my good friend on both the Financial Services Committee and the Ag Committee. We do a lot of great work together. It is a great pleasure.

I commend this bill to the full House of Representatives and hope we have a unanimous vote.

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

□ 1245

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Georgia. He has worked tirelessly on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, what I think is nice about this issue is that it's bipartisan. It's a good piece of legislation in that it doesn't expand government, and it doesn't cost the taxpayers any money. Ultimately, I think it's going to bring better choices for consumers and, I hope, for our small business people across the country. For example, in my congressional district, it is closer to three or four other States than it is to some of the cities that are within my State, for example, from Walipp to within a hundred miles of Colorado and within 100 miles of Oklahoma and Colorado and these other States. Basically, we have a lot of insurance agencies and agents who now will have the ability to do business in multiple States in a less cumbersome way, so I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1155, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

STREAMLINING CLAIMS PROCESSING FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES ACT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2747) to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2747

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Streamlining Claims Processing for Federal Contractor Employees Act''.

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY TO THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

(a) AUTHORITY OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL TO PAY WAGES AND LIST CONTRACTORS VIOLATING CONTRACTS.—Section 3144 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**of Comptroller General**''; and

(2) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''Comptroller General'' and inserting ''Secretary of Labor''.

(b) REPORT OF VIOLATIONS AND WITHHOLDING OF AMOUNTS FOR UNPAID CONTRACTS AND LIQUIDATED DAMAGES.—Section 3703(b)(3) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Comptroller General'' both places it appears and inserting ''Secretary of Labor''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2747.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2747,

and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With our Nation facing difficult challenges at home and abroad, it is important we continue the work the American people sent us here to do. That includes pursuing commonsense reforms that will make the Federal Government more efficient and a better steward of taxpayer dollars. The legislation we are considering today is a small, yet important, part of that effort.

Approximately one out of every five workers is employed by a Federal contractor. Drawing on the strength and expertise of the private sector workforce to complete Federal projects has helped deliver better results at a more competitive price for taxpayers.

A number of laws govern the wages workers on Federal projects receive. For example, the Davis-Bacon Act requires Federal contractors to pay workers the local prevailing wage. Additionally, the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act ensures these workers receive 1½ times their basic rate of pay for hours worked in excess of 40 hours a week. Both laws have played a central role in Federal contracting for decades. However, both are plagued by inefficiencies. The Department is responsible for enforcing these laws; yet the Government Accountability Office has long been a middleman in an overly bureaucratic claims process.

Here is how the current process works:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor first determines whether workers have failed to receive their proper wages, and it calculates the amount of pay they are due. Next, the Department forwards to GAO a report that states the names of underpaid employees and the amounts they are each owed. Funds from the relevant contracting agencies are delivered to GAO, which then deposits the money into an account at the Treasury Department. Based upon claims forms submitted by affected workers, GAO transmits payment requests to Treasury, which disburses directly to workers their unpaid wages. It should be noted that GAO has no authority to overturn or to even challenge the Department's judgment in this area.

As a result of this lengthy back and forth between numerous Federal entities, workers can experience delays in receiving their correct wages, and taxpayers are forced to support an unnecessarily complex process. I think we can all agree we can do better.

H.R. 2747 is commonsense and bipartisan legislation that would transfer GAO's administrative duties under these two laws to the proper Federal agency, which is the Department of Labor. GAO has requested this relief and believes it will encourage more efficiency within the Federal Government. Furthermore, it will free up time and resources at GAO that can be better spent fulfilling its central mission of investigating waste and abuse in the Federal Government.

By moving wage claims adjustments for federally contracted workers to the Department of Labor, we can ensure workers receive their pay in a timelier manner while providing greater efficiency. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a win for workers and for taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2747, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of the pending legislation, H.R. 2747, the Streamlining Claims Processing for Federal Contractor Employees Act, which will transfer the authority for processing claims under the Davis-Bacon Act from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor. As the Department of Labor is already responsible for many aspects of Davis-Bacon, this change will help streamline the process and ensure that workers receive their hard-earned pay in a timelier and more efficient manner.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan for introducing this commonsense fix, which I am pleased to cosponsor. It is time that we transfer this administrative responsibility to the agency that enforces the law, and I hope that this bill will be the first step in a larger effort to allow the Department of Labor to engage in further enforcement actions under the Davis-Bacon Act, including the GAO's current debarment authority.

As a strong supporter of Davis-Bacon and of the protections it provides our contracted workers, I am pleased to see that this bill will help streamline the process and allow our workers access to the prevailing wages they have rightly earned. That's why I rise in support of H.R. 2747, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan for introducing the bill.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this issue, and I would be glad to close.

I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) as well, not only for his support of the legislation, but for his leadership on this issue. As members of the House Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, we are privileged to oversee a number of Federal laws and agencies that directly affect the lives of workers and their families—the basis for this country's greatness.

The Davis-Bacon Act is one law in particular that I believe is in need of additional reform. Independent reports have highlighted administrative challenges facing the law that result in workers being shortchanged and taxpayers being overcharged on Federal construction projects.

I know there are sharp differences over what, if any, Davis-Bacon reform would look like, but I believe we've demonstrated today, Mr. Speaker, how incremental, yet important, change can occur when we work together in good faith on behalf of the American people. At the very least, I hope we can continue to discuss these issues with one another, thereby bringing us closer to the common ground that is necessary to move this country forward.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 2747, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2747.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1300

POWELL SHOOTING RANGE LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 130) to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 130

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Powell Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DISTRICT.—The term ''District'' means the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Powell, Wyoming Land Conveyance Act'' and dated May 12, 2011.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE POWELL RECREATION DISTRICT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall convey to the District, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (a) consists of approximately 322 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, Wind River District, Wyoming, as generally depicted on the map as ''Powell Gun Club''.

(c) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(2) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(A) the map; or

(B) the legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for

public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) USE OF CONVEYED LAND.—The land conveyed under this section shall be used only—

(1) as a shooting range; or

(2) for any other public purpose consistent with uses allowed under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the ''Recreation and Public Purposes Act'') (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Secretary shall require the District to pay all survey costs and other administrative costs necessary for the preparation and completion of any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in subsection (b).

(f) REVERSION.—If the land conveyed under this section ceases to be used for a public purpose in accordance with subsection (d), the land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(g) CONDITIONS.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (a), the District shall agree in writing—

(1) to pay any administrative costs associated with the conveyance including the costs of any environmental, wildlife, cultural, or historical resources studies; and

(2) to release and indemnify the United States from any claims or liabilities that may arise from uses carried out on the land described in subsection (b) on or before the date of enactment of this Act by the United States or any person.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 130 directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Powell Recreation District approximately 322 acres of land located in Park County, Wyoming.

The Powell Recreation District will continue to use the land for a public recreational shooting complex, as it has since 1980.

The bill will have no cost to the taxpayer since the Powell Recreation District is required to pay for any administrative costs associated with the conveyance.

This is a noncontroversial bill, Mr. Speaker, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Powell Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act would transfer 322 acres of Bureau of Land Management lands to the Powell, Wyoming, Recreation District. Currently, the Powell Recreation District manages a shooting range on these lands.

We have no objections to this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I urge adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 130.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

DENALI NATIONAL PARK IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 157) to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 157

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Denali National Park Improvement Act''.

SEC. 2. KANTISHNA HILLS MICROHYDRO PROJECT; LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPURTENANCE.—The term ''appurtenance'' includes—

(A) transmission lines;

(B) distribution lines;

(C) signs;

(D) buried communication lines;

(E) necessary access routes for microhydro project construction, operation, and maintenance; and

(F) electric cables.

(2) KANTISHNA HILLS AREA.—The term ''Kantishna Hills area'' means the area of the Park located within 2 miles of Moose Creek, as depicted on the map.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Kantishna Hills Micro-Hydro Area'', numbered 184/80,276, and dated August 27, 2010.

(4) MICROHYDRO PROJECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''microhydro project'' means a hydroelectric power generating facility with a maximum power generation capability of 100 kilowatts.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''microhydro project'' includes—

(i) intake pipelines, including the intake pipeline located on Eureka Creek, approximately ½ mile upstream from the Park Road, as depicted on the map;

(ii) each system appurtenance of the microhydro projects; and

(iii) any distribution or transmission lines required to serve the Kantishna Hills area.

(5) PARK.—The term ''Park'' means the Denali National Park and Preserve.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) PERMITS FOR MICROHYDRO PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may issue permits for microhydro projects in the Kantishna Hills area.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Each permit under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) issued in accordance with such terms and conditions as are generally applicable to rights-of-way within units of the National Park System; and

(B) subject to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(3) COMPLETION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which an applicant submits an application for the issuance of a permit under this subsection, the Secretary shall complete any analysis required by the National Environment Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) of any proposed or existing microhydro projects located in the Kantishna Hills area.

(c) LAND EXCHANGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of consolidating ownership of Park and Doyon Tourism, Inc. lands, including those lands affected solely by the Doyon Tourism microhydro project, and subject to paragraph (4), the Secretary may exchange Park land near or adjacent to land owned by Doyon Tourism, Inc., located at the mouth of Eureka Creek in sec. 13, T.16 S., R. 18 W., Fairbanks Meridian, for approximately 18 acres of land owned by Doyon Tourism, Inc., within the Galena patented mining claim.

(2) MAP AVAILABILITY.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(3) TIMING.—The Secretary shall seek to complete the exchange under this subsection by not later than February 1, 2015.

(4) APPLICABLE LAWS; TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The exchange under this subsection shall be subject to—

(A) the laws (including regulations) and policies applicable to exchanges of land administered by the National Park Service, including the laws and policies concerning land appraisals, equalization of values, and environmental compliance; and

(B) such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(5) EQUALIZATION OF VALUES.—If the tracts proposed for exchange under this subsection are determined not to be equal in value, an equalization of values may be achieved by adjusting the quantity of acres described in paragraph (1).

(6) ADMINISTRATION.—The land acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the exchange under this subsection shall be administered as part of the Park.

SEC. 3. DENALI NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE NATURAL GAS PIPELINE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPURTENANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''appurtenance'' includes cathodic protection or test stations, valves, signage, and buried communication and electric cables relating to the operation of high-pressure natural gas transmission.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ''appurtenance'' does not include compressor stations.

(2) PARK.—The term ''Park'' means the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) PERMIT.—The Secretary may issue right-of-way permits for—

(1) a high-pressure natural gas transmission pipeline (including appurtenances) in nonwilderness areas within the boundary of Denali National Park within, along, or near the approximately 7-mile segment of

the George Parks Highway that runs through the Park; and

(2) any distribution and transmission pipelines and appurtenances that the Secretary determines to be necessary to provide natural gas supply to the Park.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A permit authorized under subsection (b)—

(1) may be issued only—

(A) if the permit is consistent with the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to utility rights-of-way within units of the National Park System;

(B) in accordance with section 1106(a) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3166(a)); and

(C) if, following an appropriate analysis prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the route of the right-of-way is the route through the Park with the least adverse environmental effects for the Park; and

(2) shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF THE WALTER HARPER TALKEETNA RANGER STATION.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Talkeetna Ranger Station located on B Street in Talkeetna, Alaska, approximately 100 miles south of the entrance to Denali National Park, shall be known and designated as the ''Walter Harper Talkeetna Ranger Station''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Talkeetna Ranger Station referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Walter Harper Talkeetna Ranger Station''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 157 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits for a natural gas pipeline and a microhydroelectric project within the boundary of Denali National Park in Alaska.

Additionally, S. 157 authorizes a land exchange between Denali National Park and Doyon Tourism, Inc., to facilitate the water project and renames a nearby ranger station in honor of Walter Harper. One hundred years ago, Harper became the first man to reach the summit of Mt. McKinley.

Congressman DON YOUNG, our colleague from Alaska, has sponsored a companion measure to this bill in the House, but to allow this bill to become public law more quickly, I urge adoption of this Senate bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Denali National Park Improvement Act allows the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits for specified small hydroelectric power facilities within the park boundaries. The legislation allows the park service to exchange approximately 18 acres of park land. Finally, the bill provides for right-of-ways for a natural gas pipeline and other natural gas distribution infrastructure.

We have no objections to this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge adoption of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 157.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY LAND CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 304) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 304

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Natchez Trace Parkway Land Conveyance Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Natchez Trace Parkway, Proposed Boundary Change'', numbered 604/105392, and dated November 2010.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Mississippi.

SEC. 3. LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall convey to the State, by quitclaim deed and without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcels of land described in subsection (b).

(2) COMPATIBLE USE.—The deed of conveyance to the parcel of land that is located southeast of U.S. Route 61/84 and which is commonly known as the ''bean field property'' shall reserve an easement to the United States restricting the use of the parcel to only those uses which are compatible with the Natchez Trace Parkway.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcels of land referred to in subsection (a) are the 2 parcels totaling approximately 67 acres generally depicted as ''Proposed Conveyance'' on the map.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

SEC. 4. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) EXCLUSION OF CONVEYED LAND.—On completion of the conveyance to the State of the land described in section 3(b), the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway shall be adjusted to exclude the conveyed land.

(b) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway is adjusted to include the approximately 10 acres of land that is generally depicted as ''Proposed Addition'' on the map.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The land added under paragraph (1) shall be administered by the Secretary as part of the Natchez Trace Parkway.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 304 directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey 67 acres of Natchez, Mississippi, to the State of Mississippi and to adjust the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway.

This property was originally donated to the National Park Service by the State to construct the parkway, but was ultimately unneeded. Rather than lease the property back to Mississippi, this would transfer the title back to the original owner.

This is a commonsense measure, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Natchez Trace Parkway Land Conveyance Act of 2013 conveys 67 acres of National Park Service property to the State of Mississippi. We have no objections to this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I urge adoption and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 304.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC LAW 93–435 WITH RESPECT TO NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 256) to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 256

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section and section 2 of Public Law 93–435 (48 U.S.C. 1705, 1706) are amended by inserting ''the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,'' after ''Guam,'' each place it appears.

(b) REFERENCES TO DATE OF ENACTMENT.—For the purposes of the amendment made by subsection (a), each reference in Public Law 93–435 to the ''date of enactment'' shall be considered to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 2. ADJUSTMENT OF SCHEDULED WAGE INCREASES IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

Section 8103(b)(1)(B) of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206 note; Public Law 110–28) is amended by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2011, 2013, and 2015''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 256 would amend the 1974 law to convey certain submerged lands in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Under this bill, the territory would have the administrative authority over lands covered by tidal waters out to 3 nautical miles, giving it parity with the other United States territories of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. Comparable control of the seabed has been also granted to coastal States under the Submerged Lands Act. On May 15, the House passed similar legislation by a voice vote.

S. 256 also contains an amendment to delay in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands an annual minimum wage increase of 50 cents. Under the new formula in this bill, a 50-cent minimum wage bump would still occur in 2014, with annual increases starting in 2016, until the Federal minimum wage is reached. The territory has asked for a deferral on this because its economy cannot currently sustain the minimum wage increases that are current law at this time.

I want to thank Chairman KLINE of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and his able staff for their assistance in scheduling this bill for consideration today as the minimum wage matter is under that committee's jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of S. 256. The bill conveys to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands 3 miles of surrounding submerged lands, providing parity with America's other coastal States and territories.

S. 256 also provides for a hiatus in 2013 and 2015 of the annual 50-cent increase in minimum wage in the Northern Marianas, while retaining the mandate to reach the Federal level.

I want to thank the chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, RON WYDEN, and Ranking Member LISA MURKOWSKI for introducing S. 256 at my request. Its companion, H.R. 573, passed the House unanimously in May of this year, as did predecessor bills in the 111th and the 112th Congresses.

Thanks also to leaders and staff from both sides of the aisle: Chairman DOC HASTINGS of the House Natural Resources Committee and Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO; Chairman JOHN FLEMING on the Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans, and Insular Affairs Subcommittee; and the chairman on the Education and the Workforce Committee, JOHN KLINE, and Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER. Their assistance reflects a longstanding tradition of treating territorial issues as essentially nonpartisan.

To summarize briefly, the Northern Mariana Islands is the only U.S. coastal jurisdiction that does not have ownership of the submerged lands off its coast. S. 256 corrects that irregularity and provides the same ownership rights over the submerged lands surrounding the Northern Marianas as are provided by Federal law to Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

Additionally, S. 256 reschedules the rate of increase of the minimum wage in the Northern Mariana Islands, but it retains the mandate to reach the Federal minimum wage level, which will occur in 2018. The wage has risen 82 percent since 2007—16.5 percent each year.

The Government Accountability Office has reported uncertainty over how this rapid change affects the local economy, especially given the negative GDP in most of those years. Congress previously provided for the scheduled 2011 increase to be skipped. In light of continuing unpredictability of the impact of annual increases on an economy where as much as 80 percent of the hourly paid workforce will be affected, similar deferrals of the 2013 and 2015 increases are advisable.

I ask for Members to support S. 256 today as the House has supported these same proposals in the past.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER).

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 256, and would like to speak also in support of the bill just considered, S. 304, a bill sponsored by a senior Senator of Mississippi, THAD COCHRAN.

This legislation authorized the transfer of approximately 67 acres of unused Federal land originally envisioned to be part of the Natchez Trace Parkway to the State of Mississippi.

The city of Natchez plans to use 37 acres for recreational purposes. It will improve the quality of life for the city's residents.

□ 1315

Without this legislation, this tract will continue to set idle.

I would like to thank Chairman HASTINGS for his work in bringing this commonsense and worthy legislation to the House floor. I also would like to thank our senior Senator, THAD COCHRAN, for his tireless leadership for the State of Mississippi. There are numerous individuals behind the scenes that have worked tirelessly for the city of Natchez to gain access to and the right to utilize this land over the years, and S. 304 will show that their hard work has finally paid off.

I urge my colleagues to continue to support this legislation.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank and commend the chairman of our Natural Resources Committee, DOC HASTINGS, for his leadership and for his support of this piece of legislation, and especially

also my good friend, the gentleman representing the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 256, a bill to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. I want to thank Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources for their work on this bipartisan piece of legislation. I also want to thank the Senate for finally taking action on this issue and passing S. 256 via unanimous consent last month.

As I said earlier, I would be remiss if I did not commend my good friend, Congressman SABLAN, for his tireless efforts on this issue and all other matters affecting the Northern Mariana Islands since he took office in 2009.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation will appropriately convey 3 miles of offshore submerged lands to the Northern Mariana Islands. As you may know, submerged lands qualify as lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waves up to but not above the line of high tide. The territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands were granted ownership over our own respective submerged lands when the Congress passed the Territorial Submerged Lands Act in 1974. This was before CNMI became a territory of the United States.

S. 256 is in response to an unfortunate decision by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in 2005 that ruled that the submerged lands off the coast of CNMI did not belong to the Commonwealth but belonged to the Federal Government. The language guarantees that the Federal Government maintains the same rights over navigation, international affairs and commerce. Furthermore, it does not circumvent any actions that may have been taken or regulations that have been put forward by U.S. naval authorities regarding these submerged lands.

This issue is not new to us. The House has passed similar legislation since the 111th Congress. The citizens and officials of CNMI, instead of officials residing thousands of miles away, should be implementing and enforcing laws that apply to their population. We should move forward and allow CNMI to utilize these resources that are rightfully theirs and allow them to engage and promote economic activities in these areas. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend from the Northern Marianas that I have no more requests for time, and I am prepared to yield back if the gentleman is prepared to yield back.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, but I would like to thank DOC HASTINGS for a wonderful way of managing bills. This is probably at the fastest pace, and we should do this more often.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his compliment, and I urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 256.

This legislation includes provisions adjusting the minimum wage schedule for the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands in a way that I think is appropriate and fair for both workers and businesses there.

Current law requires CNMI to increase its minimum wage 50 cents a year until it reaches the Mainland's federal minimum wage level of $7.25. Current law also requires the GAO to regularly report to Congress on economic conditions in Commonwealth over the course of these minimum wage adjustments.

These GAO reports are intended to give the public information so that, based on sound economic analysis, Congress can adjust the minimum wage schedule for the territories if warranted.

The next GAO report is due in April of 2014.

Since 2007 the Commonwealth's minimum wage has increased from $3.05 an hour to $5.55 an hour, an 82% increase in the past 5 years. This has brought new purchasing power and a higher standard of living for many workers than they could have negotiated on their own.

This bill would skip an increase in the minimum wage in CNMI for 2013 and 2015, while still requiring increases in 2014, 2016 and subsequent years.

This approach was recommended by the Saipan Chamber of Commerce.

The Chamber stated in a May 8th letter that given the fragile economy in CNMI "spreading the wage jumps over a two-year period seems prudent."

This legislation is also recommended by Congressman SABLAN, a tireless advocate for workers and for improving the Commonwealth's economy.

Because CNMI's wages had been depressed for so long, it is a long march of nearly a decade to more than double their minimum wage. In a territory like CNMI, we have recognized that we would need to be flexible with the wage rate schedule over that time frame, as conditions warranted.

Today's bill reflects that need for flexibility. It allows us to review the next GAO economic analysis for CNMI before another wage increase takes effect.

Because of CNMI's unique economic circumstances and relatively undiversified economy, it is appropriate for Congress to adjust the minimum wage schedule in response to changing economic conditions, while keeping our long-term commitment to reaching parity with the federal minimum wage.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 256.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 256.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MINUTEMAN MISSILE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 459) to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 459

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Minuteman Missile National Historic Site Boundary Modification Act".

SEC. 2. BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

Section 3(a) of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site Establishment Act of 1999 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 106–115) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

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

"(3) VISITOR FACILITY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SITE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the components described in paragraph (2), the historic site shall include a visitor facility and administrative site located on the parcel of land described in subparagraph (B).

"(B) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subparagraph (A) consists of—

"(i) approximately 25 acres of land within the Buffalo Gap National Grassland, located north of exit 131 on Interstate 90 in Jackson County, South Dakota, as generally depicted on the map entitled 'Minuteman Missile National Historic Site Boundary Modification', numbered 406/80,011A, and dated January 14, 2011; and

"(ii) approximately 3.65 acres of land located at the Delta 1 Launch Control Facility for the construction and use of a parking lot and for other administrative uses.

"(C) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map described in subparagraph (B) shall be kept on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

"(D) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—Administrative jurisdiction over the land described in subparagraph (B) is transferred from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary, to be administered as part of the historic site.

"(E) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundaries of the Buffalo Gap National Grassland are modified to exclude the land transferred under subparagraph (D).".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative

days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 459 would authorize an agency-to-agency conveyance of Federal lands to allow for the expansion of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in South Dakota.

The U.S. Air Force administered over 1,000 Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles in silos throughout the Central States. These sites played a critical national security role until they were deactivated following the end of the Cold War.

The Minuteman Missile National Historic Site was established by Congress in 1999 to recognize the importance of the Minuteman ICBM program. S. 459 would convey just under 30 acres of the Buffalo Gap National Grassland to allow for the establishment of a visitor facility, administrative site, and a parking lot. This is good legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 459 transfers administrative jurisdiction of Forest Service lands in South Dakota to the National Park Service. These lands will be used by the Park Service to provide a visitor facility and administrative site for the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in Philip, South Dakota.

We support S. 459 and urge its passage by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and so in record time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I, too, have no more speakers, and so I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 459.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1338

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY) at 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1155, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2747, by the yeas and nays;

S. 130, by the yeas and nays.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS REFORM ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1155) to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 6, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—397

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

NAYS—6

Amash
Bridenstine
Griffith (VA)
Massie
Sanford
Smith (NE)

NOT VOTING—29

Bera (CA)
Bishop (UT)
Clarke
Cohen
Conyers
Davis, Danny
Esty
Frankel (FL)
Gohmert
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Larson (CT)
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Murphy (FL)
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Velázquez
Walz
Welch
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1404

Mr. BRIDENSTINE changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. DUNCAN of South Carolina and ELLISON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STREAMLINING CLAIMS PROCESSING FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2747) to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 10, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

YEAS—396

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

NAYS—10

Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Gohmert
Huelskamp
LaMalfa
McClintock
Poe (TX)
Stockman
Weber (TX)

NOT VOTING—26

Bera (CA)
Bishop (UT)
Clarke
Cohen
Davis, Danny
Esty
Frankel (FL)
Garcia
Gutiérrez
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Larson (CT)
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Meeks
Meng
Murphy (FL)
Ruiz
Velázquez
Welch
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

Messrs. POE of Texas and LAMALFA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

□ 1415

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 450—H.R. 1155, and 451—H.R. 2747, I was at meetings on Syria with the Vice President at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at a White House briefing with Vice President BIDEN on the Syria Resolution, I missed the afternoon series of votes on September 10, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted the following way on these suspension votes:

H.R. 1155—NARAB Reform Act—I would have voted ''yea.''

H.R. 2747—Streamlining Claims Processing for Federal Contractor Employees—I would have voted ''yea.''

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

POWELL SHOOTING RANGE LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 130) to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

YEAS—408

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

NAYS—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—23

Bachmann
Clarke
Cohen
Davis, Danny
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Hartzler
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Jeffries
Kind
Larson (CT)
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks
Meng
Murphy (FL)
Ruiz
Velázquez
Welch
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1424

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on September 10, 2013—I was not present for rollcall votes 450–452 due to a meeting at the White House with Vice President JOE BIDEN. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 450, "yea" on rollcall vote 451, "yea" on rollcall vote 452.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in a classified security briefing on Syria and missed rollcall votes No. 450, No. 451, and No. 452.

Had I been present for H.R. 1155, a bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, I would have voted "aye."

On H.R. 2747, a bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title, I would have voted "aye."

On S. 130, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 450 on H.R. 1155, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained at a White House briefing on Syria. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 451 on H.R. 2747, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained at a White House briefing on Syria. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 452 on S. 130, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained at a White House briefing on Syria. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I was at the White House meeting with the Vice President and was unable to vote on rollcall votes 450, 451, and 452.

If present, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 1155, H.R. 2747, and S. 130.

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 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 304, by the yeas and nays;
S. 256, by the yeas and nays;
S. 459, by the yeas and nays.

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

NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY LAND CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 304) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

YEAS—419

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

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—12

Culberson
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Hurt
Jeffries
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks
Meng
Nadler
Pingree (ME)
Velázquez
Young (FL)

□ 1656

Mr. MEEHAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 453. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC LAW 93–435 WITH RESPECT TO NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 256) to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

YEAS—415

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
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)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall

Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Culberson
Cummings
Fleming
Garamendi
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Jeffries
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks
Meng
Nadler
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Velázquez
Wilson (FL)
Young (FL)

□ 1707

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, on September 10, 2013, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 454 on S. 256. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MINUTEMAN MISSILE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 459) to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 5, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 455]

YEAS—414

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

NAYS—5

Amash
Benishek
Griffith (VA)
Weber (TX)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt
Culberson
Garamendi
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Jeffries

McCarthy (NY)	Nadler	Young (FL)
Meeks	Pingree (ME)	
Meng	Velázquez	

□ 1714

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the first series of votes today.

Had I been present, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall No. 450, H.R. 1155, the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013. I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall No. 451, H.R. 2747, Streamlining Claims Processing for Federal Contractor Employees Act. I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall No. 452, S. 130, Powell Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2775, NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–206) on the resolution (H. Res. 339) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TERRORIST ATTACKS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–59)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared in Proclamation 7463 with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, is to continue in effect for an additional year.

The terrorist threat that led to the declaration on September 14, 2001, of a national emergency continues. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect after September 14, 2013, the national emergency with respect to the terrorist threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 10, 2013*.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2109

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2019.

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

There was no objection.

END SCHOOL VIOLENCE NOW

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just last week, the beginning of the school year, in Houston, Texas, we experienced an enormous tragedy in the loss of a young man due to school violence inside one of Houston's Harris County high schools.

I rise today to extend sympathy to the family of Joshua Broussard and his friends, teachers, parents, and administrators, for it is an unspeakable act to have an incident that causes children to fear the very place where they should be safe and secure. I and all of our elected officials and law enforcement have already offered their commitment and time to work with the young people to restore their faith in the sanctity and security of schools, but, more importantly, to speak to the issue of bullying, to speak to the issue of violence, and to work with the parents to be able to say that violence in America's schools must end. We must also end it in terms of knives and guns. Children must feel loved.

And so to Spring ISD, we look forward to coming to your school district and standing with the children to ensure that they know that there are those in the United States Congress like my good friend, Mr. HOYER, and others that have stood against school violence and will stand together to ensure that our children can learn and are safe.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the ''Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change'' report indicated that there are now dire new estimates for the rate of warming around the planet in the next century. The report represents the latest finding from the international scientific community that not only is the planet warming, but there is a 95 percent certainty that that warming is being caused by human activity.

We've known for over 100 years how greenhouse gases work in the atmosphere to trap heat. It's basic physics. We also know that atmospheric concentrations of heat-trapping gases have been rising, based on decades of direct measurements. As we directly track and measure the human activities that release heat-trapping gases, such as burning fossil fuels, we understand we are responsible.

Unfortunately, there are some politicians in this body that are content to ignore the overwhelming scientific consensus. That's being done at the bidding of the oil and gas lobby. The House of Representatives has to listen to these experts and take action on climate change.

CONCERNS OVER FOREST FIRES IN THE WESTERN UNITED STATES

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as we come back after our August district work period, there have been several major events that have happened and generally do happen in late summer in the western part of the United States. Those events generally revolve around forest fires.

I'm joined on the floor tonight by a number of my colleagues from the western part of the United States in whose districts we've experienced some of these forest fires. But the reason we wanted to have this time, Mr. Speaker, is because this issue about forest management that I'm going to get into and my colleagues will be getting into has been building up for some time.

I have the privilege to chair the House Natural Resources Committee. We have broad jurisdiction over all Federal lands, and that certainly includes our forested lands. And what I have observed in the time that I've had the privilege to be in this body is that our national forests are being badly mismanaged, particularly on Federal lands. They're being badly mismanaged generally because of events and regulations coming from the Federal Government. We'll talk about that a bit tonight. But there is a solution to what we will be discussing tonight for the problems we've had in the western part of the United States with these forest fires—and that's the Healthy Forest Act that we'll have on the floor, hopefully, later on this month.

As the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, I have always felt

that all Federal lands, unless otherwise designated, should be for multiple purposes. That includes recreation, that includes commercial activity, and that includes whatever activity would be allowed unless Congress otherwise designates. And those designations could be national parks, they could be wilderness areas, they could be national monuments. But unless Congress otherwise designates, these areas should be for multiple purposes. In many respects, that goes to the crux of the problem that we'll be talking about tonight: the high incidence of forest fires on our Federal lands.

What we propose in the Healthy Forest Act that I hope will be on the floor here later this month and has passed out of committee by a voice vote is that on Federal lands where there is multiple purpose, there should be target dates for harvesting timber. If one looks at timber like any other commercial crop, the only difference is timber harvests happen in a longer period of time—generally, 30 to 40 years. But you should still manage that crop. That means thinning and doing all the things you do with any other commercial crop. This hasn't been done. As a result, this has led to these catastrophic forest fires that we've had.

I know there will be a chart on the floor later on that shows when you reduce harvests, the incidence of wildfires goes up dramatically. But it's gotten to the point where it's getting into the taxpayers' pocket. It's getting into the taxpayers' pocket because when we were properly managing land some 30 years or more ago, for every dollar that the Federal Government spent on managing our forest lands, $2 would come back in return, generally from the revenue that was realized because of harvesting. But now, Mr. Speaker, that ratio is exactly reversed. For every $2 spend, we only get $1 back.

□ 1730

As a result, it is getting into the pocket of the taxpayer when we're running these trillion-dollar deficits. Where we could have a positive cash flow, we don't have a positive cash flow.

So the response to that is to set target dates in various forests for how much timber should be harvested. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not just on the Federal level where there would be a benefit. There is a benefit also to local communities within various counties that are heavily timbered on Federal forest lands.

Back some 100 years ago, when we were looking at using these forests as national assets, there was a promise by the Federal Government to give local counties 25 percent of the revenue that they got for timber. This was their source of income, and it worked well for some 80 years. But because of the regulations that I mentioned in my brief opening remarks, and particularly in the Northwest, and particularly in Washington, Oregon, and in northern California, because of the Endangered Species Act—and specifically within the Endangered Species Act, the spotted owl—timber harvests have dropped off dramatically. That means these counties have lost their revenue. In fact, in Washington, Oregon, and California, in the last 20 years, timber harvest has fallen by 90 percent on Federal lands; and so, as a result, those counties that relied on the revenue from forest activity simply don't have any other means of income.

Unfortunately, that's one of those issues that needs to be addressed. We do address that in the Healthy Forests Act by allowing counties to manage these Federal forests and get a return as they did—it started some 100 years ago—of 25 percent of the harvest.

So these are issues that we will be discussing tonight, some in more detail, how they affect individual districts. And we hope to have this bill on the floor, as I mentioned, later on this month. It did pass out of committee, by the way, on a voice vote. I think that is significant. I think more and more people are understanding the need to properly manage our forests.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize first a gentleman whose district was heavily impacted. We all heard about the forest fires surrounding Yosemite National Park. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to yield back my time but recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS for organizing this discussion and for his work on H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. This act takes on a poignant and crucial importance to my district in the Sierra Nevada Mountains of California where the Yosemite rim fire continues to burn through nearly 400 square miles of forestland.

For years foresters have warned us that the excess timber will come out of the forest one way or another. It will either be carried out or it will be burned out, but it will come out. For generations we carried the excess timber out of our forests through sound forest management practices, leaving room for the remaining trees to grow healthy and strong. We had far less frequent and less intense forest fires, healthy trees that were disease resistant and pest resistant, and a healthier watershed as well as a thriving economy.

But today, extremist environmental regulations have driven that harvest down by more than 80 percent in the Sierras in the past 30 years. We now consign the forests to a policy of benign neglect. And rather than harvesting a small percentage of the trees to keep our forests healthy and fire resistant, we are watching more than 400 square miles of Sierra Nevada incinerated. If we had just harvested a small fraction of those trees, it's quite possible that we could have spared the Sierras from the conflagrations that are now feeding on excessive fuels. It is also likely we could have snuffed out those fires almost immediately after they started.

A generation ago, small harvesting crews operated throughout the mountains and they moved along well-maintained timber roads. When a fire first broke out, it took no time for a crew with a bulldozer to get to that fire and stop it before it got out of control. Today, those crews are gone, the roads are in disrepair, and so fires that a generation ago consumed just a few acres now consume hundreds of thousands of acres.

The result of these misguided policies is now clear and undeniable: economically devastated communities, closed timber mills, unemployed families, overgrown forests, overdrawn watersheds, jeopardized transmission lines, rampant disease and pestilence, and increasingly intense and frequent forest fires. That is the story of the towns throughout the Sierra Nevada—once thriving and prosperous communities that have been devastated by these policies. This is not environmentalism. True environmentalists recognize the damage done by overgrowth and overpopulation and they recognize the role of sound, sustainable forest management practices in maintaining healthy forests.

If there is any doubt of the connection between the reduction of timber harvesting and the increase in acreage incinerated by forest fires, I ask you to look at this chart. It shows the board feet of timber harvested from our public lands since 1983 and the forest acreage destroyed by fire. There is nothing subtle about these numbers. As the timber harvest has declined, the acreage destroyed by fire has increased contemporaneously and proportionally. It is either carried out or burned out, and at the moment it's being burned out.

They say there isn't enough money for forest thinning, And yet we used to have no problem keeping our forests thinned and healthy when we sold commercially viable timber. The problem is that if they take place at all, timber harvests are restricted to small diameter trees with no commercial value. I mean, can you imagine a fishery or a wildlife policy limited to taking only the smallest juveniles of the species? Thus, the U.S. Forest Service, which once produced revenues through timber sales, now consumes revenues, and even that isn't enough to maintain the acreage the government owns and controls. The mountain communities that once thrived economically are now economically prostrate, with unemployment levels that rival those of Detroit.

This act is long overdue. By streamlining regulations and refocusing the Forest Service's mission on sound forest management practices, H.R. 1526 will mean environmentally healthy

forests and economically healthier communities.

Ironically, just 2 weeks before the Yosemite rim fire broke out, Congressman NUNES and I hosted a public meeting on a proposal by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that would add more restrictions on nearly 2 million acres of the Sierras. Our expert witnesses warned urgently of the fire dangers these policies have created, yet these warnings were actually ridiculed by leftist newspapers like the Sacramento Bee. How sad. Two weeks later, the Yosemite rim fire was burning out of control.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of my district, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for this important reform. I only wish it had come in time to prevent the environmental devastation we are now suffering this summer in the Sierras.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 48 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to control this next 48 minutes as we explain how significant this Secure Rural Schools fix is and how important it is that we do something on a program that, quite frankly, is not sustainable.

So at this time I would like to recognize, if not the father, the godfather of Secure Rural Schools, the gentleman from Oregon. His State is impacted significantly by this program. It is a significant issue to the school kids of Oregon. Mr. WALDEN of Oregon is someone who has talked about this for many years and knows the significance and the importance of this particular issue. So I gladly yield to the gentleman from Oregon to explain his take on the Secure Rural Schools issue.

Mr. WALDEN. Well, I thank the gentleman from Utah, the chairman of the Forestry Subcommittee, a subcommittee that a number of years ago I had the great privilege and honor to chair when we passed legislation, as we're going to do in this House once again, to not only make America's great forests healthy, but also then to stop the devastation that we heard from the gentleman from California. We have so much work to do to continue the legacy of real environmentalism, which is healthy forests and healthy communities.

When President Theodore Roosevelt created the great forest reserves back in 1905, thereabouts, he said they have to be in partnership with the communities and the communities have to be supportive of this. The great purpose of this creation of forest reserves, in a speech he gave in your home State, as a matter of fact, in Utah, I believe, was wood for woodmaking, for homebuilding, water for agriculture, which means the preservation of healthy forests, in the real term preservation—which is what I want—not what we're seeing in Yosemite National Park and the surrounding areas, the focus of 400 square miles of devastation, not what we saw in Oregon this summer where the smoke was so thick in the Rogue Valley that they had to cancel performances at the Shakespeare Theater. The restaurants literally shut down. The people had to wear masks. I called into the call center of one of the phone companies and the attendant there said to me, he said, It's smoky in here inside the building.

This is not what we want out of our forests. It's not what our taxpayers want. It's not what the schoolchildren want. Because, you see, we've lost the jobs; we've lost the revenue from the jobs. We've got sheriffs in counties in my district that now have maybe one deputy. We had situations of violence, 911 calls. A woman was being attacked and basically told by the 911 folks, We don't have anybody to send. Can you tell him to go away?

You can't make this stuff up.

I thank Chairman HASTINGS, Chairman BISHOP, and others for bringing this bill forward. Let me tell you what it means in a State like mine.

In 2012, the Oregon Department of Forestry, in collaboration with other State and Federal agencies, issued a report to Oregon Governor John Kitzhaber stating that, over the 20-year period from 1980 to 2000, wildfires in eastern Oregon burned approximately 553,000 acres, with an average fire size of 26,000 acres. Over the last 10 years, in that same area, it has burned 1 million acres, averaging 93,000 acres in size. That means wildfires have tripled in size in the last 30 years. Not all of those are in forests. Some of them are grasslands. But the point is it's out of control and it's very, very deadly and expensive. And it's unacceptable.

The Oregon Forest Resources Institute reported that, since 1990, the timber harvest from Federal forestlands in the great State of Oregon has dropped by more than 90 percent—90 percent reduction since 1990 in harvested timber off Federal lands. In fact, 60 percent of Oregon's forestland is owned/controlled—but not really managed—by the Federal Government. It now contributes less than 12 percent of the State's total timber harvest. Sixty percent owned by and controlled by the Federal Government, 12 percent of timber harvest.

What does that mean for timber dependent communities? Counties that have like 50, 60, 70 percent Federal ownership, my friend who taught school knows you don't have a tax base, and now you don't have jobs because now you're not doing harvest. You can't turn and entice some big company to come in. This is a forested, rural area, a long way from freeways in most cases but not all.

So what does that mean? Nine out of 20 counties I represent face double-digit unemployment today. Sixteen of the 20 counties I represent have more than 14 percent of their populations living in poverty in America.

Here's a chart that shows what's happening. It shows mill closures in Oregon over the last 30 years. We've lost three-fourths of our mills and 30,000 mill jobs. Just recently, we lost another in. One Josephine County, the Rough & Ready mill closed after nearly 100 years. The owners were ready to invest $2 million in upgrades, and they said, We can't count on a timber supply off the Federal ground that surrounds them. There went 87 jobs.

I want to show you another picture. I have used it before over the years. It is indicative of what happens in a fire. This is Kaleb and Ashley after the Egley fire, which burned 140,000 acres in Harney County, 2007. It just shows the devastation, these young children out there.

And what does it mean for our kids? The chairman asked about that. The Oregon Department of Education says 60 percent of the schoolchildren in the county where this fire occurred are eligible for free and reduced lunch. There's poverty all over the West, and there's a way to end that and produce jobs and revenue and have healthy forests rather than what we see today.

The chairman's bill would require foresters to look at the sustainable yield a forest could produce and then only seek to harvest half of that, of the sustainable yield, and only on land that is suitable for timber harvest. It says, if you're going to appeal a plan, you had to at least be involved in the process. We put that in the Healthy Forests Restoration Act that passed this body overwhelmingly and I think passed the Senate—huge support—signed by then-President Bush into law. It had great effect, but limited in terms of what we need to do. But it had that provision in there. It strikes a balance. You need to participate in the process in order to have a right to appeal.

□ 1745

It includes a 1-year bridge payment. This gets your schools issue for the counties who currently have lost or will lose their funding for emergency services, for roads, and for schools in the Secure Rural Schools side. This is a bridge to put people back to work in the woods when coupled with active management. This is balance—this is balance.

The bill also has an Oregon-specific provision. Not everything I would necessarily do if I could write it on my own, but do you know what? You don't get that process here. We've put together a good plan with Representatives DEFAZIO and SCHRADER. We've worked through our differences. We forged a balanced plan that would create thousands of new jobs. Creators saved up to 3,000 jobs in Oregon in these very unique lands called the O&C Lands. It ensures the health of these

lands for future generations. It provides long-term management and certainty of funding for our local services and schools and roads and law enforcement that lie within these counties.

According to Governor Kitzhaber's O&C Lands Report, it would generate $120 million per year in county revenue. We don't come back here to the Federal taxpayer and say, Give us another check, give us another handout. We say, Let us manage our own lands and do it under the Oregon State Forest Practices Act, which is one of the leading environmental laws in the country for balance, for sustainable forest health and management. Do it under that and we'll create the jobs and save them, we'll create the revenue for our schools.

Let me tell you about the protections that you will get. It provides:

Activities near streams, lakes, and wetlands must include water quality protection. Something we all agree on.

Wildlife trees and down logs have to be left in most large clear-cut areas. Clear-cut sizes are limited to 120 acres. Now, some will say, Oh, my gosh, 120 acres. Let me tell you that the Douglas Complex fire that burned this summer burned 48,000 acres. If there isn't a more destructive clear-cut than that, I don't know what it is. And do you know what? After it burns, there's no requirement they go in and replant. If you harvest 128 acres, you're required to go in and replant, and those trees have to survive, and you go in right away.

Let me show you what happens after a fire to the environment. There's no stream setback here. Fire knows no bounds. Our legislation says you can't harvest near that, near a stream, you have to have setbacks. We believe in the environment. This is what you get when you don't manage.

You see, lack of action has an impact in a dynamic forest environment. Doing nothing doesn't mean the forest gets better. It means it gets overcrowded, overstocked, and when you get fire—and we'll always have it—it just won't burn naturally anymore. It will blow up, like my friend and colleague from California has experienced in the Yosemite fire and like we've experienced all over the West this summer and will every summer thereafter.

The Forest Service now spends more fighting fire than anything else. They ought to change their name to the U.S. Fire Service.

We've got to get back to managing these lands, and this legislation does that. I thank the committee for its incredible work. I thank you for bringing this to the floor. I look forward to voting for it when it comes to the floor. Together we'll get back to proper, thoughtful, constructive management of our Federal forests. We'll take care of that trust the people put in us to take care of their lands, and we'll take care of the people as well.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman for his comments here.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard now from three Members from the west coast—one from California, one from Oregon and one from Washington—who have explained the situation and how this particular act is, indeed, a solution to the problems that those west coast States are finding in their forestry efforts.

But this also impacts the interior of this country, so I would like to yield a few minutes to the representative from the State of Montana, who represents the entire State of Montana, to explain how this has an impact on interior State forests, as well as the coastal State forests.

I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) to explain what's happening in his State.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah, and I thank the chairman for reserving this hour for this very important issue, saving our national forests and our forested communities, which is very important to my home State of Montana.

H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests and Healthy Communities Act is important to Montana because many of our counties in Montana rely on the forest economy or at least the relics of what used to be one. Several decades ago, Montana forests supported local timber jobs and provided a steady revenue stream for our counties and schools.

In fact, I remember growing up when I was riding in the back seat, mom and dad in front in the station wagon and I would be in back with my sisters, we would watch logging trucks drive up and down our highways. Our counties enjoyed the benefits of the receipts from timber sales. It used to help support our schools.

But today, as I now drive around the State representing the State of Montana, most of our forest counties struggle with unemployment. In fact, Lincoln County, the most northwest county of my State, which is comprised mostly of national forest land, it used to generate timber jobs. They now face double digit unemployment.

The Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest faces a very high mortality rate due to beetle kill. The tragedy here as we drive all over the State this time of year, we are seeing forest fires on one hand and then standing dead timber on the other that has died because of beetle kill. We can't even go in and harvest the dead trees, which we have a couple years to do so, because of the onerous process here on our national forest.

Inflexible and outdated Federal laws like the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act have imposed a huge administrative burden on Federal agencies, which limits our timber industry's access to wood and ultimately resulted in the mismanagement of our forests, allowing places where we love to recreate instead to burn up in smoke. And when they burn up in smoke, as the gentleman from Oregon mentioned, it threatens our watersheds as well.

In fact, so far over 100,000 acres in Montana have burned this year. The number of large fires—large fires—has been as high as five just this week. My son last year played high school football his senior year. We had ''Friday Night Lights'' high school football games in Montana canceled because of air quality, because of forest fires.

Laws like NEPA and the Endangered Species Act are often the basis of lawsuits. These aren't filed by the rank and file Montanans who are working to collaborate to improve access to our national forests, but they're filed by fringe extreme groups to halt healthy timber management projects that could help prevent these fires and, importantly, create hundreds of jobs.

In fact, in one of our hearings in our committee, a top national forest official, Deputy Chief Jim Hubbard, said litigation has played a huge role in blocking responsible timber sales in Montana and other region 1 States, including projects supported by collaborative groups consisting of timber as well as conservation leaders. To quote Mr. Hubbard, he said this: ''It has virtually shut things down on the national forest.''

As the gentleman from Oregon mentioned, the numbers in Montana are the same. Timber harvests are down 90 percent on our Federal lands from where they were when I was growing up.

Mr. Chairman, something must be done, and I'm glad to join you in introducing this very important bill. H.R. 1526 will help revitalize the timber industry throughout Montana and create thousands of good, high-paying jobs. It also tackles beetle kill, protecting our environment for future generations and reducing the threat of catastrophic wildfires in Montana.

The Restoring Healthy Forests and Healthy Communities Act will cut the red tape that has held up responsible forest management in timber production. It also includes comprehensive reforms to discourage and limit the flood of frivolous appeals and litigation. It requires the Forest Service to increase timber harvest on non-wilderness lands now that it will have much needed latitude to do the work it knows how to do.

This improved management will protect the health of our forests, the health of our watersheds, the safety of our communities, and allow jobs to return to the timber industry. In addition, the legislation restores the Federal Government's commitment to provide 25 percent of timber sales receipts to timber counties. It extends the Secure Rural Schools program pending the full operation of the new timber program.

SRS has provided crucial stopgap funding to timber counties after timber sales, and the corresponding receipts, after they plunged in recent decades. It is the taxpayer now who is funding

that gap when instead we could have the timber industry cutting down trees and supplying jobs and supplying revenue to support our schools.

Recently, we welcomed Chuck Roady, the vice president and general manager of F. H. Stoltze Land and Lumber in Columbia Falls, Montana. He came back to Washington, D.C., as a witness for a House Natural Resources hearing on forest and fire management.

During the hearing, Chuck perfectly summed up the challenges we face. He said:

> This is a nonpartisan, nonregional issue. It's simply the case of doing the right thing to manage our public forest. If we don't, Mother Nature is going to do it for us, and when she does it, it's uncontrollable and catastrophic.

Mr. Speaker, I could not have conveyed our challenges any better than that. We all know too well how devastating wildfires can be to our communities and our local economies.

I urge passing the Restoring Healthy Forests and Healthy Communities Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Montana.

Very few people realize the Federal Government actually owns 1 out of every 3 acres in this country, but it is disproportionate. So, of the 13 Western States, 54 percent of the land mass is actually owned by the Federal Government. The 33 States east of the Western States only have 4 percent of their land. Which simply means no one actually east of Denver quite understands how this relationship necessarily works. It also means that the unfortunate truth is, as we've already heard, that private and State forests are today healthier than the Federal forest system. But those of us in the West realize this firsthand because those are our neighbors, those are the areas that surround our communities.

I'm glad to hear from the next two speakers who will be talking—they are from Colorado. The first one is the gentleman from Colorado Springs, who is on the Natural Resources Committee, and he's going to explain the significant situation that they find in Colorado with our forest health situation.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah. It's great to serve on the committee as a subcommittee chairman with him. And we serve with Chairman DOC HASTINGS, who is doing a great job on these issues.

The bill, H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, is a long-term solution to help put hardworking Americans back to work and ensure that these rural counties have a stable source of revenue to help pay for schools and teachers. It was introduced by my friend and colleague, Representative SCOTT TIPTON, of Colorado, and I am a cosponsor.

Over a century ago, the Federal Government made a promise to actively manage our forests and share 25 percent of the revenues generated from timber sales with counties containing national forest land. This is funding that rural counties depend on to help fund vital services, such as education and roads. But the Federal Government has failed to uphold this commitment and has cut back on active management of our national forests.

This lack of active forest management not only deprives counties of revenue to help fund schools and roads but also inhibits job creation and makes our national forests increasingly susceptible to wildfires and invasive species. Currently, there are over 21 active large wildfires burning right now in eight States. Over 406,000 acres are burning, with only 2 of the 21 fires contained.

This year, to date there have been over 35,000 fires with almost 4 million acres burned. Last year, the tragic Waldo Canyon fire occurred on Federal land in my Colorado district, claiming two lives and destroying almost 500 homes.

H.R. 1526 will help improve forest health and prevent catastrophic wildfires by allowing greater State and local involvement in wildfire prevention on Federal lands. It will help improve local forest management by allowing counties to actively manage portions of national forest land.

Restoring active management of our national forests would ensure a stable, predictable revenue stream for counties and schools. Active management would also promote healthier forests, reduce the risk of wildfires, and decrease our reliance on foreign countries for timber and paper goods.

I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, since Mr. LAMBORN has already introduced the concept of what's taking place in Colorado and the bill for Mr. TIPTON, let's turn now to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) to also explain the significance of why he actually did that particular bill.

Mr. TIPTON. Thank you, Chairman BISHOP. I certainly appreciate your leadership on this issue, along with Chairman HASTINGS.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague had just described some of the challenges that we've been facing in Colorado. I would like to be able to expand upon that.

Not long ago, I was at the incident command centers in Monte Vista, Colorado, on the east side of the Rockies, and also in Pagosa Springs, on the west side of the Rockies, to be able to visit the incident command centers trying to deal with the West Fork Complex fire.

□ 1800

How big is the fire? It's 170 square miles and counting. We are not talking 170 acres. We are talking 170 square miles of forests in my district.

The challenges that this is going to bring in terms of being able to deal with endangered species, in terms of water quality, in terms of tourism and the economy in western Colorado can probably not yet be numbered. That is why the Restoring Healthy Forests Act is a bill whose time has come.

The National Interagency Fire Center reported this week that there have been 35,000-plus fires in the United States in 2013 alone. Devastating bark beetle infestation, prolonged drought conditions, and unnaturally dense forests—these have all combined with ineffective forest management for a devastating fire season. These factors have led to a significant increase in the magnitude and in the number of wildfires in the country over the past decade.

So far this year, 3.9 million acres have already burned, and these figures continue to grow with 21 active, large wildfires. The property damage and costs associated with these wildfires is tremendous; and to date, the Forest Service has already spent over a billion dollars in fire suppression alone. In 2012, the Forest Service spent only $296 million on hazardous fuels reduction; whereas, they spent $1.77 billion on wildfire suppression at that same time.

Part of this is a planning process. We have dealt with leadership in the Forest Service. They've talked about computer models which their own folks are telling us simply don't work. We have to be able to get in and effectively manage these forests, to be able to treat them in a responsible way, to be able to build for our communities, and to be able to make sure that our children are able to see the same forests that we grew up living in.

The cost of proactive healthy forest management is, indeed, far less than the cost of wildfire suppression. When it comes to our forests, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure; but instead of ramping up forest management efforts and addressing hazardous conditions in the West, the Interior Department has proposed to cut the budget by 48 percent for hazardous fuels reduction in 2014, and the Forest Service has proposed reducing this proactive management by a further 24 percent. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have expressed outrage at this approach of further reducing funding for hazardous fuels.

Under the current management system, a cumbersome regulatory framework has further inhibited active forest management while excessive litigation has obstructed projects that would prevent devastating wildfires and protect our vital water supplies and precious species habitats. The status quo is not working, and immediate action is needed to be able to fix this broken system.

Our forest management package, H.R. 1526, would allow greater State and local involvement in wildfire prevention on Federal lands in order to expedite hazardous fuels reduction projects and reduce litigation. In doing so, it would help restore sustainable

timber harvesting, create jobs, and provide reliable sources of revenue for rural education and infrastructure.

H.R. 1526 also addresses the shortfall in county revenue for schools and critical services caused by a lack of timber harvest by requiring the Forest Service to produce at least half of the sustainable annual yield of timber required under the 1908 law and to share 25 percent of those receipts with our rural counties.

In order to meet this goal while providing for healthy forests, the bill includes the local management framework by directing the Forest Service to prioritize hazardous fuels reduction projects proposed by Governors and affected counties and tribes. To expedite locally based healthy forest projects, this package builds on the positive streamlining procedures implemented under the bipartisan Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003.

I am pleased to have been able to work with Chairman BISHOP and Chairman HASTINGS on this bill. It's time that we stand together to be able to return health to our forests in a proactive, responsible, and positive way. H.R. 1526 accomplishes that goal.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the last two speakers from Colorado for explaining the situation they are facing within their State on Federal forest land.

Before we turn to somebody from the East who gets what we're talking about here, let's continue with the backbone of the Rocky Mountains by turning some time over to the Representative from the State of Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) in order for her to explain how this impacts her State.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I also thank Chairman HASTINGS of the Natural Resources Committee for bringing this important legislation to the attention of the American people, especially after this tremendous fire season that we've had in the West for the past 3 or 4 years, in which we have lost valuable natural resources, jobs, wildlife, livestock, people, houses. It is an unnecessary devastation that always amazes me as we would bring about legislation to address regional haze, which has no environmental impact other than to reduce the viewsheds or the damage to the viewshed, when the damage to the viewshed is being caused by our inattentiveness in managing our national forests.

I want to talk, Mr. Chairman, about forest health and about the benefits of logging to have healthy forests, vibrant wildlife, and clean water and air.

The air is cleaner when the West is not on fire. The water is cleaner when protected from the ash that goes down the hills, into the streams, choking the oxygen out of our streams, which then, in turn, kills our fish. That reduces fishing opportunities, and it reduces a vibrant fish population.

In addition to providing clean air by lack of fire, clean water due to lack of fire, by logging, we can actually have more vibrant, widespread wildlife habitat and water for that habitat. When we log and do it in a manner that preserves the natural contours in our forests, we can have high mountain meadows with forages that will keep elk, deer, and other species on those high mountain meadows longer in the year, thereby providing habitat for a vibrant, healthy, diverse, ungulate population and for the species that share that ecosystem habitat. So it's good for wildlife.

Furthermore, it's good for the health of the forests, themselves, because, if you would look, for example, at the Medicine Bow National Forest and the Routt National Forest across the border in Colorado, these two forests have been absolutely denuded of lodgepole pine by the bark beetle with the exception of the young trees in the areas that have previously been logged. The healthy areas of the Medicine Bow National Forest in Wyoming and the Routt National Forest in Colorado are the areas that were previously logged, because there is a diversity of the age of the trees, thereby having a young, more resilient, healthy tree intermingled with stands of medium-maturity and high-maturity trees. The combination of the old growth, the medium-maturity trees, and the young trees makes for a more vibrant, healthy forest that can better withstand an onslaught like the bark beetle epidemic that has devastated so much of the Intermountain West.

So we have addressed clean air, clean water, wildlife habitat through the opportunity for high mountain meadows, and we have addressed the health of the trees, themselves. All this can happen while we have jobs in logging, while we have opportunities for revenues for schools.

The point here is we are all part of this ecosystem—the people, the animals, the air, the water, the trees. All can benefit by this bill. This is a commonsense solution that has taken Americans decades to understand and appreciate the importance of, but that has never been more apparent than it was this summer.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this important dialogue.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentlelady from Wyoming for being with us and talking about the concepts that are going on and what we can do for our future.

If I could, Mr. Speaker, at the turn of the 20th century, the so-called ''progressive era,'' there was a paradigm shift that took place in the United States in which the government decided to basically keep all of the land. It was based on three premises:

The first is that the West had to be protected from itself. The second is that only somebody in Washington, D.C., would have the vision to make decisions that could impact the rest of the Nation, and if there were ever a conflict between what local leaders or local officials wanted and what D.C. wanted, D.C. obviously had the better advantage.

The result of that is, as you have heard from the people here today, that our forest system is not as healthy as it used to be or ought to be. The communities that relied upon the timber industry to survive and the school systems in those areas that relied upon the timber industry to survive have been decimated, and our solution as a Congress and as an administration is simply to find a temporary payment to these solutions with actually no revenue source to make them permanent.

What we have now done since 2000, when the Secure Rural School Program started, is spend $6 billion, which has come from the pockets of those who live in the East, to fund a temporary program when what we actually need is a long-term solution that works—that puts people to work, that finds a real source of funding for education services and provides a real solution for what we need, a solution that will provide for healthy forests, a solution that will provide for vibrant communities and for the support of our public school system. That is, indeed, what this proposal for the Secure Rural School Program attempts to do.

Mr. Speaker, about 20 years ago, a former Democrat Member of this House, who is now part of the Senate leadership—I realize that's an oxymoron, ''Senate leadership''—but he was here, and he gave an impassioned speech upon this floor that dealt with the controversial decision of Major League Baseball's potentially switching to aluminum bats. As that Representative from Illinois, who is now a Senator, rose, he said:

> Mr. Speaker, I rise to condemn the desecration of a great American symbol. No, I am not referring to flag burning; I am referring to the baseball bat.
>
> Several experts tell us that the wooden baseball bat is doomed to extinction . . . Please, do not tell me that wooden bats are too expensive . . . Please, do not try to sell me on the notion that these metal clubs will make better hitters . . . If we forsake the great Americana of broken-bat singles and pine tar, we will have certainly lost our way as a Nation.

His conclusion was simply this:

> I do not want to hear about saving trees. Any tree in America would gladly give its life for the glory of a day at home plate.

As much as I agree with his statements, I'd like to take his comment one step further and say that, not only would any tree in America gladly give its life for the glory of a day at bat at home plate, but any tree in America would gladly be overjoyed to give its life to help fund the education of our kids.

The solution is that we don't need all trees to provide the bats or the education funding—just some of the trees. In fact, by not cutting them all, you actually save and improve the health of the forests; but if you don't do it, we lose these trees to fire, and every burned tree is a burned baseball bat,

and that is not good for the psyche of this particular country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time in order to turn the management time of this Special Order over to Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania so that he may speak and also introduce a couple of more speakers whom we have still to talk about this vital issue of Secure Rural Schools and how this House has finally come up with a solution—a long-term, lasting solution—to this particular problem.

SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 12 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Chairman BISHOP and Chairman HASTINGS.

As an individual from Pennsylvania, from the eastern portion of the United States, I do get it. This is a problem that obviously—as you've heard from my colleagues from the western part of the country—is devastating there. It's devastating in communities in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. We have the Allegheny National Forest there. I have four counties—schools, municipalities—which struggle because of a failed policy in terms of forest management. They struggle economically.

□ 1815

When we do not have healthy forests, we do not have healthy communities. So I stand here very appreciative to Chairman HASTINGS' work and certainly supportive of H.R. 1526.

As chairman of the Agriculture Committee's Forestry Subcommittee, I continually point out that the Forest Service is housed within the USDA—rather than the Interior—and was done so for very specific purposes.

This decision was made long ago because our national forests were intended for multiple use. The most important function of that mission is to properly manage these forests and grasslands in order to retain the ecological health of those resources for sustained economic and recreational use.

You can't adequately manage a forest without harvesting timber. Just look to our private and State forests to see how to manage a forest cost effectively and environmentally responsibly. National forestlands, when managed correctly, will be more ecologically healthy and economically beneficial to the local communities.

Representing a forested district and as an outdoorsman, I've been very alarmed at how precipitously our annual harvests have dropped off in the past 20 years. Between 1960 and 1989, the Forest Service was harvesting roughly 10 billion to 12 billion board feet per year. Since the early nineties, the annual harvest across Forest Service lands fell below 2 billion board feet and hit its bottom in 2002 at 1.7 billion feet. This is about one-fifth of what they've been harvesting in an average year.

We have seen firsthand the economic impacts of reducing our harvesting levels in national forests. Under longtime Federal law, 25 percent of the timber receipts generated on national forests are required to be returned to the county of origin. The purpose of this is that since there is no tax base there for the local government, timber receipts were to provide a consistent source of revenue to the counties to be used for schools, police, and local expenses.

In 2000, this lack of timber dollars plummeted so low that Congress created the now expired Secure Rural Schools program to make up for the loss of the county revenues in the national forestlands. This program simply would not have been needed if the Federal Government was keeping its promise to these rural areas by managing and harvesting the appropriate amount of timber.

In the Allegheny National Forest located in my district, we have slightly inched up in meeting the recommended level of harvest, but we are still nowhere near where we need to be. This is especially true across almost every other national forest around the country where they typically are generating only a few percent of the recommended level.

Too little harvesting will have a significant impact on overall forest health. Decreased timber harvesting means more dead trees and more highly flammable biomaterials that do little more than serve as fuel for wildfires. According to the Forest Service, the instances of wildfires each year have actually decreased in recent years. However, fires that we've been seeing recently are much more intense than they have been in past years. Why? The reason is because of increased flammability in the forests as a result of materials that have been accumulated and not removed through management activities.

According to the U.S. Forest Service, 65 million to 82 million acres of forestland are at high risk of wildfires. Last year, wildfires burned 9.3 million acres while the U.S. Forest Service only harvested approximately 200,000 acres. This means that 44 times as many acres burned as were responsibly managed and harvested.

As an original cosponsor of H.R. 1526, I want to applaud Chairman HASTINGS for his leadership and introduction of the bill. This legislation will provide responsible timber production on forestlands and does so in areas specifically identified by the agency.

Access and retaining the multiple-use mission of the Forest Service is paramount to ensuring that our rural forest communities continue to flourish and be viable.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to recognize my good friend, a Western Caucus colleague, Mr. PEARCE.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding and for his work on behalf of H.R. 1526.

New Mexico is a home to multiple national forests. We see firsthand the effect of our national Forest Service policy. Last year, in the middle of the year, a fire broke out. It was about 4 acres for 2 or 3 days. The Forest Service's policy was basically ''let it burn.''

They let it burn for 3 or 4 days, had enough people to swat it out with whisk brooms, when suddenly the winds got up, as they do in New Mexico always, and blew that fire into 10,000 acres. It almost immediately started burning down homes, 255 homes. It's at that point we began to speak publicly about the Forest Service policies that would create infernos in our western forests.

Formerly, we had a policy in the Forest Service of the 10 a.m. rule. It was, if you get a fire, you put it out by 10 a.m. tomorrow. If you're not successful by 10 a.m. tomorrow, then it's 10 a.m. the next day. You dedicate all the resources you can to putting out the fire.

Those policies have been amended by current Forest Service Chief Tom Tidwell into saying, We're going to let them burn. We're watching right now wondering if the sequoias will survive this Forest Service policy.

Many of the forests in New Mexico and the West are not surviving. Hundreds of millions of acres are at risk every year. It's not a matter of if they will burn, but when.

As we talked publicly about Forest Service management policies during that fire, then we started getting calls from individuals around the country who had retired out of the Forest Service saying, Yes, keep talking. We, as retired professionals, disagree with the current philosophies in the Forest Service.

We invited one of those 30-year employees—Bill Derr—into our district to run a congressional study and to come up with recommendations. He basically had two, after months of study. He said we should be mechanically thinning our forests—that is, logging in our forests—and, secondly, returning to the 10 a.m. policy.

What are the downstream effects of bad Forest Service management?

First of all, we're losing the habitat for millions of species; we're burning millions of species in the fire. These are endangered species sometimes, but otherwise we're just killing lots of animals.

Also, we're destroying a watershed. In New Mexico, in the Whitewater-Baldy fire, the forest around one of the lakes there that provides drinking water for Alamogordo was at risk. The Forest Service said they should clean it, and instead lawsuits were filed to stop that. The fire burned right up to the edge of the lake, and the lake now has 50 feet of fill in it. All the fish are

dead, starved for oxygen, exactly like the gentlelady from Wyoming said. The streams are now filling with silt.

Forest Service personnel tell us we will be having to empty that lake for the next 15 years. That's 15 years of dead fish; 15 years downstream facing flooding; 15 years without the drinking water that sustains a community of about 30,000. These are what we face.

Also, the West is starved for jobs because of Forest Service policy. The original Organic Act, the act that created the U.S. Forest Service, said that they should be logging to create local commerce and jobs and they should be protecting the watershed. The U.S. Forest Service is negligent on both of the underlying reasons for their existence. We in the West are suffering lost education opportunities, destroyed habitat, and destroyed forests. Those forests will not grow back for 100 years according to the Forest Service personnel.

It's time for us to pass H.R. 1526. I support it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I would like to recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, every year, rural America, especially the western States and areas like mine in northern California, are in the news. It's not for something good, but for something like we see going on with so many of the wildfires around the country. There's no reason for this. That's why I support this bill here today that would actually make our forests perform for us, instead of being a detriment to us and our health in California and the western States.

We can have either the type of air quality problems that are happening—like in the central valley of California, for example, one of my colleagues was talking about, although we've had challenges there in recent years, they've actually improved things. The air quality right now is much worse because of these fires than anything going on by people or after the improvements that have gone on with other air quality issues. In my own part of the State back in 2008, the whole summer and into the fall, brown, dirty—including the areas close to the fire—kids couldn't go outside because the quality was 10 times above health levels for them to be safe.

We see our small communities that are devastated by an economy that has shifted away due to forest management and Forest Service policies that don't work for them. This legislation would allow our forests to perform for us and help these economies, help the health of the forest, the health of the people, and the health of the local economies to be strong once again, and, as was mentioned earlier, our rural schools.

So let's do commonsense legislation instead of watching our forests burn. I urge you to support this.

POTENTIAL U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN SYRIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this is an extraordinarily busy week in Washington as we have all returned from a district work period. There are many issues to discuss, including how we're going to fund the Federal budget, get the fiscal house in order, potentially have the right type of tax reform, and deal with a whole host of other issues, but I felt like it would be very inadequate if the evening went by but did not delve into a little bit deeper of a discussion as to the nature of the Syrian conflict and the potential for United States military involvement.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote my constituents last week as they expressed tremendous concern about the potential for U.S. entanglement in the situation in Syria. In fact, it's overwhelming the number of people who have shared deep, heartfelt concerns. It is overwhelming. I'm hearing that from my colleagues, as well.

This is not some sort of populous reaction to the elites of this institution in government. It is an intuition of the American people who are suggesting to us in leadership that we have poured ourselves out as a country, sacrificed tremendously, extraordinarily, to give other people a chance for stability, for human rights, for the right forms of development, for political outcomes that uphold just governing structures.

Where have we gotten for our investment? Basically since World War II, the United States has been cast into the role of the superpower being the proprietor of international stability and we've accepted that arrangement, but there are tremendous pressures upon us as we continue to move forward in the 21st century as we've empowered other people and other economies through appropriate development to take responsibilities for themselves.

The United States has not always done this perfectly, but we've fought multiple wars and we've engaged in many areas of the world in order to try to give other people a chance and to stop aggressive ideologies that are inconsistent with basic and fundamental human rights. I've responded to the people of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share that with you this evening:

Life in Syria today is, as the philosopher Thomas Hobbes once wrote, ''nasty, brutish, and short.'' An ongoing civil war ravishes the country. The oppressive regime of President Bashar al-Assad wages battle against a nebulous, undefined mix of rebels, who have regularly employed the same brutal violence that the government has. The result is that there are more than 100,000 persons dead, including many innocent civilians—mothers, fathers, and children.

In response to the suspected use of chemical weapons by Assad, President Obama is now advocating U.S. military intervention, although, of course, the situation is now fluid. In the past, he has stated that the use of chemical weapons is a ''red line'' that Assad could not cross without a serious rethinking of American involvement in the conflict, which to this point has included a significant amount of humanitarian aid—and properly so—targeted to those caught in the middle of this violence. The President, to his credit, has rightly asked for a vote of Congress prior to taking military action, and some in Congress are signaling their support.

In recent days, however, I have clearly stated my opposition to this idea. I oppose this action of unilateral military strikes. The United States should not bomb Syria in the name of stopping violence in Syria. While quick, unilateral military strikes might satisfy the President's ''red line'' rhetoric, the collateral damage and further risk of destabilization is very high.

□ 1830

Now, as Congress has returned to Washington this week, there are hard questions that are in the process of being asked: What will be the consequences of this bombing? Who's on the other side of this? And how much do we really know of this rebel movement that we will be implicitly aiding if we attack Assad's government? What happens following the military strike? Why not expend the energy of this debate over military involvement on solidifying international outrage and holding particularly Russia, a longtime ally of Syria who's entangled in this situation, holding them accountable?

The international community must work together creatively to stop the savagery of Assad, but it cannot hide behind the United States military might. No longer can it be assumed that the United States is responsible for fixing all aspects of global conflicts, and no longer should the United States accept that framework. For the sake of global stability, a new construct must instead take its place, one in which the responsible Nations of the world are serious about their own defense and stabilization of conflicts within their regions.

In light of the increasing brutality in Syria, the United States should continue to advance its support for the innocent victims of this civil war. Meanwhile, we should also aggressively use this opportunity to facilitate new international partnerships that seek lasting solutions to complicated situations of mass violence.

Until such a united front is achieved, unilateral military action may only introduce further chaos to an already disastrous problem and, as I have said, implicitly put us on the side of a rebel movement who has also shown willingness to murder innocent civilians. And it is not clear whether or not the more

moderate elements of that very movement have any capacity to implement governing structures that are just and lasting. So then what happens? Syria, this area degrades into a vast, ungovernable space, ripe for jihadists with no protections for innocent persons or the ancient peoples who call that place home.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other aspects of this that I have written about that I would like to share momentarily, but I would like to turn to my good friend, Congressman CHARLIE DENT from Pennsylvania, as he wishes to share a few concepts and perspectives on this conflict.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for organizing this Special Order this evening to discuss the crisis in Syria. In my view, it is really indisputable that Bashar al-Assad is a villain who has committed heinous, mortal crimes with the use of chemical weapons against his own people.

What is debatable, however, is America's policy on Syria and the broader Middle East. I have raised the issue of Syria with this administration at numerous hearings as a member of the Appropriations Committee. I have also worked with Syrians in my own community, and I have the largest population of Syrian Americans of any Member of Congress in the United States. I have met with them. They have brought to my attention issues of abducted Christian archbishops who have been abducted in Syrian and whose whereabouts, unfortunately, are unknown. There is a lot of work going on to try to secure their release, but that said, you can understand their concern for that part of the world.

I have spent time, too, in meetings with America's wonderful friend, King Abdullah of Jordan, who has also shared his perspective on the plight of the Syrian people. But what I have observed most of all is a very sad observation, and that is the friends of the Syrian regime—Iran, Russia and Hezbollah—are far more committed to President Assad than the friends of the Syrian people—and that would be the West and the Arab League—are to these moderate opposition forces.

I had asked Secretary Hillary Clinton—former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton—back in February, 2012, if the administration was prepared to provide some type of material support to moderate secular opposition groups given that it looked like Assad's government was very weak, there was a popular uprising, and it seemed there might be a better outcome. She was pretty clear with me at the time that she thought providing light arms would be of little help to the opposition in the face of Assad's substantial military, with all his air assets, artillery and armor. To put it bluntly and short, she really didn't want to get too involved at that time. We really didn't have much of a discussion about the benefits to America, its friends and allies and their interests, if Iran's influence in the region were substantially weakened through the overthrow of Bashar al-Assad.

I thought at the time that the President was maybe more concerned about maintaining his reputation as a Nobel Peace Prize winner antiwar candidate than actually developing what I thought would be a more practical response for Syria. It just seemed that inaction and indecision were, and frankly today, remain the order of the day.

In the meantime, let's fast forward from a year and a half, 2 years ago to today: al-Nusra and other radical Islamist terrorist organizations have rushed into this vacuum and filled the void, so to speak. So really today there aren't any good public policy outcomes for the United States. The time for the United States to more constructively intervene and to reach a more efficacious resolution, the time for that has long passed.

So here we are, over these last 2½ years, this Syrian civil war has descended into both a sectarian and proxy conflict, and these events have moved well beyond the United States ability to control with Iran, Hezbollah, and Russia fully committed to the Assad government.

I think we all know, as Mr. FORTENBERRY knows, we know we have a very war-weary population which is not going to support a half-hearted, poorly thought out military strike which will only expose the United States and its friends to greater risks, including the possibility of a broader regional conflagration. This could include more chemical weapons attacks against the Syrian people and possibly Israel, potential cyber attacks on American critical infrastructure in both the financial services and energy sectors, an unleashed Hezbollah, and other unforeseen, asymmetrical responses.

I am deeply concerned about this, as we all should be. But we can't just look at Syria in isolation; we have to look at it in the much broader context of the Middle East. Unfortunately, and I'm going to have to be a bit critical of the President at this time, witness how President Obama turned his back on Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak in 2011 after 2 weeks of uprisings. Whatever his faults, whatever his shortcomings, Hosni Mubarak was a loyal, 30-year friend of the United States—a lesson learned by our friends and our allies throughout the region and throughout the world.

Of course, prior to that incident there was the Green Revolution in Iran where we saw a lot of very brave people in Iran stand up to the Ahmadinejad regime in Iran. We witnessed that, and it seemed this administration could barely utter words of support to these very brave people who stood up to a tyrant, Ahmadinejad, who made all sorts of reckless and inflammatory and hateful statements against the West and particularly Israel, and so I was just astounded that the administration could barely utter words of support.

Then, of course, we learned about leading from behind in Libya. Actually, leading from behind the French and the British in Libya, to be precise. I was one of only a handful of Republicans in the House to support the authorization for force in Libya—after the fact, but I supported it. So I'm not an isolationist. I believe that we have an important role internationally with the United States, and we have to be constructively engaged.

But let's move forward to 2013. Bashar al-Assad's government launches chemical attacks against his own people. I believe the intelligence is clear that he did it, or his government did it, so I'm not debating those facts, what appear to be facts. But we witnessed these chemicals attacks in both the late spring and again just a few weeks ago in August, these chemical attacks. We witnessed the trampling of the red line set down by the President not once but twice, maybe more than that for all I know. And now over 100,000 Syrians have been killed. What is the President's strategy for Syria? I couldn't explain it to anybody if they asked. He talked about pinpricks or his administration has talked about pinpricks, shots across the bow, a military action of days not weeks, and no intention to topple Assad or to degrade his military capacity to make war on his own people, for that matter. I'm learning a lot about what we will not do, but I'm not really sure what we're trying to do or trying to accomplish. So a very limited air strike to punish Mr. Assad is not going to alter the outcome of the Syrian civil war. What is the point or purpose? What is the clarity of mission?

In my view, America's national interest is really twofold in Syria. One, we want to limit Iranian influence in the region, and, two, the other issue deals with securing those chemical weapons, frankly, from both the Assad government and the radical elements of that opposition who would probably be just as inclined to use them. So much so that King Abdullah of Jordan came to Members of Congress to express his real concern about al-Nusra forces getting too close, dangerously close to a chemical site in southern Syria, and that was just a few months ago.

So now we also witnessed, too, there really is not a coalition of the willing to tackle Mr. Assad's crimes. It seems more a coalition of the unwilling. The United Nations really doesn't seem anywhere to be found, although in recent days, in the last 24 hours we're hearing there might be some discussion with the Russians about some kind of a resolution on securing those sites, but the U.N. is really nowhere to be found. NATO does not seem to be fully engaged at all, although maybe some members are supportive. And, of course, we've witnessed what the British Parliament did to Prime Minister Cameron in rebuking him. And so the British, our beloved friends and allies, are not going to be engaged in this one,

and so we're pretty much on our own. Again, I've called this a coalition of the unwilling. And so I think it would behoove the United States not to move in what appears to be almost a unilateral manner.

I have read, too, recently, that some of the Arab governments, Saudi Arabia and others, would be willing to help pay for some of this mission should we strike. You know, on the one hand, I appreciate that. On the other, the United States military is really not a mercenary force for anyone. A lot of folks may be encouraging us or cheering us on, but it doesn't seem they are willing to put people in harm's way. So I think we have to keep that in mind as we talk about this.

I'm going to conclude in a moment, but I was one of the folks who said it is always important for the President to consult with Congress prior to taking any kind of military action. It's important in our system, although I don't believe the President necessarily needs a congressional authorization for what he has called a very limited airstrike. But now that he has asked me to engage in this debate, I owe the President fair consideration of his policy in Syria, whatever it may be.

Again, I said call me skeptical; now you can call me outright opposed. I have said from day one that the President didn't seem to have his heart in this impending military action. He was looking for a way out after the U.N., the U.K., and NATO, a lot of our friends were just not willing to go along, and then the President turned to Congress as a last resort for an authorization where he has, of course, run into very, very heavy skepticism. I just did see any Churchillian resolve in our Commander in Chief. Our men and women in uniform deserve a Commander in Chief who is full-throated in support of what is likely to become a very dangerous military operation and could possibly spiral out of control. But more importantly, we have to be cognizant of the potential consequences and ramifications for that action.

I think the President of the United States owes that to the American people, to make it clear what his policy is, what his mission is, not what he's not going to do, but what he intends to do. After the President really threw this issue to Congress, we witnessed President Assad's jubilant supporters celebrating in the Syrian streets, and I'm sure the corridors of power in Tehran and Moscow, and it seems now that America's friends and allies watched this mystifying failure of Presidential leadership unfold with dismay.

So have our constituents. We have all received these calls. In my view, and I am really sad to say this, Barack Obama may have diminished his own Presidency in the process, but more problematically, diminished America's standing in the world among both friend and foe alike, and that's a real tragedy.

□ 1845

You know, in this upcoming vote in Congress, if it's to come at all at this point, it is really not so much a vote on authorizing a military strike or military intervention in Syria. The stakes have grown beyond that. It's much more a vote of confidence on the President's Syrian and broader Middle East policy. On that score, I have no confidence.

And I just wanted to say one last thing. I mentioned I have a very large Syrian population in my community, Syrian Americans. They're great Americans. They've been part of my community for a long time, largely Christian, Antioch Orthodox, Greek Orthodox, Presbyterian and other denominations.

They are scared. I think they know what Bashar Assad is, and many are very uncomfortable with what he is. And on the other hand, they have seen al-Nusra and al Qaeda, and are absolutely terrified of that operation.

And so they're caught in this sectarian crossfire. They don't want to be there. They're worried about atrocities, grievous atrocities being committed against the Christian people of Syria.

We just witnessed the other day, there was a story of a small village, I believe not too far from Damascus, where the language of Aramaic is spoken; I guess one of the few places in the world where it is still spoken.

Why is that significant?

Well, if you're a Christian, you know that Aramaic was the language that Jesus Christ spoke. And to know that this ancient community—and of course much of Syria's an ancient civilization—to know that these people could be under attack when you find out that al-Nusra forces had entered and intervened, and I hope they've been cleared out.

But that said, you think about this, and we worry about the history of mankind and the history of the Christian tradition is at risk here, and potentially a great risk of extermination.

And we've witnessed this in Egypt too. I mean, there are lessons to be learned from Egypt. When Mubarak fell, the Christian population, the Coptic Christian population of Egypt, became very vulnerable. We know that—extremely vulnerable. Atrocities committed against Christians, desecration of the churches, burning, other terrible things have happened, and I fear that we might see similar, if not worse, things happen in Syria.

So whatever this country chooses, whatever course of action this country chooses to pursue, I don't believe that a military intervention right now by the United States would advance America's policy objectives; and frankly, I don't think it would change the trajectory of the Syrian civil war.

People have said, well, doing nothing at all is the worst of all possibilities, the worst of all options. Well, I would argue that if we're not certain what this limited, so-called limited military intervention will bring, if we're very unclear about that, then I would argue that no action is better than a limited action which may not do much of anything to alter the course of this civil war. So I think we have to be very cautious and very restrained.

I do appreciate the gentleman from Nebraska allowing me this opportunity to speak on this issue, and for his leadership, and for allowing me this time.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Let me thank you, as well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my good friend. I've heard you speak behind the scenes in this body, particularly today, with great passion, particularly for the people who are directly impacted by this, people who you represent and are directly connected to the conflict, the ancient Christian community, as you said.

I appreciate your clarity and your resolve on this issue because I know you, as I do, have great respect for the institution of the Presidency. He is our Commander in Chief.

But we also have a responsibility to render to him our judgment in this case; and so my judgment is no, that a unilateral military strike is not going to accomplish an objective of potentially stabilizing, punishing, preventing Assad from doing further harm and stabilizing that situation, versus pulling the United States, as a coalition of one, into a conflict where we are very unclear as to what the collateral damage and destabilization outcome could actually be.

In addition to that, the American people are intuiting that there is a serious, serious problem here with us being drawn into another conflict where the options are all bad, where our hearts are with the innocent victims, and we will continue to provide humanitarian aid.

But we must not allow the international community to simply hide behind our military might; and I think that that is what the people are sensing, that we are being drawn into something that has much broader implications for the entire international community to respond in a constructive, creative way.

And if we would have expended this energy, as I said earlier, on trying to get underneath the problem and perhaps point the finger and lay it at the footsteps of the Russians, who are completely entangled in this situation, maybe we would have had better movement on this question prior to now.

Now, we'll see what the President says tonight. We'll listen with an open mind. I don't know whether he is going to pull back from his intention to potentially strike Syria or not. But I think it is prudent to allow some diplomatic actions to potentially take their course, even though that might be a bit farfetched at the moment.

But, hopefully, that new diplomatic momentum has some good creative elements and stops the situation, pressures Assad, brings about a collective

international response that stabilizes the situation and protects innocent people. I think that's the best outcome that we could potentially hope for here.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. It seems that the policy of the United States and Syria, since the beginning of the uprising in Syria, has largely been one of inaction and detachment. And, in many respects, we outsourced the arming of the opposition forces to many of our good friends: the Turks, the Qataris, the Saudis, and others. And whether we like it or not—and we don't like it in many respects—many of the folks who were armed were people who don't share our interests and values, the al-Nusra forces in particular.

But there are moderate forces, and if the United States had demonstrated some leadership early in this, during that conflict, to help identify moderate secular opposition forces, there probably could have been multi-ethnic again and secular, it could have been Kurdish and Christian and moderate Sunni, that might have helped bring about a more legitimate or a better opposition force that the international community would be rallying around.

But that, unfortunately, has not happened, and now you read about large swaths of territory in Syria dominated by some opposition forces that have been rather radicalized; and that's unfortunate because there are many elements of the Free Syrian Army, of course, who really do want to try to bring about more representative government and, I think, would embrace the values that you and I hold dear.

But, you know, time has passed. Time has passed, and I just don't see a good outcome, as I stated earlier, at this point. And I just wish—I think the American people understand this intuitively.

And it also speaks to NATO. What's happening with NATO?

It's a great organization. I believe in NATO. It's a collective defense organization. I believe in its military value and its political value. But it seems, since the end of the Cold War, maybe it's gone a little bit adrift.

And Turkey has been a loyal friend and NATO ally for decades. They are directly affected by this conflict in Syria. They may make demands of us and NATO at some point, and we're going to have to think that through, as policymakers, what we would do if our good friends, the Turks, make a request of us, and certainly our good friends in Jordan.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Reclaiming my time, it's a good question you raised, and one that I pointed to earlier, new international constructs that might be using templates of old international constructs, but that are revitalized so that we can have collective operations, if necessary, to engage in this type of stopping mass violence.

The NATO allocations for many countries, they don't meet them year after year. In other words, the money they're supposed to contribute, they just don't do it.

So who has to pick up the pieces?

We do. There's a ''free rider problem'' as we call it here. And you deal in a lot of international diplomatic circles and you constantly hear it. Oh, the United States is the only one who has the ability. You're the only superpower. You must act, and it is your—you must be compelled morally, based upon who you are, to do something here.

All of those are fine points. But in the 21st century, you have a shift of the global framework for international stability occurring. We have expended ourselves, as a country, for nearly 70 years, providing that framework for global stability, economically and politically protecting human rights, as I said earlier, not always perfectly.

But the United States cannot single-handedly lift this burden for the entire world, particularly for countries that benefited from our past sacrifice, who have the economic wherewithal, and should have the moral compass to be thinking constructively about regional organizations that stop this type of conflict before it starts and demanding just outcomes of sovereign territories.

That is the long-term strategy. I recognize we're in a difficult moment because we're being pressured to decide unilateral military action or not, but this is the type of long-term thinking that I think will help bring about new models of international, multilateral cooperation to prevent this from happening, or when it does happen, to have the right response in place.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I just want to say one more thing. You know, the President has said that this red line that was crossed was not his red line, but the international community's red line. Ninety-eight percent of the world has opposed chemical weapons use and has agreed to the various conventions on chemical weapons.

Unfortunately, 98 percent of the world isn't prepared to help us in this intervention. We're on our own, and I just wanted to point that out.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Well, our time has expired, and I do thank you for the good constructive conversation. I appreciate your insights and clarity on the situation. It's complex, it's difficult; but, again, unilateral military action allows the international community to hide behind our might, and it's simply not the right response at this time.

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

THE SYRIAN CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Missouri). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. And I appreciate the presentation that's come forward from my colleagues from Pennsylvania and Nebraska with regard to the Syrian situation and the international issue that's in front of all of us.

I don't always find myself in complete agreement with the wisdom that emerges here from this microphone; but, generally speaking, that's where I stand this evening on the Syrian issue.

And I think that it would be of interest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I and a couple of other Members, yesterday morning, perhaps the day before yesterday, in the morning—my days blend together—we sat down with Syrian Christians who were expatriates who had escaped from Syria and are very interested in the cause there. And I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has a good number of constituents that would be representative of the same cause.

It was a very interesting conversation that we had at breakfast day before yesterday at Brussels. And the concern that they expressed essentially came back to it's hard to choose a good side in Syria, in that Assad, of course, he's an evil dictator. We've known that for a long time.

We have the Free Syrian Army that emerged as a force for good that seems to now be taken over by forces that are not so good. So it appears to them, and it appears to me, that whether it would be the Assad forces that prevail in the end, or whether it would be the forces that are taking over the Free Syrian Army, it's not going to be good for Christians in Syria.

And I'm concerned that, for us to find a way forward, the best hope for Christians in Syria is likely to be the moderate groups that began the Free Syrian Army in the first place, those groups that want to have a secular Syria that respects everyone's right to freedom of religion and freedom to associate, and respects the rights of humanity that we all defend here.

So I reiterate the statements that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made. And we stand, certainly, with the Christians in Syria, but also the secular forces in Syria, however they've been marginalized by the forces of the Muslim Brotherhood, the forces that are Assad, and the anti-freedom forces that seem to want to take Syria over and use it for their own evil aims.

So having traveled, Mr. Speaker, over into that part of the world, not into Syria specifically, but into the Middle East—and we just came back last night from a trip that was to Tokyo. We spent several days there dealing with the top leadership in Japan, including Prime Minister Abe,

and then from there to the United Arab Emirates, where we had a meeting set up with a number of officials.

The first meeting was at 11:00 in the morning. We were scheduled to meet with the Crown Prince about 1 or 1:30 in the afternoon. Instead, he gave us a very pleasant surprise and arrived at our 11:00 meeting. And we were able to have a long, engaging conversation, doors closed, which gave us a very good perspective on the Middle East and on Syria.

So I appreciate my colleagues' focus and interest on this, and mine is also focused the same.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for his kind comments about his experiences with various folks who are in Syria.

I just wanted to say one other thing too. This past Sunday I attended a church service at my own church that has a large Syrian community; and a woman made a presentation at the church who represents the Presbyterian Church of Lebanon and Syria, and spoke in my church in very moderate, secular tones about why she thought it was not in anyone's interest for the United States to intervene at this point in the Syrian civil war.

□ 1900

It was a very compelling statement. Then, after that church service, I stopped by another at St. George Antioch Orthodox Church after their services had ended and met with some of the parishioners whose family members are over there, in many cases, and some told me their family members had been killed. And there was a lot of crying and wailing and deep sadness. It's quite emotional for them, as you can well imagine. They feel so strongly that this intervention is only going to make the plight of the Christians that much more dire and difficult in Syria and that it could lead to their ultimate extermination in many cases. This was their term, not mine.

That's how serious this is to them in a country, that I believe, the last I checked, is somewhere between 15 to 20 percent Christian, although the numbers are diminishing, given this turmoil. We've seen that in many Middle Eastern countries. The Christian communities are just not able to endure in this type of environment.

So I appreciate your interest in this issue, Mr. KING, and thank you for allowing me to speak. Keep up the good work.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

I would add that there was some dialogue in that breakfast meeting with the Syrian Christians that took place the day before yesterday, in the morning, about how there was a concerted effort to push and eradicate Christians out of all the areas in the Middle East. That seems to be something that they have embarked upon. And I know that there's a long history of it of over a thousand years. But it's been accelerated here, I believe, Mr. Speaker, within the last few years. In fact, the date of this meeting goes back to 1982 when that began.

We're hearing similar narratives about Christians that are being persecuted by both sides in this. The population percentage in Syria of around 15 to 20 percent fits with what I'm told. I added up the data that they gave me from different sections of the Syrian Christians and my number came to about 2.6 million Syrian Christians.

There are also about 2 million Syrians that are refugees that have left Syria and that are now housed in refugee camps in the surrounding country. There's about 2 million refugees. There are about 2.6 million Christians in or around Syria altogether. I see that as almost the equivalent of the population of the State of Iowa.

So we've watched as Assad has persecuted his people—the people that were not his. Anybody but his political allies were persecuted by him over the years. I remember that he was identified by the Bush administration as, I believe, an evildoer. I remember some communications being opened up with Bashar al-Assad that took place sometime in 2007 or 2008. I remember some pictures that came back from there. This individual now has been identified as head of the regime that has launched chemical weapons against his own people.

The evidence that we see doesn't necessarily confirm that it would be Assad himself that gave the order, but it does appear that there were chemical attacks. It also appears that there were conventional artillery assaults into the same neighborhood that brought about many casualties. To sort out whether they were chemical casualties or whether they were kinetic action casualties is a question that's not been answered yet.

I'm hesitant to get very far into this from a factual standpoint because of what's classified and what isn't, Mr. Speaker. I want to make this point. It doesn't get brought out in this Congress enough, if at all. The forces are lined up on the side of either Sunni or Shia. Of course, the Alawite sect of the Shia is the sect that is Assad himself. And he's supported by them. When you look at his allies—Hezbollah and Iran—they are Shia. If you look at his enemies, generally speaking, his enemies are al Qaeda and the Muslim Brotherhood. There's a list of those Sunni interests that have poured into Syria.

At the beginning, this was a conflict that was formed by the Free Syrian Army that wanted to unseat Assad and establish a government that would be of, by, and for the people of Syria and consistent with American ideals and American principles of a government that's empowered by the will of the people instead of by the will of a dictator or a king.

So as the Free Syrian Army began, their forces were growing and they were strong and they were taking over territory. Since that period of time, we've watched as the sometimes-labeled ''rebel effect'' has diminished. And it's almost been in direct proportion to the influence of the Muslim Brotherhood, al Qaeda, and other radical interests stepping in to take over and pick up some of the resources that are being used to support the opposition to Assad.

As I've watched this and from what I know and from the information that's come to me, continually the Free Syrian Army is more representative of the Muslim Brotherhood than it is of the free Syrian people. And not by a majority of the population of the army itself, but by the leadership, by who commands the resources, by who's being trained. This is now ever more clear that there's not a side that's easy to get on in this conflict and be confident that the forces are the forces of good. In other words, to identify the good guys has gotten ever more difficult month by month. It's more difficult today than it was a month ago or 2 or 3 or 4 or 6 months ago.

But it doesn't mean that there aren't good influences, that there aren't good cores of people that we should be identifying with and that we should be strengthening and empowering. But from my view, anybody that supports al Qaeda or is of al Qaeda is our enemy. Anybody that is Muslim Brotherhood or supports Muslim Brotherhood turns out to be our enemy. The difference between the Muslim Brotherhood and al Qaeda is they both have the same military wing. The Muslim Brotherhood has got a lot broader political approach to this. But in the end, they're looking to establish the Islamic caliphate everywhere in the world they can and establish sharia law everywhere in the world they can. And they don't view individual rights, human rights, or this God-given liberty and freedom here that our Founding Fathers claimed for us here over 200 years ago. They don't have respect for that. They reject it. And their approach is not compatible with human rights.

So we see the sectarian interests in Syria taking over the secular initiates in Syria. I believe that there's an ability—if we can identify the good guys—to empower them, to train them, to fund them, to supply them. But there's a way to bring this around and bring it to a good conclusion. But the people that need to be empowered in Syria are a long way from power. The people that don't need to be in power, whether it's the Muslim Brotherhood side of this and the Sunni radical Islamists or whether it be the Shia interests and Assad, they are competing with each other now for dominance. They fought each other for centuries as well.

There's no good result that can come easy in Syria. There is a good result that could come over a long period of time if our administration identified

the people that we should be allying ourselves with and if they could emerge as the strong force. But while that's going on, we've been offered something from Putin and the Russians that I don't think anyone expected, a little more than 24 hours ago, and that is a way to avoid a military conflict in engaging U.S. forces in Syria.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the mail that I'm getting and the phone calls that I'm getting are almost universally in opposition to going into any kind of military action whatsoever in Syria. Almost universal. All of my calls today were against going into Syria. Almost every call the last week were against going into Syria.

It's not that I make decisions exclusively off of constituent input or American communications input. I have an obligation and I owe my constituents and I owe Iowans and the people in this country my best effort and my best judgment. And that includes the input that comes from them, weighed more heavily than if it were not directly from my constituents. And I owe them my best effort and best judgment—and that is to go out and gather information. I have probably the best access to the broadest amount of information, including myself, among my constituents.

So I owe them my best effort. Part of that is to go and see with my own eyes and get into those parts of the world so that I can be fully informed, because this Congress is being called upon to make decisions that redirect the destiny of the United States of America. We should not do that in an uninformed way. We should not do it in a willfully ignorant way.

There are many things going on in the world that you cannot learn by listening to just briefings here or reading the paper. We should know from long history that you've got to drill into these things. You've got to look the right people in the eye and you've got to verify the information that they give you. I've done that. I've done that over the last week. I kept my powder dry on Syria throughout that period of time because I wanted to gather all the information that I could.

I didn't want to take a public position until I had seen as much as I can with my own eyes and hear as much as I can with my own ears. And even though we've done a trip into Cairo and the United Arab Emirates and the Middle East and we had briefings in countries beyond that and briefings from our State Department, we met with, as I said, Syrian Christians and we also met with refugees from Libya. We met with Special Forces interests and different perspectives on the Middle East entirely and different perspectives on the Syrian operation.

You put that altogether, from the State Department's position on, I came back with stacks of notes on it, Mr. Speaker. But I didn't want to speak on my Syrian position until such time as I had sat through the classified briefing that I knew over a week ago was scheduled for five o'clock yesterday. And that went on from five o'clock until about a quarter to seven last night.

That briefing was useful. The people that were there to brief us were Susan Rice and Director Clapper and Secretary Kerry. We also had Secretary of Defense Hagel and General Martin Dempsey, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Five people of the highest level you could ask for assured the President of the United States. He gave us a briefing with the data that they have and what they know. And they told us what was classified and what wasn't. They told us the conclusions they had drawn and some method about how they arrived at those conclusions.

But my independent assessment doesn't agree with the course of action that seems to be the direction from the President of the United States. It doesn't mean that I disagree with the data that they have, but the conclusion and how to move forward, I do disagree with. And I have taken a position today that if there were a vote on the floor today to authorize military force in Syria, I would not support that. Mr. Speaker, I would vote ''no.''

I want to make it clear that I believe the President has constitutional authority to order action in Syria or anywhere else. The President of the United States has to have that authority to order our military into action in an instant. Our Continental Congress was not very functional when it came to fighting a war by consensus. When they finally got through the Revolutionary War and put a country together and built a Constitution that could be ratified by the majority of the States—the 13 original colonies—they concluded that we needed to have a President of the United States who was also the Commander in Chief of the United States military who was in full control of the military. And subsequent to that, there was a piece of legislation passed within the 20th century that was the War Powers Act that was designed to restrain the activities of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

Those two conditions were, one, the constitutional authority of the Commander in Chief to order our military into battle in an instant without consulting Congress. And the other, the War Powers Act, requires the President to come back after a period of time and consult with Congress. Those two, the Constitution and the War Powers Act, are compatible as long as they are respected by the Congress and by the President of the United States.

Anytime we're engaged in a long military engagement, I think the President should come consult with Congress. If it's a short operation and it's over before it can be consulted, that's consistent with the Constitution.

I would point out when President Reagan ordered our military into Grenada, that was an operation that took place quickly. He came before the American people and let us know after it was launched that he had ordered military action in Grenada. It was a successful operation, and we pulled out of there when the objective was achieved. That was Ronald Reagan.

When George Herbert Walker Bush—Bush 41—ordered our military into action in Panama to put an end to dictator and drug smuggler Noriega, that order was issued and our military took to the field. And as that operation was unfolding, then we found out about the order of our Commander in Chief.

This operation that's proposed in Syria is an operation that the President of the United States has the authority to order. He has the constitutional authority to do so. And if he had identified targets in Syria, and was determined that was the right course for America, the President should have then issued the order to engage our military in the fashion that his best judgment said he should.

□ 1915

But what has happened instead is there has been a vacillation that has taken place. He has sought to sell this to the American people while the message and the warning is going out to Assad. The red line that was drawn in the sand back during the Presidential campaign, it appears that the administration thinks that line has been crossed multiple times. And if you cross a red line in the sand enough times, it gets pretty blurry after awhile. Now they've decided that August 21 was the bright red line that was crossed by Assad. And here we are on the eve of the anniversary of the Benghazi attack—tomorrow is September 11—and on the anniversary of course of the September 11, 2001, attack; now we're negotiating with Congress to get support to go into military action in Syria.

My position, Mr. Speaker, is if the President thought it was a good idea, in a very limited way, as Secretary of State Kerry said, he should have done that. He should have issued the order, gotten it over with. If they're right and it's a very narrow operation, he could have pulled back and we would be done by now. But he watched as David Cameron and the United Kingdom took the issue before the British Parliament. The British Parliament voted down the initiative to strike Syria over the chemical weapons, and that put the brakes on the United Kingdom supporting us or any other entity in an operation in Syria. I think when the President saw that, maybe he concluded, Well, I'll ask Congress. If Congress says no, then I'll have this responsibility, this cup taken from him, so to speak—the one that he asked for when he put out the red line statement during the campaign in a debate with Mitt Romney.

So we're now in this situation where we've had a protracted national and

global debate. And each stop around the world where we have gone into—into Tokyo, into the UAE, into Cairo, into Brussels—and met with multiple entities along the way, Syria is the discussion matter. But they look to the United States to lead.

Some of the countries don't think it's a very good idea to go in there, but they say they will support us anyway because they want America to succeed. They understand that if we're not strong in the world, if we don't lead in the world, then this becomes a very precarious place.

I had it expressed to me a number of times: We don't think it's a very good idea, but if you do this, we'll support you; or, We think it's a bad idea; we have to support you anyway. But I didn't find anybody that said that they were really happy about the idea that America might strike someplace inside Syria to send a message to Assad. Some said don't pave the road to Damascus for the Muslim Brotherhood, that the devil we know may not be as bad as the devil we don't know. And we're starting to learn that.

So as this has unfolded—and I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I believe it was, mention NATO and a NATO operation. We aren't going to have the support of NATO in an operation in Syria. NATO operates off of a consensus. The 28 nations or so that are NATO now have a lot of trouble getting to a consensus. If some of those countries decide they don't want to participate, they will just simply not commit their forces. In the end, it comes down to what will the U.S. do, what won't the U.S. do.

We're not going to have the support of the United Nations. There has already been that effort to bring it before the United Nations, and we've got opposition from Russia and opposition from China. Now, maybe they would reconsider. Maybe China would reconsider; maybe Russia would reconsider. But the United Nations is not going to be there behind us, Mr. Speaker. NATO is not going to be there behind us. We will have perhaps a coalition—not of the willing, but a coalition of the unwilling, those unwilling to allow the United States to, let's say, be embarrassed by this policy.

So the best course forward appears to be the lifeline that was tossed to us within the last 24 hours by Putin from Russia. He said, Let's take you up on your offer, Secretary Kerry, and see if we can gather up these chemical weapons and eradicate them from Syria. If doing so will prevent a military strike, then let's give it a go. That's a British expression, by the way, Mr. Speaker, ''give it a go.''

Well, I'm for giving it a go. I think that is the best alternative we have. I think the military strike is a mistake because it runs the risk of paving the road to Damascus for Muslim Brotherhood and other radical Islamist entities that are part of that constellation that have been systematically marginalizing the true free Syrian Army and empowering themselves, and some of them with resources that we would see as sourced back to the U.S. taxpayers.

Well, the best course forward now is to work with the Russians and see if we can get the chemical weapons gathered together. I would want Americans involved in any kind of a mission to gather those chemical weapons. I think the United Nations showed an ability to go into Iraq before 2003 and do the nuclear inspection that was there. I was uneasy with their conclusions—in fact, I didn't agree with their conclusions, but they're the force on the planet that has an opportunity to have the global credibility. If they get to that point where they say we've got all these weapons picked up, or they will qualify their answer, that's the kind of thing that should be going on, Mr. Speaker. But in any case, any kind of inspection team, any kind of chemical weapon collection team, under the auspices perhaps of the United Nations so that it isn't directly under, say, Russia or the United States, but with Americans there on the ground to verify the actions that are taking place and give us a sense of credibility and confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that it won't work to go there and just get the job done to eradicate the chemical weapons. We must do so in a way that has credibility so that especially the American people will accept a conclusion and we can perhaps move on. But picking up chemical weapons and gathering up that entire inventory, which is tons and tons of that inventory, if it's done so in a precision way, perhaps doesn't change the balance of the regime versus the forces for good and those evil forces that align themselves with the forces for good, perhaps doesn't change that balance, or changes it in a more minimal way than a military strike would, and it would send the message that we will put an end to the abuse of chemical weapons.

It is also curious to me, Mr. Speaker, that this level of concern and outrage didn't seem to exist when chemical weapons were being used between Iraq and Iran during the Iraq and Iran war in the eighties. It doesn't mean it's all right. I think it's a good position to take against the abuse and the use of chemical weapons, but the red line itself, as far as a reason for America to put ourselves into a military conflict in a nation that we don't have much strategic interest in is, I think, a mistake and I would oppose that. We should remember, again, who are the forces there, the messages they send to the world.

What have we seen happen in the Arab Spring? An Arab Spring that has emerged now—we are a couple years into that. It looks to me like the forces that have emerged on top have invariably been the Muslim Brotherhood. So it isn't always good to see a change within a regime or administration.

We saw President Carter support the return of the Shah in Iran and support ousting the current power, the power that was in Iran and put the Shah in, thinking that there would be a representation that was a religious movement—excuse me, the opposition to the Shah in Iran. In any case, the Ayatollah was viewed by President Carter as being a religious movement that was a voice for the people. What we ended up with the Ayatollah instead of the Shah was the beginnings of radical Islam within Iran, and the flow that came from 1979 until today might have been different had we taken a different position in Iran. Where we had friends in Iran, now we have enemies in Iran. As we have developed friends in Iraq, we are watching that friendship diminish. As we developed the foundational support in Afghanistan, we are watching that diminish.

As we see, we have strong friends and a military alliance with Egypt. We supported Mubarak and he was our friend. We built military operations going on in the Sinai Desert. That took place with—a good number of Iowans served there and people from probably every State served in the Sinai in operations with the Egyptians. Then Mubarak was essentially pushed out. And the message that came from our administration was he needs to leave yesterday. Well, the Morsi forces were able to push Mubarak out. They held one election. 5.8 million of the 83 million Egyptians voted for Morsi. Morsi came in as an incompetent Muslim Brotherhood, and the Muslim Brotherhood came out of that on top again like every other situation in the Arab Spring that has unfolded in the last couple of years, Mr. Speaker.

Now the best break we've seen in Egypt is that 30 to 33 million Egyptians took to the streets. Their peak day was the 3rd of July. They took their country back; and, yes, they had the support of the military. And some call it a coup, but there is no constitutional provision for them to impeach the incompetent Morsi. The Egyptian people had had enough. You can't mobilize that kind of support unless there are many good reasons—the economic shambles that they allowed to take place and the injustices that were taking place under the Morsi regime.

So now we have a new leadership that has taken hold in Egypt. I have met with the interim President of Egypt, President Mansour. He makes it clear he is the interim President, that they are going to hand the country of Egypt over to an elective representative government. They're going to pass a constitution that they're busy writing now. And the military will let go of their control over the country and submit to the civilian leadership that emerges in a constitutional fashion. They have laid out a timetable and a roadmap, Mr. Speaker. So this is the best future that Egypt can hope for.

Morsi was a mistake. He is Muslim Brotherhood. These forces are anti-

Muslim Brotherhood. They are pro-Egyptian people. I'm supporting the forces that are in place in Egypt now, and I would, face to face, encourage them, move forward with the timetable that you have. It appears to be aggressive and it has some risk. But writing a constitution, ratifying a constitution, having elections and establishing a civilian government in Egypt and then handing the control of the military over to that civilian government is the right thing to do. It sets the right destiny for Egypt. And I think that the United States needs to do a 180 on the support of the people that are now in charge in Egypt.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, your attention and an opportunity to address you here this evening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 11, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2771. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's fiscal year 2012 report on the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2772. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Qantas Airways Limited of Mascot, Australia, pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2773. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendment to Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2013-0513; FRL-9845-9] received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2774. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Disapproval of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Arizona; Regional Haze and Interstate Transport Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0904; FRL-9846-5] received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2775. 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 Wyoming; Revised General Conformity Requirements and an Associated Revision [EPA-R08-OAR-2013-0059; FRL-9846-8] received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2776. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Emamectin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0405; FRL-9395-6] received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2777. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Imazapic; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0384; FRL-9394-8] received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2778. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0394; FRL-9845-5] received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2779. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0546; FRL-9834-5] (RIN: 2060-AR43) received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2780. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Procedural Regulations Governing Transportation by Intrastate Pipelines [Docket No.: RM12-17-000; Order No. 781) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2781. A letter from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting the June 2013 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2782. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2783. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-067, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2784. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2785. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2786. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2787. A letter from the Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2013 Annual Performance Plan, in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2788. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2789. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Kamchatka Flounder in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC750) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2790. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries in the Western Pacific; Fishing in the Marianas Trench, Pacific Remote Islands, and Rose Atoll Marine National Monuments [Docket No.: 110819515-3563-03] (RIN: 0648-BA98) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2791. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Dusky Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC741) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2792. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish and Dusky Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC756) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2793. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trip Limit Adjustment for the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 120109034-2171-01] (RIN: 0648-XC737) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2794. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC740) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2795. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Gulf of Mexico Aggregated Large Coastal Shark and Gulf of Mexico Hammerhead Shark Management Groups [Docket No.: 120706221-2705-02] (RIN:

0648-XC748) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2796. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting Activities of the Review Panel on Prison Rape in Calendar Year 2012 and the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Data Collection Activities for 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2797. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties for the second quarter of fiscal year 2013 (January 1, 2013 — March 31, 2013); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2798. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties for the first quarter of fiscal year 2013 (October 1, 2012 — December 31, 2012); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2799. A letter from the Staff Director, Sentencing Commission, transmitting report on the compliance of the federal district courts with documentation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2800. A letter from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting the June 2013 Report to Congress: Medicare and the Health Care Delivery System; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 130. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the state of Wyoming (Rept. 113–190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 304. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the state of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 157. An act to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 459. An act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. 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 (Rept. 113–194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2388. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take certain Federal lands located in El Dorado County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 113–195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2337. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado (Rept. 113–196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1964. A bill to amend the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, including at least one lease sale in the Reserve each year in the period 2013 through 2023, and for other purposes. (Rept. 113–197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1684. A bill to convey certain property to the State of Wyoming to consolidate the historic Ranch A, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1394. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish goals for an all-of-the-above energy production plan strategy on a 4-year basis on all onshore Federal lands managed by the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service (Rept. 113–199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 255. A bill to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 555. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct onshore oil and gas lease sales through Internet-based live lease sales, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1818. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow importation of polar bear trophies taken in sports hunts in Canada before the date the polar bear was determined to be a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Rept. 113–202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 740. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 113–203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 553. A bill to designate the exclusive economic zone of the United States as the ''Ronald Wilson Reagan Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States'' (Rept. 113–204). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. 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; with an amendment (Rept. 113–205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 339. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provisions of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–206). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3073. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require that supplemental nutrition assistance benefits be used to purchase only supplemental foods that are eligible for purchase under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (commonly known as the WIC program); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINCHER (for himself and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 3074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to notify the taxpayer each time the taxpayer's information is accessed by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3075. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of designating the study area as the Black Metropolis National Heritage Area in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. YOHO, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. COTTON):

H.R. 3076. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act with respect to health insurance coverage for certain congressional staff and political appointees in the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 3077. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit certain Medicare providers licensed in a State to provide telemedicine services to certain Medicare beneficiaries in a different State; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 3078. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to disregard amounts transferred from a traditional IRA to a Roth IRA in computing income for purposes of determining the income-related premiums under parts B and D of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition

to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 59. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 338. A resolution recognizing the National Hellenic Museum in Chicago, Illinois, and the contributions of Hellenism to the United States and celebrating Greek and American democracy; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H. Res. 340. A resolution expressing the support of Congress for National Telephone Discount Lifeline Awareness Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona introduced a bill (H.R. 3079) for the relief of Jesus Garcia Flores; which was referred 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 Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3073.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3074.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3075.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;''

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 Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 3076.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 3

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 3077.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 3078.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona:

H.R. 3079.

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

Article I, section 8, clause 4

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky

H.J. Res. 59.

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

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 12: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 148: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 207: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 259: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 288: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 335: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 411: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 436: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 450: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 460: Mr. BACHUS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 495: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 526: Ms. MOORE and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 565: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 574: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 594: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 596: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 611: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 616: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 679: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 683: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 685: Mr. WELCH, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 688: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 695: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 712: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 792: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 794: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JONES, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 813: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 820: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 847: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 855: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 858: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 911: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 920: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 928: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1014: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 1019: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1037: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1089: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 1091: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1102: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1146: Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1154: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1175: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1201: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1209: KUSTER, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1250: TIPTON.
H.R. 1276: KILDEE.
H.R. 1313: CICILLINE.
H.R. 1339: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1346: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1354: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1385: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1386: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1396: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1428: Mr. RADEL, Mr. MORAN and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 1526: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1551: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 1587: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1588: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1616: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1666: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1692: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1701: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1726: Mr. COLE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1729: Mr. CASTRO of Texas and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1750: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1756: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1779: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 1795: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MASSIE and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1796: Mr. MORAN and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1801: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1809: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1812: Mr. YOHO and Mr. REED.
H.R. 1814: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 1845: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1851: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1861: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 1875: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1905: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BARBER, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1907: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1920: Mr. CARDENAS and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1921: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1940: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1980: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1992: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2003: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2020: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 2027: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 2028: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2056: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2066: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 2084: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2088: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2108: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2110: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2111: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2134: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LANCE, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COLE, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2189: Mr. TURNER, Mr, MCINTYRE, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2194: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2288: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2313: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2315: Mr. NUNES, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2338: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2343: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2355: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2426: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2453: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2482: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2483: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2506: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 2510: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2554: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2578: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2615: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2619: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2633: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2637: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 2646: Mr. FARR and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 2654: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2663: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2686: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2691: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2702: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MORAN, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2705: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2715: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2725: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2726: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2728: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2737: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2744: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2750: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2765: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2773: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2775: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2783: Mr. HARPER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 2785: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2788: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2801: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 2807: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2823: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2825: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2839: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2845: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2854: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 2904: Mr. TIERNEY.
H R. 2905: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2909: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BASS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2918: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2936: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2962: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VELA, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2983: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3005: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3026: Mr. POSEY and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 3027: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3036: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3040: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 3045: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 3050: Mr. KIND and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.J. Res. 44: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.J. Res. 47: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. DAINES.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. DUFFY.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. COOK, Mr. BARR, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MESSER, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H. Res. 36: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. HUDSON.
H. Res. 101: Mr. DOYLE.
H. Res. 112: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H. Res. 227: Mr. MEEHAN.
H. Res. 254: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 319: Mr. ENYART, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 331: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. MCGOVERN.

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. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 2019: Mr. MORAN.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2013 No. 118

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the fountain of every blessing, tune our hearts to pray with power. Bless today the work of our lawmakers, empowering them to accomplish Your purposes on Earth, guided by Your wisdom and courage. Lord, inspire them to act justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with You as You give them the gifts of increasing awareness and openness of heart. Teach them to bring harmony from discord and hope from despair.

We pray in Your eternal Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

AUTHORIZING THE LIMITED AND SPECIFIED USE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AGAINST SYRIA—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 166, S.J. Res. 21.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 21 to authorize the limited and specified use of the United States Armed Forces against Syria.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my and Senator MCCONNELL's remarks, there will be a period of morning business until 11 a.m. this morning. At 11 a.m. we will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to the Syria resolution. The time until noon will be divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. The Senate will recess from noon until 2:15 p.m. to allow for our caucus meetings.

The leader and I have talked this morning—and prior to this morning—with regard to the energy efficiency bill. We automatically go to that bill at 11 a.m. We are trying to work out a way we can go to that bill. Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN have worked for more than a year to come up with a bill. We have not done an energy bill in a long time, so there is a desire on both sides to move forward on this.

Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN have bipartisan amendments they want to offer to their bill, and I have expressed to the Republican leader that we need to move to that when we finish the Syria issue. I would like permission to move to that bill at the appropriate time. Once we get on the bill and we get the CR from the House, for example, I told the Republican leader—and everyone who wants to hear—that we don't have to finish the energy efficiency bill all at one time. We want to have an amendment process, and we will do that. I don't want to file cloture on the motion to proceed again, so we have instructed our staffs to try to come up with something before 11 a.m. that we can agree on.

I repeat. There will be amendments offered, and we will have adequate time to work on this. We may not be able to do it all at one time, but we will do it and finish this legislation.

SYRIA

Mr. President, we are engaged in a very important debate. The Syria debate is one that cannot be taken lightly, and I don't believe anyone has taken it lightly. The discussion and bipartisan resolution under consideration is simply too important to be rushed through the Senate or given short shrift. So it is right and proper that the President be given an opportunity to meet with Senators from both parties, as he will today. He will meet with us at 12:30 p.m. When he finishes with us, it is my understanding he will report to Senator MCCONNELL's conference.

In addition to that, he is going to address the Nation tonight. He is going to speak directly to the American people about the potential for limited military action to Syria. He will do that at 9 p.m. tonight.

As I said last night, it is appropriate to allow other conversations to go on. We now have—as a result of some work done by other countries—France, Russia, and we understand Syria is involved in this as well. This is aimed at avoiding military action. We will have to see if this works out.

It is very important to understand that the only reason Russia is seeking an alternative to military action is that President Obama has made it plain and clear that the United States will act, if we must. Our credible threat of force has made these diplomatic discussions with Syria possible, and the United States should not withdraw from the direction we are taking as a country.

If there is a realistic chance—and I certainly hope there is—to secure Syria's chemical weapons without further atrocities of the Asad regime, we should not turn our backs on that chance. But for such a solution to be plausible, the Asad regime must act quickly and prove that their offer is real and not merely a ploy to delay military action or action by the body of the Senate.

Any agreement must also assure that chemical weapons in the hands of Syria can be secured and done in an open process, even in the midst of this ongoing war we have in Syria. Any agreement must ensure that Syria is unable to transfer its dangerous chemical

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

weapons to the hands of terrorists in that area. Such an attempt would be met with a rapid and robust response from the United States.

I am pleased the administration is considering this offer. I am pleased other countries are involved in addition to Russia. It is my understanding that France is heavily involved, as of a few hours ago, and I think that is the right direction at this time. We will move forward but under the general criteria I have suggested and outlined.

The Senate should give these international discussions time to play out but not unlimited time. That is why, although there is support to move forward and debate this bipartisan resolution reported by Senators MENENDEZ and CORKER—they did a terrific job for the committee last week—I didn't rush to file cloture, as I indicated last night, on the motion to proceed. We don't need to prove how quickly we can do this but how well we can do this.

The Syrian regime should fully understand that the United States is watching very closely. The Asad regime should be warned our country will not tolerate this breach of human decency and long-held international consensus against the use of chemical weapons.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1392

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order with respect to S. 1392, which is the energy efficiency legislation, be modified so that the motion to proceed be agreed to at a time to be determined by me with the concurrence of the Republican leader—not consultation with him but concurrence with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

SYRIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, first, I would like to welcome the President to the Capitol today. Members on both sides of the aisle are eager to hear from him and to share their own thoughts. We look forward to a spirited and constructive exchange.

It is often said that of all the questions we face as lawmakers, none is more serious or indeed more difficult than the question of whether to commit ourselves to military action. That is why it is so important for us to have this debate, to lay out the arguments for and against military action in Syria, to let the public know where we stand on this issue and why.

If debates such as this are always challenging, in some ways this one has been even more difficult, not because of some political calculus—though cynics will always suspect that—no, this debate has been made more difficult because even those of us who truly want to support the Commander in Chief have struggled to understand the purpose of the mission.

Over the past several days I have spoken with a lot of people—a lot of Kentuckians—and most of them are not exactly clear about the mission or shy about saying so. What I have told them is that I understand their concerns, and I share them. I also appreciate the war weariness out there, but then I tell them there are other potential concerns we cannot ignore either. Chief among them is the fact that the credibility of the Commander in Chief matters, and related to that is the fact that we cannot afford, as a country, to withdraw from the world stage. So no one should be faulted for being skeptical about this proposal, regardless of what party they are in, or for being dumbfounded—literally dumbfounded—at the ham-handed manner in which the White House announced it.

There is absolutely no reason to signal to the enemy when, how, and for how long we plan to strike them—none. As I have said before, we don't send out a save-the-date card to the enemy. Yet there are other important considerations to keep in mind as well that go beyond the wisdom or the marketing of the proposal.

I have spent a lot of time weighing all of these things. I thought a lot about America's obligations and the irreplaceable role I have always believed, and still believe, America plays in the world. I have also thought a lot about the context, about this President's vision and his record and what it says about whether we should be confident in his ability to bring about a favorable outcome in Syria because how we got to this point says a lot about where we may be headed. That is why, before announcing my vote, I think it is important to look back at some of the President's other decisions on matters of foreign policy and national security and then turn back to what he is proposing now in Syria because, in the end, these things simply cannot be separated.

It is not exactly a State secret that I am no fan of this President's foreign policy. On the deepest level I think it comes down to a fundamentally different view of America's role in the world. Unlike the President, I have always been a firm and unapologetic believer in the idea that America isn't just another Nation among many; that we are, indeed, exceptional. As I have said, I believe we have a duty as a superpower, without imperialistic aims, to help maintain an international order and balance of power that we and other allies have worked very hard to achieve over the years.

The President, on the other hand, has always been a very reluctant Commander in Chief. We saw that in the rhetoric of his famous Cairo speech and in speeches he gave in other foreign capitals in the early days of his administration. The tone, and the policies that followed, were meant to project a humbler, more withdrawn America. Frankly, I am hard pressed to see any good that came from any of that.

Any list would have to start with the arbitrary deadlines for military withdrawal and the triumphant declaration that Guantanamo would be closed within a year, without any plan of what to do with its detainees. There were the executive orders that ended the CIA's detention and interrogation programs.

We all saw the so-called ''reset'' with Russia and how the President's stated commitment to a world without nuclear weapons led him to hastily sign an arms treaty with Russia that did nothing to substantially reduce its nuclear stockpile or its tactical nuclear weapons. We saw the President announce a strategic pivot to the Asia-Pacific region, without any real plan to fund it, and an effort to end the capture, interrogation, and detention of terrorists, as well as the return of the old idea that terrorism should be treated as a law enforcement matter. After a decade-long counterinsurgency in Afghanistan, we have seen the President's failure to invest in the kind of strategic modernization that is needed to make this pivot to Asia meaningful. Specifically, his failure to make the kind of investments that are needed to maintain our dominance in the Asia-Pacific theater in the kind of naval, air, and Marine Corps forces that we will need in the years ahead could have tragic consequences down the road.

His domestic agenda has also obviously had serious implications for our global standing. While borrowing trillions and wasting taxpayer dollars here at home, the President has imposed a policy of austerity at the Pentagon that threatens to undermine our stabilizing presence around the globe. Of course, we have seen how eager the President is to declare an end to the war on terror. Unfortunately, the world hasn't cooperated. It hasn't cooperated with the President's vision or his hopes. Far from responding favorably to this gentler approach, it has become arguably more dangerous. We have learned the hard way that being nice to our enemies doesn't make them like us or clear a path to peace.

I understand the President ran for office on an antiwar platform, that his rise to political power was marked by his determination to get us out of Afghanistan and Iraq, and to declare an end to the war on terror. I know he would rather focus on his domestic agenda. But the ongoing threat from Al Qaeda and its affiliates and the turmoil unleashed by uprisings in north Africa and the broader Middle East, not to mention the rise of Chinese military power, make it clear to me, at least, that this is not the time for America to shrink from the world stage.

The world is a dangerous place. In the wake of the Arab spring, large parts of the Sinai, of Libya, of Syria, are now basically ungoverned. We have seen prison breaks in Iraq, Pakistan, Libya, and the release of hundreds of prisoners in Egypt. Terrorists have also escaped from prisons in Yemen, a

country that is no more ready to detain the terrorists at Guantanamo now than they were back in 2009. And the flow of foreign fighters into Syria suggests that the civil war there will last for years, regardless of whether Asad is still in power.

Yes, the President deserves praise for weakening Al Qaeda's senior leadership. But the threat we face from Al Qaeda affiliates is very real. These terrorists are adaptable. They are versatile, lethal, resilient, and they aren't going away. Pockets of these terrorists extend from north Africa to the Persian Gulf and it is time he faced up to it.

It is time to face up to something else as well: International order is not maintained by some global police force which only exists in a liberal fantasy. International order is maintained—its backbone is American military might, which brings me back to Syria.

For 2 years now Syria has been mired in a ferocious civil war with more than 100,000 killed with conventional arms. That is according to U.N. estimates. This tragic situation has prompted many to look to the United States for help. So 1 year ago President Obama made a declaration: If Asad used or started moving chemical weapons, he would do something about it.

Well, as we all know, on August 21 of this year, that redline was crossed. The President's delayed response was to call for a show of force for targeted, limited strikes against the regime. We have been told the purpose of these strikes is to deter and degrade Asad's regime's ability to use chemical weapons. So let's take a closer look at these aims.

First, no one disputes that the atrocities committed in Syria in recent weeks are unspeakable. No one disputes that those responsible for these crimes against the innocent should be held to account. We were absolutely right, of course, to condemn these crimes. But let's be very clear about something: These attacks, monstrous as they are, were not a direct attack against the United States or one of its treaty allies. And just so there is no confusion, let me assure everyone that if a weapon of mass destruction were used against the United States or one of our allies, Congress would react immediately with an authorization for the use of force in support of an overwhelming response. I would introduce the resolution myself. So no leader in North Korea or Iran or any other enemy of the United States should take any solace if the United States were not to respond to these attacks with an action against Syria. We will never—never—tolerate the use of chemical weapons against the United States or any of its treaty allies.

Second, in the course of administration hearings and briefings over the past several days, Secretary of State Kerry has revealed that Asad has used chemical weapons repeatedly—repeatedly—over the last year. So there is a further question here about why the administration didn't respond on those occasions.

Third, Asad, as I have indicated, has killed tens of thousands of people with conventional weapons. Is there any reason to believe he won't continue if the President's strikes are as limited as we are told they would be?

Fourth, what if, in degrading Asad's control of those weapons, we make it easier for other extremist elements such as those associated with the al-Nusra Front and Al Qaeda to actually get hold of them themselves or what if, by weakening the Syrian military, we end up tilting the military balance toward a fractured opposition that is in no position to govern or control anything right now?

I think the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, put this particular best when he recently suggested in a letter to Congress that the issue here isn't about choosing between two sides in Syria, it is about choosing one among many sides; and that, in his estimation, even if we were to choose sides, the side we chose wouldn't be in a position to promote their own interests or ours. That is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs.

Then there is the question of how Asad himself will react to U.S. action in Syria. If Asad views an air campaign as preparation for regime change, then he may lose all constraint in the use of his arsenal, chemical or otherwise, and lose any incentive whatsoever to move to the negotiating table. It is very clear that the unintended consequences of this strike could very well be a new cycle of escalation, which then drags us into a larger war that we are all seeking to avoid. Some have even suggested that the humanitarian crisis surrounding the Syrian civil war could actually be made worse as a result of even targeted U.S. strikes.

In the end, then, the President's proposal seems fundamentally flawed since, if it is too narrow, it may not deter Asad's further use of chemical weapons. But if it is too broad, it risks jeopardizing the security of these same stockpiles, potentially putting them into the hands of extremists.

That is why I think we are compelled in this case to apply a more traditional standard on whether to proceed with a use of force, one that asks a simple question: Does Asad's use of chemical weapons pose a threat to the vital national security interests of the United States? And the answer to that question is fairly obvious; even the President himself says it doesn't.

One could argue, as I have suggested, that there is an important national security concern at play, that we have a very strong interest in preserving the credibility of our Commander in Chief, regardless of the party in power, and in giving him the political support that reinforces that credibility. This is an issue I take very seriously. It is the main reason I have wanted to take my time in making a final decision. But, ultimately, I have concluded that being credible on Syria requires presenting a credible response and having a credible strategy. For all of the reasons I have indicated, this proposal doesn't pass muster.

Indeed, if, through this limited strike, the President's credibility is not restored because Asad uses chemical weapons again, what then? And new targets aimed at toppling the regime which end up jeopardizing control of these same chemical weapons stashes—allowing them to fall into the hands of Al Qaeda and others intent on using them against the United States or our allies. Where would the cycle of escalation end?

Last night we learned about a Russian diplomatic gambit to forestall U.S. military action through a proposal to secure and eventually destroy the Syrian chemical weapons stockpile. This morning there are initial reports that suggest Syria is supportive of them. Let me remind everyone that even if this is agreed to, it is a still a long way off to reaching an agreement at the United Nations, to Syria gaining entry to the chemical weapons convention, and to eventually securing and destroying the stockpile. As we have seen in my own State of Kentucky where we have been working for 30 years to finally destroy a stockpile of chemical weapons, destroying chemical weapons is extremely challenging and requires a great deal of attention to detail and safety. Nonetheless, this proposal is obviously worth exploring.

But, more broadly—and this is my larger point—this one punitive strike we are debating could not make up for the President's performance over the last 5 years. The only way—the only way—for him to achieve the credibility he seeks is by embracing the kind of serious, integrated, national security plan that matches strategy to resources, capabilities to commitments, and which shows our allies around the world that the United States is fully engaged and ready to act at a moment's notice in all the major areas of concern around the globe, whether it is the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, or in the South China Sea, and, just as importantly, that he is willing to invest in that strategy for the long term.

In Syria, a limited strike would not resolve the civil war there, nor will it remove Asad from power. There appears to be no broader strategy to train, advise, and assist a vetted opposition group on a meaningful scale, as we did during the Cold War. What is needed in Syria is what is needed almost everywhere else in the world from America right now: a clear strategy and a President determined to carry it out.

When it comes to Syria, our partners in the Middle East—countries such as Turkey, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Israel—all of them face real consequences from instability, refugee

flows, and the growth of terrorist networks. Responding to this crisis requires a regional strategy and leadership. What we have gotten instead is an administration that seems more interested in telling us what the mission is not—more interested in telling us what the mission is not—rather than what it is. We have gotten the same timid, reluctant leadership that I have seen from the President for nearly 5 years.

As I have said, this decision was not easy. When the President of the United States asks you to take a question like this seriously, you do so. Because just as our credibility in Syria is tied up with our credibility in places such as Iran and North Korea, so too is the credibility of the Commander in Chief tied up, to a large extent, with America's credibility in general. There is no doubt about that. So let me repeat: I will stand shoulder to shoulder with this President or any other in any case where our vital national security interests are threatened, our treaty allies are attacked, or we face an imminent threat.

As for Israel, very few people, if anyone, expect that Syria would test its readiness to respond on its own, which just goes to show you the importance of credibility on the world stage. As Prime Minister Netanyahu put it last week, the enemies of Israel have very good reason not to test its might. But the Prime Minister should know nonetheless that America stands with him.

I have never been an isolationist, and a vote against this resolution should not be confused by anyone as a turn in that direction. But just as the most committed isolationist could be convinced of the need for intervention under the right circumstances when confronted with a threat, so too do the internationalists among us believe that all interventions are not created equal. And this proposal just does not stand up.

So I will be voting against this resolution. A vital national security risk is clearly not at play, there are too many unanswered questions about our long-term strategy in Syria, including the fact that this proposal is utterly detached from a wider strategy to end the civil war there, and on the specific question of deterring the use of chemical weapons, the President's proposal appears to be based actually on a contradiction: either we will strike targets that threaten the stability of the regime—something the President says he does not intend to do—or we will execute a strike so narrow as to be a mere demonstration.

It is not enough, as General Dempsey has noted, to simply alter the balance of military power without carefully considering what is needed to preserve a functioning state after the fact. We cannot ignore the unintended consequences of our actions.

But we also cannot ignore our broader obligations in the world. I firmly believe the international system that was constructed on the ashes of World War II rests upon the stability provided by the American military, and by our commitments to our allies. It is a necessary role that only we can continue to fulfill in the decades to come. And especially in times like this, the United States cannot afford to withdraw from the world stage. My record reflects that belief and that commitment regardless of which party has controlled the White House. We either choose to be dominant in the world or we resign ourselves and our allies to the mercy of our enemies. We either defend our freedoms and our civilization or it crumbles.

So as we shift our military focus to the Asia Pacific, we cannot ignore our commitments to the Middle East, to stability in the Persian Gulf, to an enduring presence in Afghanistan, to hunting down the terrorists who would threaten the United States and its people. And when the Commander in Chief sets his mind to action, the world should think he believes in it. When the Commander in Chief sets his mind to an action, the world should think he believes in it. Frankly, the President did not exactly inspire confidence when he distanced himself from his own redlines in Stockholm last week.

It is long past time the President drops the pose of the reluctant warrior and lead. You cannot build an effective foreign policy on the vilification of your predecessor alone. At some point, you have to take responsibility for your own actions and see the world the way it is, not the way you would like it to be.

If you wish to engage countries that have been hostile, so be it. But be a realist, know the limits of rhetoric, and prepare for the worst.

For too long this President has put his faith in the power of his own rhetoric to change the minds of America's enemies. For too long he has been more interested in showing the world that America is somehow different now than it has been in the past; it is humbler; it is not interested in meddling in the affairs of others or in shaping events.

But in his eagerness to turn the page, he has blinded himself to worrisome trends and developments from Tunisia to Damascus to Tehran and in countless places in between.

A year ago this month four Americans were senselessly murdered on sovereign U.S. territory in Benghazi. Last month the President ordered the closing of more than two dozen diplomatic posts stretching from west Africa to the Bay of Bengal. As I have indicated, and as the decision to close these embassies clearly shows, the terrorist threat continues to be real. Expressions of anti-Americanism are rampant throughout Africa and the Middle East, even more so perhaps than when the President first took office.

So the President's new approach has clearly come with a cost. And for the sake of our own security and that of our allies, it is time he recognized it. Because if America does not meet its international commitments, who will? That is one question that those on the left who are comfortable with a weakened America cannot answer, because the answer is too frightening. No one will. That is the answer.

If this episode has shown us anything, it is that the time has come for the President to finally acknowledge that there is no substitute for American might. It is time for America to lead again, this time from the front. But we need strategic vision, in the Middle East and in many other places around the world, to do it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, and with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Illinois.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened carefully to the statement made by the Republican Senate leader. He is a member of the loyal opposition and it is no surprise that he is critical of the policies of President Barack Obama. That is the nature of the debate, the American debate, which takes place on the floor of this Chamber on a regular basis. But in fairness to this President, there are some things that were not mentioned.

This President, under his leadership, has brought the war in Iraq to a close. This President is bringing the war in Afghanistan to a close. This President, with the best military minds and the best military talent in the world, has made Osama bin Laden a piece of history. He was captured and killed. The man who, sadly, led an attack on the United States that cost almost 3,000 innocent lives has been dispatched because of the leadership of this President and the wonderful abilities and talents and resources of the United States military.

So to stand here and criticize this President as some reluctant warrior is unfair. Yes, I would say in some instances I want a President to be a reluctant warrior, to think twice before America is engaged in a war, to think twice before this country commits its troops to a foreign theater. Certainly, as of this moment, having lost more than 5,000 brave Americans in Iraq and Afghanistan, we know the terrible price that is paid by the men and women who so bravely represent this country. And I would like every President to think twice before committing

those troops to battle. Reluctant? Yes. But wise? Yes, I want a wise warrior too.

I listened to the Senator from Kentucky criticize the President because he is, quote, telegraphing his punches when it comes to what is going to happen in Syria. Well, you cannot have it both ways. This President could make a unilateral decision and attack without even consulting Congress and thereby maintain the element of surprise or he could do as this President has done and follow what he considers to be our constitutional requirement of a national debate before we engage in military action.

So I would say to the Senator from Kentucky, do not criticize the President for letting us know what he might do when he turns this over to Congress to debate. It is something most of us in Congress should welcome.

I also take exception to this notion that we have somehow abandoned our commitment to the world—this notion that what we hope to do in the Pacific is unreachable, or the closing of embassies because of danger is problematic or that there is austerity in the Department of Defense.

It is hard to reconcile those statements from the Republican side of the aisle with the fact that repeatedly we have asked for a conference committee on the budget to work out our budget differences when it comes to funding the Department of Defense and our Nation's national defense and time and again the Republicans have objected—objected to even sitting down and trying to work out differences so we can restore some of the funds cut through sequestration.

You cannot have it both ways. Do not criticize the President for not spending enough money when it comes to our Nation's defense and then stand by the sequestration which continues to cut even more from that same Department and many others.

As for the war on terror, what the President has said is there comes a moment, and we have reached it, where we cannot always be on a war footing. It causes a nation to make decisions which in the long haul may not stand the test of time and history. The President has said, yes, there is a war on terrorism, but we have to resume our leadership in this world with the view of a stable nation, not always thinking about the wartime status we face.

I listened to the Senator from Kentucky, who talks about saving money and cutting budgets, trying to hang on to that relic of times gone by at Guantanamo, where we are spending so much money—hundreds of thousands of dollars for each prisoner to be kept at Guantanamo—when we know full well that at least half of them should be released—carefully released—and should not be maintained at Guantanamo.

Today, we have hundreds of convicted terrorists safely incarcerated in the Federal penitentiaries of America, including one in Illinois in Marion, and the people in the nearby community would not even know it because they are safely incarcerated.

Let me say a word too about this issue of Syria. You cannot, on the one hand, criticize this President for stepping up and saying we need to take action, if necessary, to stop the use of chemical weapons and then, on the other hand, say he is a reluctant warrior and that he does not support it. How in the world do you reconcile those two points of view?

The President has shown leadership. What he has asked is for the Congress to follow. What I heard from the Republican Senator from Kentucky is he is not interested in following that leadership.

Let me also add, this Putin overture, that we find some peaceful way to resolve this—I hope it turns out to be true and something that works. And if it does, give credit where it is due. This President stepped up and said we have to challenge the use of chemical weapons in Syria. Even if it does not affect the United States directly or its allies directly, we have to stand up to them. And if this Putin overture leads to some containment or destruction of those chemical weapons, give the President credit for it. Do not criticize him for not leading. He has shown more leadership on this issue than, frankly, many politicians of either party wanted to face.

I think when it comes to a credible strategy, this President has one.

It is a strategy which is ending two wars, which has put an end to the leader of that terrible terrorist attack on the United States on 9/11. It is a strategy which has improved the image of the United States since this President has come to power over the last several years. It is a strategy we can build on in the future. But we need to make certain that what we do is done with an eye toward the reality of this world in which we live. It is a dangerous world. It is one where the United States may be called on to lead at times when we do not want to lead. We cannot be isolationist. The United States has a responsibility in this world. That responsibility has to be used very carefully. This President understands that.

I hope that at the end of the day we can, in fact, see a peaceful resolution of the chemical weapons issue in Syria. I hope we can find a way to harken back to Ronald Reagan where we can trust that will happen but verify it as well. That would be the right ending. I think the President has taken the right position.

I would like to add something. When it comes to the nation of Israel, our closest and best ally in the Middle East, they understand what we are trying to do with chemical weapons in Syria. They have made it clear through their friends in the United States and other ways that they support it without fear of retaliation by Syria. They are ready, according to Prime Minister Netanyahu, for whatever Syria chooses to do. We should not be any less forceful or less committed when it comes to ending the threat of chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes and that following my remarks Senator PORTMAN be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SYRIA

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I know that—and what we have heard this morning—what is rightfully at the forefront of all of our minds this week is the debate about whether to authorize the use of force in Syria. This is a very serious matter, as we all know. It raises a number of geopolitical and national security issues.

The decision to undertake military action is not one to be taken lightly. I am very aware that people are war-weary, that they are concerned about the consequences of the use of military force. Consequently, I believe we should pursue every possible diplomatic solution prior to engaging in military action.

I welcome the possibility of international cooperation to secure and destroy Syria's chemical weapons stockpile. I hope that Russia is being serious and that they will take real, legitimate actions to quickly follow through on what they have raised with their effort to try to encourage Asad to give up his chemical weapons to international control. I am working with some of my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on an amendment to the resolution that would incorporate this new development and pressure the Syrians to ensure that we see credible concrete steps in any possible effort to place their chemical weapons under international inspection. I look forward to hearing from the President today and this evening, and I look forward to the debate later this week as we consider the situation in Syria.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes this morning to talk about legislation that was previously scheduled to be debated on the Senate floor this week—the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, also known as Shaheen-Portman. I know the Presiding Officer has been very involved in energy issues for all of his time in public life, and I do appreciate the work he did as a Member of the House. I know he is following this debate very closely. I appreciate that.

This bill is one Senator ROB PORTMAN and I have been working on for 3 years.

I appreciate that he has come to the floor today to talk about it as well. We have had 3 years of meetings, negotiations, and broad stakeholder outreach in an effort to craft the most effective piece of energy legislation, with the greatest possible chance of passing both Chambers of Congress and being signed into law.

Shaheen-Portman is a bipartisan effort that reflects an affordable approach to boost the use of energy efficiency technologies. It will help create private sector jobs, save businesses and consumers money, reduce pollution, and make our country more energy independent. It will have a swift and measurable benefit on our economy and our environment. In the last few weeks we saw a study from experts at the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy which found that this legislation has the potential to create 136,000 domestic jobs by 2025, all while saving consumers billions of dollars and reducing pollution.

Efficiency is the cheapest and fastest approach to reduce our energy use. Energy savings techniques and technologies lower costs and free up capital that allows businesses to expand and our economy to grow. Perhaps equally important, energy efficiency has emerged as an excellent example of a bipartisan and affordable opportunity to immediately grow our economy and improve energy security. In addition to being affordable, efficiency is widely supported because its benefits are not confined to a certain fuel source or a particular region of the country. It is clearly one of the policy areas where we really can come to a common agreement.

It is no wonder that energy efficiency legislation—Shaheen-Portman—enjoys such large and diverse support. It has received more than 250 endorsements from a wide range of businesses, environmental groups, think tanks, and trade associations, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to the Natural Resources Defense Council.

I am hopeful the Senate will return to Shaheen-Portman when we have finished debating the serious issue of Syria. I appreciate the commitment of our leadership on both sides of the aisle in the Senate to do so. I recognize this will be the first time a major energy bill has reached the Senate floor since 2007; therefore, it only makes sense for us to have a robust energy debate that allows for amendments from both sides of the aisle to be considered. I look forward to working with my colleagues to find an agreement on the way forward.

I thank my good friend Senator PORTMAN for his partnership in bringing this bill to the floor. I also thank the majority and minority leaders as well as Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for all of their support as we have gone through this process and hopefully will bring this bill to the floor in the next couple of weeks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

SYRIA

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, we rise at a time of great debate here in this Chamber and in this country about what the appropriate response should be by the United States to the horrific use of chemical weapons by the Government of Syria. That is a debate which will unfold over the next days here. We will see, as the situation continues to develop, what actually comes to the floor.

But the President of the United States has asked for our input here in the Senate. Today we are focused on really the most important question an elected representative is asked to respond to; that is, whether to commit America to military combat. To that end, we have all spent time looking over intelligence reports. We have participated in classified intelligence briefings. I have also had the opportunity to meet with top members of the administration. From the information I have received, I do believe the Government of Syria used chemical weapons against its own people.

I believe an international response is appropriate, but I do not believe the administration's proposal of a U.S. military strike is the right answer. There is no guarantee it will prevent Asad's use of chemical weapons. I do not believe it will end the senseless bloodshed in Syria. I do not believe it will bring stability to the region that is so critical to our national security. I do not believe it will enhance Israel's security. I do not believe, most fundamentally, that it is nested in a broader strategic plan for the region.

The situation we face in Syria today is partly the result of a failed foreign policy. It is time for a change of course. We need a comprehensive long-term strategy first, not a strike and then the promise of a strategy, which is what the administration has proposed. ''Strike first, strategy later'' is a recipe for disaster. If the current resolution comes to the floor as a result, the current resolution being considered, I would not be able to support it.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. America must also look to its interests here at home. Senator SHAHEEN just talked about that. Without a doubt, the ongoing chaos in Syria has served to remind us once again of the volatility and the instability that has plagued the Middle East for many years. It should also serve as a wake-up call.

As a country, we have for way too long been dependent on dangerous and volatile parts of the world for our foreign energy needs, particularly foreign oil. We have seen the impact in the price of oil, even in the last couple of weeks. We certainly have seen it in our economy, the roller coaster we have seen with energy prices up and down. As a result, the need for American energy independence is not just a matter of the economy or economic security or energy security, it is also a matter of national security.

Given these realities, it is incumbent upon us now more than ever to pursue a true ''all of the above'' domestic energy strategy. We have to find ways to produce more energy here at home. Just as important, we have to figure out how to use less by wasting less. We will save money, we will save energy, we will make our economy more competitive and create more jobs, and, yes, we will reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

The piece of legislation on which I joined with the senior Senator from New Hampshire, which we introduced just before we left for the August recess, takes important steps toward that goal of reducing the amount of energy we waste in this country. Senator SHAHEEN just talked about it. It is called the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act. It was meant to be on the floor today. We were supposed to be debating it. It is absolutely critical that we are debating Syria instead, but I do hope we can take up this legislation after the discussions about what we do with regard to the situation in Syria.

This bill, the energy security bill, is bipartisan. It is bicameral in the sense that there is support in the House and the Senate for it. It is, as Senator SHAHEEN said, a bill that reduces our energy waste and moves us toward energy independence. According to the recent study she talked about, it is estimated to aid in the creation of 136,000 new jobs, saving consumers over $13 billion a year by the year 2030. That is why it is no surprise that it is supported by such a broad group, as Senator SHAHEEN talked about. That support, by the way, is one big reason it passed the Energy Committee with a strong bipartisan vote of 19 to 3.

Simply put, the legislation we proposed makes good environmental sense, it makes good energy sense, and it makes good economic sense too. It is a rare example around here of bipartisanship, which ought to be encouraged in a number of areas, but certainly this is one where we can find common ground.

I want to thank the majority leader this morning, and the minority leader, for working out a unanimous consent agreement that allows us to move forward on this commonsense approach in the coming days. In that debate, we will talk more about the legislation, how it helps manufacturers on the global stage, and how the savings companies will accrue from energy efficiency will lead to better paying jobs. We will talk about how our legislation helps to train the next generation of workers in the skills they need to compete in the growing energy efficiency field. We will talk about how it makes

the Federal Government practice what it preaches, to reduce the waste in the largest user of energy in the world, which is our Federal Government. We will describe how our bill accomplishes these goals with no new mandates, no mandates on the private sector, no new spending, entirely offset. And again, it is a commonsense approach that is bipartisan. I look forward to that discussion. I look forward to seeing the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act become law so this Nation can take a big step toward achieving the true goal of an ''all of the above'' energy strategy and indeed make us less dependent on those dangerous and volatile parts of the world.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 191, the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Marilyn A. Brown, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2017.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

AUTHORIZING THE LIMITED AND SPECIFIED USE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AGAINST SYRIA—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 21.

Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon 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. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum calls, which I will suggest in just a few seconds, be equally divided between the majority and the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. 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. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, this week we have a very difficult set of questions to answer relating to Syria and the ongoing crisis there. But in particular we have a question to answer as it relates to what the United States should do. I rise this morning to express strong support for this authorization to degrade Bashar al-Asad's chemical weapons capability and deter the future use of these horrific weapons. I made this determination based upon the evidence and the national security interests of the United States, both our national security interests today as well as in the future.

The resolution that is before the Senate right now does not allow for the deployment of U.S. combat troops on the ground in Syria. I will not support—nor do I think there will be much support in this Chamber—any measure that would involve U.S. boots on the ground in Syria and this resolution specifically speaks to this concern. I am quoting, in part, the resolution:

> The authority granted in section 2(a) does not authorize the use of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Syria for the purpose of combat operations.

It is important we make that point.

As we have all seen, especially in the last few days, the situation in Syria is in flux, especially in the last 24 hours. The Russian Government put forth a proposal yesterday which would have international monitors take control of Syria's chemical weapons in order to avert a U.S. military strike. I am open to this diplomatic discussion—however not without caution and not without skepticism. Diplomatic solutions are always a preferred path and military strikes should always be the last resort.

I think prior to this proposal we were at this point of a last resort. But the only reason this proposal is on the table is because of the credible threat of force that is being debated in Washington—but even more significantly being debated across the country. The authorization itself should still go forward because it will keep the pressure on the Syrian regime for a diplomatic solution.

Let's take a couple of minutes on our own national security interests. In March of 2011, as reported by the U.S. State Department, multiple news sources, including CNN, reported—and I will submit for the RECORD a report from CNN—that the Syrian Government authorities had arrested 15 schoolchildren in the city of Daraa for spray-painting antigovernment slogans. These young people were reportedly tortured while in custody and authorities resorted to force when their parents and others in the community called for their release. Within 1 week the police had killed 55 demonstrators in connection with the early efforts to provide opposition to the Asad regime. The regime committed countless atrocities during the next 2 years of this conflict, culminating in the unspeakable use—the indiscriminate use of chemical weapons on August 21.

I submit for the RECORD a report from CNN, dated March 1, 2012, and ask it be printed in the RECORD.

This report is March of 2012, but it looks back in a retrospective fashion on what happened in those early days of the opposition coming together in 2011. I will read a pertinent part, part of what CNN said about what happened when these schoolchildren were demonstrating against the regime. They talked in this report about the young people, as I mentioned, not just protesting but spray-painting their beliefs against the regime. At the time, not a lot of people around the world were focused on what was happening in Syria. Let me quote in pertinent part what at one point one of the citizens on the street was saying, that the people in Daraa:

> . . . didn't want to go against the regime. People thought that this [leader, Mr. Asad] was better than his dad. Nobody wanted to go face-to-face with him.

But then of course it was young people, in this case even schoolchildren, who led the way to take him on. I submit this for the record because this opposition started on the streets of Syria, in this case in Daraa, starting with young people, but it of course continued from there. We know that the regime itself has the largest chemical stockpile in the region, one of the largest in the world. We know Mr. Asad used these weapons against his own people, not only on August 21 but on multiple occasions prior to that in a much more limited way. We also know he has the capacity, the will, and unfortunately the track record to use these weapons against innocent civilians.

We also should remember we have troops and other military and diplomatic personnel in the region, in the Middle East. Even Syria's acquisition—even Syria's very acquisition of chemical weapons threatens our national security. In 2003, the Congress of the United States—some people have forgotten about this—the Congress of the

United States in 2003 passed the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of that year. This act explicitly states that Congress found—the U.S. Congress made a finding that ''Syria's acquisition''—and I am underlining that word ''acquisition''—''of weapons of mass destruction threatens the security of the Middle East and the national security interests of the United States.''

This Congress 10 years ago made a determination that the acquisition of chemical weapons was a threat to our national security. We are in a different world now. Syria not only acquired them but has now used them multiple times on its own people, the most recent being the horrific scenes that we all saw in some of the videos that are now part of the public record. So there is clear and convincing evidence of the direct involvement of the Asad regime, the forces of the Asad regime and senior officials, in the planning, execution, aftermath, and attempts to cover up the August 21 attack. This is graphically evident in the 13 authenticated videos released by the Senate Intelligence Committee compiled by the Open Source Center showing the results of chemical weapons use in the Damascus suburbs on August 21. These videos were shown to the Intelligence Committee on Thursday and played on CNN on Saturday. So many Americans have seen them. If anyone would like more information about those, go to my Web site and I am certain many others as well.

It is clear that the regime violated international law as it relates to chemical weapons. We know the regime committed a barrage of terror across the country with the sole aim of remaining in power. We have to ask ourselves, when a dictator or terrorist organization uses chemical weapons in violation of international law, should that regime or terrorist organization pay a price? I argue that they must pay a price.

We simply can't condemn this crime against humanity; it is in the national security interest of the United States for the administration to have the authorization to act. The regime in Iran, the terrorist organization Hezbollah, and the regime in North Korea are watching very closely, so it is imperative that we take steps to address this threat.

Let me talk about the regime in Iran and Hezbollah. What happens in Syria is of great consequence to our security interest as it relates to that regime in Hezbollah. When I say ''that regime,'' I am speaking about the Iran regime. Their support for Hezbollah, through Syria, has resulted in constant plotting against the United States and its allies. The Asad regime in Syria is the conduit of this relationship between Hezbollah and the Iranian regime itself.

I support this authorization of targeted and strategic military action in order to hold the Syrian regime accountable and because it will diminish the ability of Iran and Hezbollah to conduct acts of terror. It will also protect American lives if we hold them accountable, as well as, of course, the Syrian people. Indeed, other than Al Qaeda, Hezbollah has killed more Americans than any other terrorist organization in the world, including 241 marines in 1983. Hezbollah has consistently partnered with Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps to bolster Asad's campaign of repression and violence in Syria, which has further destabilized the region. The regime in Iran has provided funds, weapons, logistical support, tactical advice, and fighters to the Syrian Government forces. Just this year Iran's support to Asad has increased, with reported daily resupply flights to Syria.

The Syrian regime possesses a stockpile of chemical weapons that we cannot allow to fall into the hands of terrorists. Iran and Hezbollah—I think some people in Washington missed this—are not on the sidelines; they are already on the battlefield. I would argue that Iran and Hezbollah are on two battlefields. Certainly, they are on the battlefield in Syria but also the daily battlefield of terrorist acts plotting against the United States and other countries as well.

Failure to bring action and failure to hold Syria accountable after such a horrific crime will only serve to embolden the Iranian regime, to embolden the terrorist organization Hezbollah and others, to expand terror across the world. Iran's status as the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism is well established, and its proxies have perpetuated attacks against the United States, Israel, and our allies.

Emboldened by Iran's support, Hezbollah has conducted terrorist attacks since its inception in the early 1980s—including Western targets. Hezbollah has become more aggressive in the last few years and has executed attacks not only in the Middle East but on two other continents—South Asia and Europe. Just 2 years ago a plot was uncovered to blow up a restaurant in Georgetown—right here in Washington, DC—to kill the Saudi Ambassador to the United States, along with U.S. officials and average citizens who are American. When the Iranian-backed attacker was questioned, he referred to the potential killing of Americans as ''no big deal.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report by the Department of Justice entitled ''Two Men Charged in Alleged Plot to Assassinate Saudi Arabian Ambassador to the United States.''

The list goes on. We know that in June of 1996 there was the bombing of Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia where 19 U.S. Air Force personnel were killed. That is another example of an Iran-backed terrorist activity. It goes back, as I mentioned, to 1983 when 241 marines were killed by a truck bombing in Beirut. There are also new reports on evidence that strongly suggests that an Iran-backed plot was underway to kill a U.S. Ambassador in 2011. Hezbollah has consistently partnered with Iran to do just that.

The national security interest of the United States is even more significant than that. It is not simply the green light it would send to Iran and Hezbollah as it relates to terrorism. If we don't take the right action here, it would send a message and green light to Iran as it relates to their nuclear program. We know the Iranian regime is intent on developing nuclear weapons capability. I support a variety of measures to prevent Iran from acquiring that capability. Condemnation only of Syria would embolden Iran and undermine our efforts to prevent the Iranian regime from developing and possessing a nuclear weapon.

Every Member of Congress will have to weigh the consequence of giving the green light to the use of chemical weapons and contemplate what it will mean for enemies, such as the Iranian regime and Hezbollah, who plot against the United States every day. I am like a lot of Members of Congress in that after receiving several intelligence briefings, I have more confidence than ever before that we have a significant national security imperative to authorize the President to act as it relates to Syria. I have no doubt that Mr. Asad used the chemical weapons against his people and it is evident that he crossed more than one redline. So I support this limited and proportional scope of authorization for the use of force.

By the way, this authorization would probably be the most limited authorization in recent American history.

I believe Congress must stand united on this issue, and we have to make sure we not only hold the regime accountable but make sure we are doing everything possible to send the right message.

I have two more points before I conclude. One of the best rationales for the reason we are taking the steps I hope we will take was set forth in an op-ed printed in the New York Times last weekend by Nicholas Kristof, and it is dated September 7, 2013. The op-ed is entitled ''Pulling the Curtain Back on Syria,'' and I ask unanimous consent to have this op-ed printed in the RECORD.

I think one of the most important lines in here—and, of course, I will not read the entire op-ed—is what Mr. Kristof wrote:

> In other words, while there are many injustices around the world, from Darfur to eastern Congo, take it from one who has covered most of them: Syria is today the world capital of human suffering.

There are few journalists—there are few Americans—who have more credibility on the issue of what is happening to children and vulnerable populations around the world than Nicholas Kristof. For him to say the world capital of human suffering is in Syria is a powerful and compelling statement.

That brings me back to where I started. I started walking through the early days of this opposition to a repressive regime against Mr. Asad, and the people who led the way and made a case against his regime in large measure were the children or young people. One of the harrowing and very disturbing elements of this entire crisis—this war that has raged on for more than 2 years now—is the impact it has had on children.

I received a report today that came from Save the Children. They have enormous credibility not only on children's issues worldwide, but there are Save the Children personnel on the ground in Syria.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the document entitled ''Briefing note: The children crisis in Syria'' be printed in the RECORD as well.

That documents in great detail the human suffering of children and the impact this has had on millions of Syrian children. But, of course, maybe the most graphic and disturbing example of that was the footage that virtually every American has had an opportunity to view which shows the hundreds and hundreds of children who were killed instantly in this horrific chemical weapons attack. By one estimate, more than 400—maybe as many as 426—children were killed.

When we confront this issue, we cannot simply say: Oh, this is just another horrific situation around the world. When we consider what this regime did to schoolchildren—arrested them and by many accounts tortured them from the beginning of this opposition all the way through to the attack on August 21—and what will continue to happen to children in Syria and in places around the world, we are summoned by our conscience to act in some fashion and hold this regime accountable.

I want to be open to this possibility that maybe there is a breakthrough, that we can remove this terrible threat from Syria and wipe out the chemical weapons threat by giving total and complete control of chemical weapons to an international force, but the burden of proof is on Syria and the Russian Federation. They have to deliver very specifically in a very short timeframe if they expect us to agree to this. We should be hopeful and consider this opportunity, but at the same time we cannot divorce ourselves from the reality of what happened, the consequence of not acting, and also the long-term and short-term national security interests of the United States, which I think are overwhelming and compelling in this instance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess.

From CNN.com, Mar. 1, 2012]

DARAA: THE SPARK THAT LIT THE SYRIAN FLAME

(By Joe Sterling)

Syria is burning—scorched for nearly a year by tenacious political resistance, a merciless security crackdown and cries for democracy.

The spark that lit the flame began about a year ago in the southern city of Daraa after the arrests of at least 15 children for painting anti-government graffiti on the walls of a school.

The community's blunt outrage over the children's arrests and mistreatment, the government's humiliating and violent reactions to their worries, and the people's refusal to be cowed by security forces emboldened and helped spread the Syrian opposition.

FATE OF NEIGHBORHOOD UNCERTAIN

Daraa soon became a rallying cry across the country for what began as a rural and provincial-driven uprising.

Syrians compare the dramatic dynamics in the rural city to the moment Tunisian street vendor Mohamed Bouazizi torched himself in December 2010. Bouazizi's act and death spawned demonstrations that led to the grassroots ouster of Tunisian President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali and fueled other protests across the Arab world.

Mohamed Masalmeh—a Halifax, Nova Scotia-based Syrian activist whose family hails from Daraa—said Daraa residents broke the people's ''wall of fear'' by defying what he and others call a police state and taking to the street.

''What people did in Daraa was unheard of,'' he said.

Omar Almuqdad, a journalist from Daraa now living in Turkey, said, ''They started protesting day after day.''

''It was the flame of the revolution.''

A SLOW BURN INTO A FIRESTORM

Discontent in Syria has slow-burned for decades.

A clampdown on a Muslim Brotherhood uprising by the current president's predecessor and father—President Hafez Assad—killed thousands in Hama in 1982.

When Bashar al-Assad took the presidency after his father died in 2000, he gave lip service to reforms.

But activists who emerged from the so-called Damascus Spring after the death of Hafez and those in 2005 who urged reforming what they said was an ''authoritarian, totalitarian and cliquish regime'' found themselves in trouble with the authorities.

There was sectarian and ethnic unrest in the last decade, too, with a Druze uprising flaring in 2000 and a Kurdish rebellion erupting in 2004.

When the Arab Spring unfolded last year, Syrians imbibed the contagious revolutionary fervor spreading across the Middle East.

But the anger smoldered under the surface because of the Goliath-sized, all-seeing and all-knowing security and spying apparatus.

Protests popped up in Syria as video images of public defiance in Egypt, Libya and Tunisia swept the world—small outpourings seen by observers as tests to build a Syrian nerve to take to the streets.

And then—Daraa.

Remote Daraa sits just a few miles from the Jordanian border. It has had its economic struggles, such as drought and drops in subsidies and salaries. Nevertheless, it had been a reliable bastion of support for the regime and its Baath party.

Tribal and predominantly Sunni, Daraa is like many small towns. People know one another and the relationships are close in the city and in the nearby villages and towns.

When the schoolchildren were arrested in late February 2011, they were accused of scrawling graffiti on a school that said ''the people want to topple the regime.'' Masalmeh, the activist, said security went to a school, interrogated students and rounded up suspects.

It wasn't as if this vandalism was rare. Such graffiti was becoming so common in the region that ID was needed to buy spray cans.

But these arrests struck a chord. Residents found out their boys were being beaten and tortured in prison.

The families of the boys approached authorities and asked for their sons' release. Activists and observers say authorities shunned and insulted the people. One official reportedly said: ''Forget your children. If you really want your children, you should make more children. If you don't know how to make more children, we'll show you how to do it.''

''At some point, the insult is so far below the belt. People do respond to it. They just don't bow down anymore,'' Amnesty International's Neil Sammonds said.

PROTESTS GROW

On March 16, a female-led sit-in in Damascus demanded the release of prisoners unfairly jailed. Some of the participants were Daraans, with strong ties back to their home province, and part of the educated, urbanite youth living in Damascus.

''Police dragged protesters by the hair and beat them,'' said Mohja Kahf, a novelist, professor and activist in Arkansas with contacts across Syria. ''This built on the gathering outrage over the Daraa children who are prisoners.''

A day later, a sit-in in Daraa, with some detained. The next day, on March 18, a protest against the arrests of the children, according to The Human Rights Watch.

''Security forces opened fire, killing at least four protesters and within days, the protests grew into rallies that gathered thousands of people,'' the group said.

Activists regard these as the first deaths in the Syrian uprising.

People began rallying in other cities across Syria that day—Jassem, Da'el, Sanamein and Inkhil. Kahf said the government responded with live fire only in Daraa.

But the more people demonstrated in Daraa, the tougher security forces cracked down. And as the crackdown worsened, the more resolute the protesters became.

The people in Daraa ''didn't want to go against the regime,'' Masalmeh said. ''People thought this guy—Bashar—was better than his dad. Nobody wanted to go face-to-face with him.

''It's not like they fought with arms at that moment,'' he said. ''They were just defiant. 'All that we want is our children.' ''

The youths were eventually freed, but YouTube videos and demonstrations were already spreading.

Al-Assad addressed the Daraa unrest in a March 30 speech before lawmakers, blaming the unrest on sedition. ''They started in the governorate (province) of Daraa,'' al-Assad said, adding ''the conspirators took their plan to other governorates.''

''That speech had a catastrophic impact,'' the International Crisis Group's Peter Harling said. ''People who wanted to support the regime at the time were shocked by the speech.''

The dismissiveness of al-Assad and the lawmakers who applauded his words awakened many Syrian people, says the Human Rights Watch's Nadim Houry. Two days later, weekly anti-government protests began across Syria.

Calls for reforms soon morphed into calls for the removal of the al-Assad regime.

''Courage is contagious,'' Houry said.

The government launched a full-scale siege on Daraa April 25, with other towns such as Homs to follow.

Mass arrests unfolded and tales of torture spread across the country. The protest movement grew and solidified into an opposition.

Paul Salem, director of the Carnegie Middle East Center, points out ''it's conceivable

that if the events didn't happen in Daraa,'' the uprising ''might not have occurred.''

But the deep-seated political and economic reasons underlining Syrian discontent was an omen. Protest in Syria was ''going to happen'' at some point, Salem said.

So, out of Daraa, a spark. And a year later, the uprisings blaze on.

''The impact of small events on history can be huge,'' Salem said.

The following is an official release from the Department of Justice on the alleged plot.

TWO MEN CHARGED IN ALLEGED PLOT TO ASSASSINATE SAUDI ARABIAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON.—Two individuals have been charged in New York for their alleged participation in a plot directed by elements of the Iranian government to murder the Saudi Ambassador to the United States with explosives while the Ambassador was in the United States.

The charges were announced by Attorney General Eric Holder; FBI Director Robert S. Mueller; Lisa Monaco, Assistant Attorney General for National Security; and Preet Bharara, U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York.

A criminal complaint filed today in the Southern District of New York charges Manssor Arbabsiar, a 56-year-old naturalized U.S. citizen holding both Iranian and U.S. passports, and Gholam Shakuri, an Iran-based member of Iran's Qods Force, which is a special operations unit of the Iranian Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) that is said to sponsor and promote terrorist activities abroad.

Both defendants are charged with conspiracy to murder a foreign official; conspiracy to engage in foreign travel and use of interstate and foreign commerce facilities in the commission of murder-for-hire; conspiracy to use a weapon of mass destruction (explosives); and conspiracy to commit an act of international terrorism transcending national boundaries. Arbabsiar is further charged with an additional count of foreign travel and use of interstate and foreign commerce facilities in the commission of murder-for-hire.

Shakuri remains at large. Arbabsiar was arrested on Sept. 29, 2011, at New York's John F. Kennedy International Airport and will make his initial appearance today before in federal court in Manhattan. He faces a maximum potential sentence of life in prison if convicted of all the charges.

''The criminal complaint unsealed today exposes a deadly plot directed by factions of the Iranian government to assassinate a foreign Ambassador on U.S. soil with explosives,'' said Attorney General Holder. ''Through the diligent and coordinated efforts of our law enforcement and intelligence agencies, we were able to disrupt this plot before anyone was harmed. We will continue to investigate this matter vigorously and bring those who have violated any laws to justice.''

''The investigation leading to today's charges illustrates both the challenges and complexities of the international threat environment, and our increased ability today to bring together the intelligence and law enforcement resources necessary to better identify and disrupt those threats, regardless of their origin,'' said FBI Director Mueller.

''The disruption of this plot is a significant milestone that stems from months of hard work by our law enforcement and intelligence professionals,'' said Assistant Attorney General Monaco. ''I applaud the many agents, analysts and prosecutors who helped bring about today's case.''

''As alleged, these defendants were part of a well-funded and pernicious plot that had, as its first priority, the assassination of the Saudi Ambassador to the United States, without care or concern for the mass casualties that would result from their planned attack,'' said U.S. Attorney Bharara. ''Today's charges should make crystal clear that we will not let other countries use our soil as their battleground.''

THE ALLEGED PLOT

The criminal complaint alleges that, from the spring of 2011 to October 2011, Arbabsiar and his Iran-based co-conspirators, including Shakuri of the Qods Force, have been plotting the murder of the Saudi Ambassador to the United States. In furtherance of this conspiracy, Arbabsiar allegedly met on a number of occasions in Mexico with a DEA confidential source (CS–1) who has posed as an associate of a violent international drug trafficking cartel. According to the complaint, Arbabsiar arranged to hire CS–1 and CS–1's purported accomplices to murder the Ambassador, and Shakuri and other Iran-based co-conspirators were aware of and approved the plan. With Shakuri's approval, Arbabsiar has allegedly caused approximately $100,000 to be wired into a bank account in the United States as a down payment to CS–1 for the anticipated killing of the Ambassador, which was to take place in the United States.

According to the criminal complaint, the IRCG is an arm of the Iranian military that is composed of a number of branches, one of which is the Qods Force. The Qods Force conducts sensitive covert operations abroad, including terrorist attacks, assassinations and kidnappings, and is believed to sponsor attacks against Coalition Forces in Iraq. In October 2007, the U.S. Treasury Department designated the Qods Force for providing material support to the Taliban and other terrorist organizations.

The complaint alleges that Arbabsiar met with CS–1 in Mexico on May 24, 2011, where Arbabsiar inquired as to CS–1's knowledge with respect to explosives and explained that he was interested in, among other things, attacking an embassy of Saudi Arabia. In response, CS–1 allegedly indicated that he was knowledgeable with respect to C–4 explosives. In June and July 2011, the complaint alleges, Arbabsiar returned to Mexico and held additional meetings with CS–1, where Arbabsiar explained that his associates in Iran had discussed a number of violent missions for CS–1 and his associates to perform, including the murder of the Ambassador.

$1.5 MILLION FEE FOR ALLEGED ASSASSINATION

In a July 14, 2011, meeting in Mexico, CS–1 allegedly told Arbabsiar that he would need to use four men to carry out the Ambassador's murder and that his price for carrying out the murder was $1.5 million. Arbabsiar allegedly agreed and stated that the murder of the Ambassador should be handled first, before the execution of other attacks. Arbabsiar also allegedly indicated he and his associates had $100,000 in Iran to pay CS–1 as a first payment toward the assassination and discussed the manner in which that payment would be made.

During the same meeting, Arbabsiar allegedly described to CS–1 his cousin in Iran, who he said had requested that Arbabsiar find someone to carry out the Ambassador's assassination. According to the complaint, Arbabsiar indicated that his cousin was a ''big general'' in the Iranian military; that he focuses on matters outside Iran and that he had taken certain unspecified actions related to a bombing in Iraq.

In a July 17, 2011 meeting in Mexico, CS–1 noted to Arbabsiar that one of his workers had already traveled to Washington, D.C., to surveill the Ambassador. CS–1 also raised the possibility of innocent bystander casualties. The complaint alleges that Arbabsiar made it clear that the assassination needed to go forward, despite mass casualties, telling CS–1, ''They want that guy [the Ambassador] done [killed], if the hundred go with him f**k 'em.'' CS–1 and Arbabsiar allegedly discussed bombing a restaurant in the United States that the Ambassador frequented. When CS–1 noted that others could be killed in the attack, including U.S. senators who dine at the restaurant, Arbabsiar allegedly dismissed these concerns as ''no big deal.''

On Aug. 1, and Aug. 9, 2011, with Shakuri's approval, Arbabsiar allegedly caused two overseas wire transfers totaling approximately $100,000 to be sent to an FBI undercover account as a down payment for CS–1 to carry out the assassination. Later, Arbabsiar allegedly explained to CS–1 that he would provide the remainder of the $1.5 million after the assassination. On Sept. 20, 2011, CS–1 allegedly told Arbabsiar that the operation was ready and requested that Arbabsiar either pay one half of the agreed upon price ($1.5 million) for the murder or that Arbabsiar personally travel to Mexico as collateral for the final payment of the fee. According to the complaint, Arbabsiar agreed to travel to Mexico to guarantee final payment for the murder.

ARREST AND ALLEGED CONFESSION

On or about Sept. 28, 2011, Arbabsiar flew to Mexico. Arbabsiar was refused entry into Mexico by Mexican authorities and, according to Mexican law and international agreements; he was placed on a return flight destined for his last point of departure. On Sept. 29, 2011, Arbabsiar was arrested by federal agents during a flight layover at JFK International Airport in New York. Several hours after his arrest, Arbabsiar was advised of his Miranda rights and he agreed to waive those rights and speak with law enforcement agents. During a series of Mirandized interviews, Arbabsiar allegedly confessed to his participation in the murder plot.

According to the complaint, Arbabsiar also admitted to agents that, in connection with this plot, he was recruited, funded and directed by men he understood to be senior officials in Iran's Qods Force. He allegedly said these Iranian officials were aware of and approved of the use of CS–1 in connection with the plot; as well as payments to CS–1; the means by which the Ambassador would be killed in the United States and the casualties that would likely result.

Arbabsiar allegedly told agents that his cousin, who he had long understood to be a senior member of the Qods Force, had approached him in the early spring of 2011 about recruiting narco-traffickers to kidnap the Ambassador. Arbabsiar told agents that he then met with the CS–1 in Mexico and discussed assassinating the Ambassador. According to the complaint, Arbabsiar said that, afterwards, he met several times in Iran with Shakuri and another senior Qods Force official, where he explained that the plan was to blow up a restaurant in the United States frequented by the Ambassador and that numerous bystanders could be killed, according to the complaint. The plan was allegedly approved by these officials.

In October 2011, according to the complaint, Arbabsiar made phone calls at the direction of law enforcement to Shakuri in Iran that were monitored. During these phone calls, Shakuri allegedly confirmed that Arbabsiar should move forward with the plot to murder the Ambassador and that he should accomplish the task as quickly as possible, stating on Oct. 5, 2011, ''[j]ust do it quickly, it's late . . .'' The complaint alleges that Shakuri also told Arbabsiar that he

would consult with his superiors about whether they would be willing to pay CS–1 additional money.

This investigation is being conducted by the FBI Houston Division and DEA Houston Division, with assistance from the FBI New York Joint Terrorism Task Force. The prosecution is being handled by Assistant U.S. Attorneys Glen Kopp and Edward Kim, of the Terrorism and International Narcotics Unit of the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York, with assistance from the Counterterrorism Section of the Justice Department's National Security Division, The Office of International Affairs of the Justice Department's Criminal Division and the U.S. State Department provided substantial assistance. We thank the government of Mexico for its close coordination and collaboration in this matter, and for its role in ensuring that the defendant was safely apprehended.

The charges contained in a criminal complaint are mere allegations and defendants are presumed innocent unless and until proven guilty.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 7, 2013]

PULLING THE CURTAIN BACK ON SYRIA

(By Nicholas D. Kristof)

When I was a law student in 1982, I escaped torts by backpacking through Syria and taking a public bus to Hama, where the government had suppressed a rebellion by massacring some 20,000 people.

The center of Hama was pulverized into a vast field of rubble interspersed with bits of clothing, yet on the fringe of it stood, astonishingly, a tourism office. The two Syrian officials inside, thrilled to see an apparent tourist, weighed me down with leaflets about sightseeing in Hama and its ancient water wheels. After a bit of small talk, I pointed out the window at the moonscape and asked what had happened.

They peered out at the endless gravel pit.

''Huh?'' one said nervously. ''I don't see anything.''

It feels to me a bit as if much of the world is reacting the same way today. The scale of the slaughter may be five times that of 1982, but few are interested in facing up to what is unfolding today out our window in Hama, Homs, Damascus and Aleppo.

As one woman tweeted to me: ''We simply cannot stop every injustice in the world by using military weapons.''

Fair enough. But let's be clear that this is not ''every injustice'': On top of the 100,000-plus already killed in Syria, another 5,000 are being slaughtered monthly, according to the United Nations. Remember the Boston Massacre of 1770 from our history books, in which five people were killed? Syria loses that many people every 45 minutes on average, around the clock.

The rate of killing is accelerating. In the first year, 2011, there were fewer than 5,000 deaths. As of July 2012, there were still ''only'' 10,000, and the number has since soared tenfold.

A year ago, by United Nations calculations, there were 230,000 Syrian refugees. Now there are two million.

In other words, while there are many injustices around the world, from Darfur to Eastern Congo, take it from one who has covered most of them: Syria is today the world capital of human suffering.

Skeptics are right about the drawbacks of getting involved, including the risk of retaliation. Yet let's acknowledge that the alternative is, in effect, to acquiesce as the slaughter in Syria reaches perhaps the hundreds of thousands or more.

But what about the United Nations? How about a multilateral solution involving the Arab League? How about peace talks? What about an International Criminal Court prosecution?

All this sounds fine in theory, but Russia blocks progress in the United Nations. We've tried multilateral approaches, and Syrian leaders won't negotiate a peace deal as long as they feel they're winning on the ground. One risk of bringing in the International Criminal Court is that President Bashar al-Assad would be more wary of stepping down. The United Nations can't stop the killing in Syria any more than in Darfur or Kosovo. As President Assad himself noted in 2009, ''There is no substitute for the United States.''

So while neither intervention nor paralysis is appealing, that's pretty much the menu. That's why I favor a limited cruise missile strike against Syrian military targets (as well as the arming of moderate rebels). As I see it, there are several benefits: Such a strike may well deter Syria's army from using chemical weapons again, probably can degrade the ability of the army to use chemical munitions and bomb civilian areas, can reinforce the global norm against chemical weapons, and—a more remote prospect—may slightly increase the pressure on the Assad regime to work out a peace deal.

If you're thinking, ''Those are incremental, speculative and highly uncertain gains,'' well, you're right. Syria will be bloody whatever we do.

Mine is a minority view. After the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, the West is bone weary and has little interest in atrocities unfolding in Syria or anywhere else. Opposition to missile strikes is one of the few issues that ordinary Democrats and Republicans agree on.

''So we're bombing Syria because Syria is bombing Syria?'' Sarah Palin wrote, in a rare comment that liberals might endorse. Her suggestion: ''Let Allah sort it out.''

More broadly, pollsters are detecting a rise in isolationism. The proportion of Americans who say that ''the U.S. should mind its own business internationally'' has been at a historic high in recent years.

A Pew survey this year asked voters to rate 19 government expenses, and the top two choices for budget cuts were ''aid to the world's needy'' and the State Department. (In fact, 0.5 percent of the budget goes to the world's needy, and, until recently, the military had more musicians in its bands than the State Department had diplomats.)

When history looks back on this moment, will it view those who opposed intervening as champions of peace? Or, when the textbooks count the dead children, and the international norms broken with impunity, will our descendants puzzle that we took pride in retreating into passivity during this slaughter?

Isn't this a bit like the idealists who embraced the Kellogg-Briand Pact that banned war 85 years ago? Sure, that made people feel good. But it may also have encouraged the appeasement that ultimately cost lives in World War II.

O.K., so I've just added fuel to the battle for analogies. For now, the one that has caught on is Iraq in 2003. But considering that no one is contemplating boots on the ground, a more relevant analogy in Iraq may be the 1998 Operation Desert Fox bombing of Iraqi military sites by President Bill Clinton. It lasted a few days, and some say it was a factor in leading Iraq to give up W.M.D. programs; others disagree.

That murkiness is not surprising. To me, the lessons of history in this area are complex and conflicting, offering no neat formula to reach peace or alleviate war. In most cases, diplomacy works best. But not always. When Yugoslavia was collapsing into civil war in the early 1990s, early efforts at multilateral diplomacy delayed firm action and led to a higher body count.

Some military interventions, as in Sierra Leone, Bosnia and Kosovo, have worked well. Others, such as Iraq in 2003, worked very badly. Still others, such as Libya, had mixed results. Afghanistan and Somalia were promising at first but then evolved badly.

So, having said that analogies aren't necessarily helpful, let me leave you with a final provocation.

If we were fighting against an incomparably harsher dictator using chemical weapons on our own neighborhoods, and dropping napalm-like substances on our children's schools, would we regard other countries as ''pro-peace'' if they sat on the fence as our dead piled up?

BRIEFING NOTE: THE CHILDREN CRISIS IN SYRIA

The crisis in Syria is a humanitarian tragedy of a scale that is almost impossible to imagine. The recent chemical attack in Al Ghouta adds to an already too bleak picture; even before the recent massacre, Syria was the most dangerous place to be a civilian.[i]

The lack of humanitarian access, and hence of witnesses, makes the human price hard to quantify, but our teams in the region responding to this humanitarian crisis report increasingly dire conditions and the daily arrival of thousands of exhausted and terrified refugees. These data indicate the scale of the crisis:

Altogether at least 100,000 people have been killed[ii], including more than 7,000 children[iii] of whom 1,700 are under the age of 10.[iv] The fighting continues to take the lives of an average of 5,000 people each month.[v]

The UN estimates that today one third of Syrians have been forced to abandon their homes.[vi] Two million are refugees and another 4.5 million are internally displaced. Children account for more than half of those displaced.[vii]

The UN estimates that 8.8 million (including 6.8 million in Syria itself[viii]) are urgently in need of assistance across the region, predicting 10 million by end 2013.[ix]

At least four million Syrians—half of them children—are in need of emergency food assistance.[x]

In Northern governorates, 80% of school facilities have ceased to function,[xi] with as many as 3,900 schools damaged or destroyed by the conflict throughout the country.[xii]

Medical supplies are severely lacking throughout the country and the World Health Organization has warned that disease outbreaks are ''inevitable'' in the midst of summer heat, with deteriorating access to water and sanitation.[xiii]

In addition to pervasive insecurity, bureaucratic restrictions imposed by the Government severely limit aid agencies' ability to reach all civilians in need: between January and July 2013 only 20 UN convoys crossed the conflict lines into opposition-controlled areas.[xiv] The UN estimates that 6.8 million—one in every three Syrians—are trapped in conflict areas and in need of assistance.[xv] However, a recent NGO assessment in northern Syria puts the figure much higher, finding that 10.5 million people in these districts alone are not getting enough essential supplies.[xvi] Despite the huge efforts of humanitarian agencies, the volume of aid crossing Syria's borders and conflict lines is still not enough and millions are still receiving no assistance. Children are dying as a result.[xvii]

With price inflation—with basics such as wheat and flour up as much as 100%[xviii]—the lack of food is reported by Syrian parents as the second biggest source of stress, after insecurity.[xix] Our teams have heard testimonies of mothers forced to feed their infants with water mixed with sugar due to a

lack of baby milk. Other reports testify to the bleak living conditions of those internally displaced in Northern Syria, who have so little resources that they are forced to eat herbs and collect stagnant rainwater to drink and wash.[xx]

For the sake of the millions of children facing a future of fear and hunger, safe and unimpeded humanitarian access is needed to all areas of Syria by the most effective routes possible. Save the Children calls on governments to:

Build consensus across the international community, including in the UN Security Council, to demand all parties to the conflict fulfill their obligation to allow humanitarian aid—including UN aid—to all areas where children need it, across conflict lines and across Syria's borders;

Increase funding. Overall the UN is calling for over $5 billion to meet needs inside Syria and among refugees in neighboring countries. Only 41%[xxi] of the appeal is funded. Governments must increase support for humanitarian operations throughout Syria by any possible channel, as well as scale up support for refugees and host communities in neighboring countries.

ENDNOTES

i. See Action on Armed Violence: ''Civilians killed in 2011 vs 2012.'' http://aoav.org.uk/2013/aoav-find-global-increase-in-civilian-casualties-of-explosive-weapons/#jp-carousel-285 last viewed 22 April 2013.

ii. Al Jazeera: UN: Syria death toll rises above 100,000; http://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2013/07/201372514215745014 1.html last viewed 28 August 2013.

iii. OHCHR, UN Committee on the Rights of the Child appalled by killing of Syrian children in alleged chemical attack, 26 August 2013; http://www.ohchr.org/SP/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=13660&LangID=E last viewed 28 August 2013.

iv. Updated Statistical Analysis of Documentation of Killings in the Syrian Arab Republic Commissioned by the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, 13 June 2013, available at: http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Countries/SY/HRDAG-Updated-SY-report.pdf

v. France 24: UN says 5,000 dying each month in the Syrian conflict: http://www.france24.com/en/20130716–un-says-5000-people-dying-month-syrian-conflict.

vi. The Telegraph: ''One third of Syrians have fled their homes, reports United Nations'' http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/syria/ 10280869/One-third-of-Syrians-have-fled-their-homes-reports-United-Nations.html

vii. Global News, ''1 million children have fled Syria as refugees: UNICEF'' http://globalnews.ca/news/797520/one-million-children-have-fled-syria-as-refugees-unicef/

viii. OCHA (2013) ''Syrian Arab Republic: Humanitarian Dashboard (as of 11 July 2013),'' http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/syria.pdf, last checked 16th August 2013

ix. The Guardian: ''Half of Syrian population will need aid by end of year'': http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/apr/19/half-syrian-population-aid-year

x. OCHA (2013) ''Syrian Arab Republic: Humanitarian Dashboard'' (as of 11 July 2013), http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/2resources/syria.pdf, last checked 16th August 2013.

xi. Assessment Working Group for Northern Syria (2013) ''Joint Regional Assessment of Northern Syria—II 2013, Final Report 2013,'' p. 20, http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/JRANS%2011%20-%20Final%20Report__0.pdf, last viewed 28th August 2013

xii. UNICEF (2013) ''UN Emergency Directors shocked by appalling plight of people in Syria,'' http://www.unicef.org/media/media__67620.html

xiii. World Health Organisation (2013) ''WHO warns of increased risk of disease epidemics in Syria and in neighboring countries as summer approaches,'' http://reliefweb.int/report/syrian-arab-republic/who-warns- increased-risk-disease-epidemics-syria-and-neighbouring

xiv. OCHA, UN-led relief convoys into hotspot areas (January to 10 July 2013), updated with field information; http://syria.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/syria.humanitarianresponse.info/files/syria__UN __led__relief __convoys __into__hot __spot__areas __january__to __10__july __2013 __en.pdf, last viewed 28 August 2013.

xv. BBC, Syria crisis: UN launches largest ever aid appeal, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-22813207, last viewed 28 August 2018.

xvi. Assessment Working Group for Northern Syria (2013) ''Joint Regional Assessment of Northern Syria—II 2013, Final Report 2013,'' p. 36, http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb. int/files/resources/JRANS%2011%20-%20Final %20Report__0.pdf, last viewed 28th August 2013

xvii. Col, A/HRC/23/58, p. 16.

xviii. FAO GIEW Country Brief, Syrian Arab Republic, http://www.fao.org/giews/countrybrief/country.jsp?code=SYR, last checked 3rd September 2013, and Syria Needs Assessment Project (2013) ''Regional Analysis Syria: Part 1—Syria, July 2013,'' p. 16.

xix. DRAFT Child Protection Working Group assessment, Syria—publication pending

xx. Global Post: In north Syria, eating herbs to survive; http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/afp/ 130402/north-syria-eating-herbs-survive-0

xxi. OCHA, Financial Tracking services, Syrian Arab Republic Civil Unrest, 2013 Humanitarian Funding : Actual http://fts.unocha.org/pageloader.aspx? page=emerg-emergencyCountryDetails&cc=syr

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:58 a.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

AUTHORIZING THE LIMITED AND SPECIFIED USE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AGAINST SYRIA—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 5 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, today there are hopeful signs that the international community will act to secure Syria's chemical weapons which have caused so much pain and so much suffering, including the suffering of little infants and children. A peaceful resolution to the Assad regime's use of these lethal, outlawed weapons would certainly be the best outcome. I commend the resolve of President Obama, without which we wouldn't be looking at a potential diplomatic solution.

I wish to lay out for the record why we must act in response to the use of chemical weapons. Of course, I prefer it to be done through the international community. But I wish to be clear: There are certain norms, there are certain rules, there are certain laws that must be respected and obeyed; otherwise, we lose our humanity, and this is an example.

Famous leaders throughout history have called war various things. They have called war a contagion. They have called war hell. They have called war a scourge, murder, a crime, despicable. But even in the chaos and in the darkness of war, there are rules. There are red lines. There are boundaries. There are limits. There are norms and there are laws. That is why in our Nation, as difficult and as painful as it has been, we have held our servicemembers accountable when they acted outside those norms. We did it just last month with the conviction of a soldier for war crimes committed in Afghanistan.

The use of chemical weapons is way outside international laws, rules, boundaries, limits, and norms, and has been so since the end of World War I, when the world uniformly condemned them. We know—we know without a shadow of a doubt—that they have been used by Syria in a big way, and it is time for all Members of Congress and, frankly, all members of civilized society to look into our hearts, to look into our souls, and to look into our consciences. The painful way to do it is to look at the shocking acts committed against innocent, men, women, and children in Syria. Look at those videos, as difficult as it might be, of children and their families dying horrible, ghastly deaths, writhing in pain, gasping for air, foaming at the mouth as the gas attacks their nervous systems.

Do we have a conscience? I pray we do. Albert Einstein once said: ''The world is a dangerous place not because of those who do evil, but because of those who look on and do nothing.''

Let me repeat it. ''The world is a dangerous place not because of those who do evil, but because of those who look on and do nothing.''

Doing nothing can sometimes be an attractive alternative. I understand it. But each of us who looks at these videos, who reads about what happened, each of us must ask ourselves, as human beings, as citizens of our great Nation: Can we respond to these atrocities by doing nothing? Can we sit back and do nothing in the face of Syria's use of chemical weapons on its own people, its own children?

When the President said he had a red line on this, he wasn't speaking for himself alone; he was speaking for the world that disavowed these weapons. I have to say that, to me, the Senate has a red line on this. Anyone who voted for the Syria Accountability Act in 2003, be it in the House or Senate, drew a red line, because in it, we condemned and we decried the development of chemical weapons by the Assad regime, and we tied that program to our own national security. There is no way our national security is unaffected when these weapons are used and no one is held accountable.

Did we mean it when we voted for the Syria Accountability Act? Did we mean it when we passed the Chemical Weapons Convention in 1997, which I was proud to vote for. Did we mean it? Words are good, but tyrants do not heed words. History is replete with tyrants who stood in the face of the worst condemnation and annihilated people. If we stand by and do nothing, what message do we send to those who have these weapons?

I mentioned the ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention in 1997, and I will tell my colleagues, as we look at the world—and there is a lot to complain about and be ashamed of and worry about—one of the good things is that since we passed the Chemical Weapons Convention and ratified it, 80 percent of the chemical weapons of the world have been destroyed.

I think we should listen again to colleagues who spoke during the Senate debate on the Chemical Weapons Convention. Here is what JOE BIDEN, our Vice President, said:

> Norms are created so that we have standards for civilized conduct by which to judge others. Without them, we leave the rogue countries to behave as free actors.

Our own PAT LEAHY said:

> We will advise and consent so the President can ratify this treaty. I truly believe we will. It will show the moral leadership that the Senate should show and the United States should show. We will act as the conscience of this Nation, and we will advise and consent to this treaty. We will show the moral leadership because we began this by saying we would act unilaterally, if need be, renouncing our own use of chemical weapons with or without a treaty. That was true leadership.

So we hear the words ''morality'' and ''conscience'' and ''leadership.'' These shouldn't be just words. We should show that courage. Here are words from John Warner, our former colleague. He said:

> I first learned of chemical weapons at the knee of my father who was a surgeon in the trenches in World War I. He described to me in vivid detail how he cared for the helpless victims of that weapon . . . we cannot turn back now from that leadership role.

Sixteen years later, in this very Chamber where I stood and proudly cast my vote for the Chemical Weapons Convention, we are facing a clear violation of law and humanity.

How do we react? If we do nothing, what is the signal to Assad? What is the signal to Kim Jong Un in North Korea, who has what has been described as a massive array of chemical weapons in an area where we have 28,000 American troops keeping the peace. The message we send if we do nothing is not a good one. It will send a message that says we don't mean what we say; We don't stand behind the laws we pass or the conventions we ratify. These chemical weapons kill people like cockroaches. When we read history, we know these weapons were used on the Iranians by Saddam Hussein and one Iraqi military official called these weapons an ''annihilation insecticide.''

That is what they have been called. These weapons cause excruciating death. That is why a monster such as Hitler chose them to wipe out millions of those he considered subhuman. We all know the history. He didn't use them on troops; he used them on those groups that he considered subhuman. Yet, while the rest of the world was eliminating chemical weapons, Syria was stockpiling precursor chemicals and building one of the largest chemical weapons arsenals in the world.

A Syrian Foreign Ministry spokesman said in 2012 that Syria reserved the right to use these weapons against external forces. His statement already is a violation of international law. He said: We reserve the right to use these weapons against external forces. But he went on to say—and we have his name: ''Any stock of WMD or unconventional weapons that the Syrian Army possesses will never, never be used against the Syrian people or civilians during this crisis, under any circumstances.'' Remarkably, Syria violated its own red line.

Chris Miller is a U.S. Army veteran and he is an expert in the area of chemical and biological weapons. Here is what he wrote in ''The Guardian.'' He said we must: ''jealously guard what progress has been made in working toward a more peaceful world.''

He added:

> The steady worldwide reduction of chemical weapons is a prime example of that progress—one that we cannot allow to be eroded so easily.

I can't underscore this enough. In a world full of challenges and disappointments and for people such as the Presiding Officer and me who believe so much that we can have a peaceful world, this is one of the few areas we can point to—where 80 percent of the world's arsenal of chemical weapons has been destroyed. If we turn our back on this tyrant and on this use, clearly, the chemical weapons will go right back into production. They will be marketing chemical weapons, and we know what will happen when they get into certain hands. We should not ignore history or we are doomed to repeat it.

The British soldier and poet Wilfred Owen wrote this in an effort to depict the horrors of chemical warfare in World War I. This is what he said: ''If you could hear, at every jolt, the blood / Come gargling from the froth-corrupted lungs.''

He saw it firsthand in World War I, where 90,000 troops were killed by these heinous weapons, including 6,000 French, British, Canadian, and Belgian troops killed by German forces in one battle alone. Nations flocked to sign the Geneva Protocol after World War I. Syria joined them, and now more than 1,000 Syrian civilians lay dead due to Assad's decision to bring back these horrors.

How will we react?

Our former colleague and respected national security leader Dick Lugar says chemical weapons ''may be the greatest threat to our country of any security risk that we have, much more than any other government, for example, or another Nation because they can be used by terrorists, by very small groups''—Dick Lugar, who played such a great role in securing nuclear weapons after the Cold War; Dick Lugar, who understands what could happen if we turn our back now.

I respectfully say to my colleagues: Don't look away. Don't rationalize inaction. We cannot stay silent. If we fail to act in the face of such a brazen violation of international norms, in the face of an assault on conscience, then outlawing these weapons becomes meaningless and we put the security of all of us at risk. If we fail to act, we make it more likely that these weapons will be used again in Syria and elsewhere. If we fail to act, we send a terrible message to brutal regimes such as North Korea and Iran, which are seeking to develop nuclear weapons. In the case of North Korea, they have what has been described by Secretary Hagel as a massive amount of chemical weapons. If we fail to act, we make it more likely that these horrific weapons could be used against our allies such as Israel and our troops. That is for sure. If we fail to act, we make it more likely that chemical weapons will fall into the hands of terrorists and others who would do us harm. If we fail to act, we send a message that the civilized world will permit the use of these ghastly and inhumane weapons, not just on the battlefield but against children and families sleeping in their beds.

I ask my colleagues and the American people, do not look away. It is easier to look away.

We had a chance to see some of the videos, Madam President, as you know, during our luncheon meeting. We cannot sit by and do nothing in the face of such horror. We cannot.

So here is the thing: We have a chance now—because of President Obama's resolve, because of the resolve of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, because of the resolve of many people inside government and outside government, we have the resolve to do something. And the best something would be an international response.

I am proud of our President for making sure this alternative was in Vladimir Putin's mind when they met. And

I am glad Secretary Kerry said: Look, there is an alternative. Let them hand over their weapons. Let's dismantle them and do it right and verify it and hold them accountable, and we get past this. That is the route I believe we all want to see happen. We want to see the world stand up against this inhumanity, but let's not be naive about it. When you are dealing with tyrants, you have to enforce that kind of a plan.

I am hopeful today but not sanguine. I am hopeful that the United Nations will take this as an opportunity to stand firm, to say that the outlawing of chemical weapons meant something in reality, not just on paper. And when we said people should not die like cockroaches, we meant it. So I am hopeful we will have a small pause here and we will give diplomacy a chance to work between the nations, and I praise our leadership in the Obama administration and France's leadership and British leadership. I hope the Russians meant it when they said: Let's try to resolve this in a way that will result in the absolute destruction of the chemical weapons Syria has. I hope they mean it.

We cannot walk away from an inhumane act that caused innocent children to die in unspeakable ways because, I will tell you, if we walk away, then I think the message is that there are no limits on gross violations of international norms, there are no limits on gross violations of international laws, and there are no limits on violations of human decency.

I am very pleased the President took this to the Congress. I think it was right. But I want to be clear: The President, as our Commander in Chief, has the authority—if he believes there is an imminent threat or danger to us, he has the authority to act. And I think Richard Lugar is sending us a very powerful message when he says one of our greatest national security threats—he said even greater than a threat posed by any nation—is the possibility that a small terrorist group could get their hands on these weapons. I will tell you, Madam President, that is an unacceptable situation, and I know the President worries about this every day, and every night when he goes to sleep, it is on his mind. One way to make sure the chance of that happening is lessened greatly is to make sure one of the largest caches of these weapons is controlled internationally and then destroyed. That will, in fact, mean we will have a more peaceful world.

There is a civil war going on in Syria. No one wants to get in the middle of it—least of all those of us who voted against the Iraq war because we saw what would happen. And years and years and years later, unfortunately, we were proven right. I was proud to vote no on that war. I think I have a little credibility here for not wanting to go to war, for making sure the intelligence is right, for making sure there is a limited mission, for making sure this is well thought out.

I would say in closing that the best ending to this crisis is for the international community to take hold of this—together, all of us—and work to see that these weapons of mass destruction are first accounted for, then controlled, and then destroyed. If we can do that, then the horrifying deaths we have witnessed and we have seen on tape today and the American people have been witnessing—at least there will be something good that could come out of this because otherwise, if there is no action, their deaths will not mean anything, they will be forgotten.

So we need to keep a credible plan before us, which means we want to see international rules apply, we want to see the international community take hold of this and have a good outcome. But I will tell you this—and I believe this with every fiber of my being—such a gross violation of humanity cannot go unanswered.

Thank you very much.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that time during all the quorum calls be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. 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. SANDERS. 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. SANDERS. Madam President, I wanted to use this opportunity to say a few words about the issue that is on everybody's minds; that is, Syria. I want to tell you that approximately 95 percent of the thousands of e-mails and phone calls my office has received are against U.S. military intervention in the bloody and chaotic civil war in Syria.

The truth is the numbers in Vermont may be higher than the national average in terms of opposition to this war. But there is probably no State in this country where U.S. military intervention in this bloody and complicated civil war in Syria is being supported. It is an interesting phenomenon.

We have a very divided Nation politically, but on this issue it appears the vast majority of Democrats, Republicans, Independents, the vast majority of progressives—I am a progressive—conservatives, moderates, have all come together to express deep concern about the United States being involved in the third military intervention in the Middle East in 12 years.

Let me tell you why I believe the American people feel so strongly against military involvement in Syria. Clearly, it has much to do with the fact that the United States has already been at war for 12 years. There are kids in this country who are halfway through primary school who have never known an America that has not been at war.

What the American people also understand is these wars have been enormously costly in many ways. Not only have these wars in Iraq and Afghanistan cost us the lives of some 4,600 brave American men and women who fought in Iraq and Afghanistan, but as chairman of the Veterans Affairs' Committee I can tell you that today we have tens of thousands of veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan who are dealing with traumatic brain injury, who are dealing with post-traumatic stress disorder, problems they are going to be carrying with them for the rest of their lives.

The human cost of those wars has been enormous. But it is not only the human cost, it is the financial cost as well. Today, at a time when working families are struggling to keep their heads above water economically, we are throwing thousands and thousands of little kids who desperately need preschool education off of Head Start. We should be expanding Head Start. But because of sequestration we are throwing them off of Head Start. We are denying nutrition programs, the Meals on Wheels Programs, that go to some of the most vulnerable and fragile seniors in this country. We are throwing them off basic nutrition programs.

We are forcing massive cuts through furloughs on tens of thousands of Federal employees, including members of the Vermont National Guard. At the end of the day, by the time we take care of the last servicemember who served in Iraq and Afghanistan, those wars will have cost us at least $3 trillion.

But it is not only the human cost of those wars that troubles the American people. It is not only the financial cost of these wars that troubles the American people. It is the deep sense that exists across the political spectrum that foreign policy and going to war are a lot more complicated and unpredictable and have unintended consequences, far more so than many of our leaders in past years have believed.

Afghanistan is a small country that in 2001 virtually had no army when the United States invaded it; no army against the most powerful military force in the history of the world.

What is the problem? Twelve years later we are still in Afghanistan. All of us remember President George W. Bush standing on an aircraft carrier telling us that in Iraq the mission was accomplished. Mission accomplished.

Well, it didn't turn out quite that way. Thousands of deaths later for

American servicemembers, tens of thousands of deaths later for the people of Iraq, peace and democracy in that country has not yet been accomplished. It is a lot more complicated than people thought it would be.

Today people worry what are the long-term implications and what are the unforeseen consequences of the United States being involved in a horrendous, bloody, and complicated war in Syria. All of us know Asad is a ruthless dictator who has exploited his people terribly and used chemical weapons against them. But not every American knows that some 20 to 25 percent of the opposition to Asad turns out to be Islamic fundamentalists, some of them affiliated with Al Qaeda.

What are the long-term implications and unintended consequences of being involved in a war in that area? I know the President has been very clear about saying he is talking about strikes that are very targeted, very minimal. But once you break the egg, once you get involved, we have to bear and will bear a certain amount of responsibility for what happens during the war and even after the war if Asad is overthrown.

This is why the American people are extremely concerned about the United States unilaterally going into Syria without the support of the international community and without the support of the United Nations.

Having said all of that, in my mind there is another reason, a deeper reason, as to why there is so much opposition to the President's proposal and the proposal that came out of the Foreign Relations Committee, which was more open-ended and spoke about regime change. That has everything to do with the fact that the favorability rating of the Congress is today somewhere between 8 and 15 percent.

The vast majority of the American people don't know. They don't care who controls the Senate, whether it is the Democrats. They don't know who controls the House, the Republicans. By and large, the American people have given up believing that the Congress and the White House are listening to their needs, which are very serious at this moment, or are interested or capable of responding to their needs.

What the American people are saying, and they are saying it very loudly, is we have a Congress and a White House which continues to ignore the enormous crises facing the middle class and working families of our country. What they are saying is: Yes, Mr. President, we agree with you, what Asad is doing in Syria is unspeakable; that he is gassing his own kids is beyond belief. We understand that. We want the international community to address that.

But what they are also saying is: Mr. President, Members of Congress, think about our children, the kids in West Virginia, the kids in California, the kids in Detroit, the kids in Vermont. What about our kids? What kind of future are they going to have in an economy in which the middle class continues to disappear and poverty remains at an almost all-time high for the last 60 years?

Today real unemployment in this country is not 7.4 percent, the official unemployment rate. Real unemployment is close to 14 percent.

Youth unemployment is a tragedy. Kids are graduating high school, going out and looking for jobs, and they want to get a sense of independence. There are no jobs for them. Youth unemployment in this country is close to 20 percent.

For minorities, the number is considerably higher. Black youth unemployment in this country is close to 40 percent. Parents are worried that their kids are graduating from high school and there are no jobs available to them.

Before I came to Washington the other day, I talked to a physician in the State of Vermont who said: Bernie, do you know what. In Vermont, beautiful Vermont, rural Vermont, we are facing a heroin epidemic. Kids are shooting up heroin in Vermont, not to mention the rest of the country, because they don't see much of a future facing them.

Parents are worried that their kids are graduating college, often deeply in debt, and that either they can't find a job or the jobs they do obtain often do not require a college degree. The fact is most of the new jobs being created in this country are part-time jobs with minimal benefits, and they are often low-wage jobs.

What the Department of Labor is telling us is that, in fact, most of the new jobs we see coming down the pike for our kids do not require a college degree. They are low-wage jobs.

The people are saying from one end of this country, yes, we are concerned about Syria, but we are also concerned about Los Angeles, Detroit, and St. Johnsbury, VT. Please, Mr. President, create jobs for the working families of this country. What they are begging the Congress to do is to address the needs our people face.

What they understand, and I think this has a lot to do with why there is so much opposition to getting involved in this war in Syria, is that the Congress has virtually done nothing to improve the economy for working families, and they worry very much that if all of our time, energy, and resources are devoted to Syria, we are never going to address the serious problems facing the working families of this country.

Tens of millions of our fellow Americans today are working longer hours for lower wages, and many of them are earning wages that are simply too low to support a family. We have been happy to hear in Michigan, for example, the automobile industry is doing better; more people are being hired. That is the good news.

Do you know what the bad news is. The new jobs in the automobile industry are barely more than 50 percent in pay of what the old jobs were. All over this country the new jobs that are being created are not paying what the jobs in this country used to pay. We have millions of people working for a disgracefully low minimum wage of $7.25 an hour.

People are saying: Mr. President, Members of Congress, yes, we are worried about Syria, but why don't you work to make sure every person who has a job in this country can earn a wage which enables him or her to take care of their family?

The media doesn't pay a lot of attention to it, Congress doesn't pay a lot of attention, but the American people also understand it is not only high unemployment and low wages, something else is going on in this country. They know that while the middle class is disappearing and 46 million Americans are living in poverty, they understand the people on top today, the people whose lobbyists surround this institution, the people who make huge campaign contributions to the political parties, are doing very well. They are doing extraordinarily well. Corporate profits are at an all-time high. The people on Wall Street, whose greed, recklessness, and illegal behavior caused the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, well, guess what. They are doing phenomenally well. They are making record-breaking profits. The rich are doing well and corporate America is doing well. They are making all kinds of campaign contributions.

The American people are looking around and saying, What are you doing for us? What are you doing to protect the seniors and their Social Security? What are you doing to protect the children of this country, to make sure they get a decent education? What are you doing to make sure the United States joins the rest of the industrialized world so all of our people have health care as a right?

One of the reasons I think there is so much lack of support for this war is the American people feel it is high time for us to pay attention to their needs.

We have recently heard, and the news is being updated almost momentarily, that Russia, for whatever reasons, has decided finally to play a positive role in this crisis. They are urging Syria to allow the international community to take possession of their chemical weapons. We believe that France right now is prepared to go to the Security Council with a resolution similar to what the Russians are talking about.

I can't tell you how honest the Russians are being in this effort, what their ulterior plans may be. But I think now is the opportunity to work with Russia, to work with China, to work with the Security Council and the United Nations. It would be an extraordinary victory, in my view, for the people of Syria, who are going through horror after horror right now,

for the entire world, and for the future of the world, if we could take those terrible chemical weapons out of Asad's hands and destroy them. I would hope very much the President and our Secretary of State will be working with the international community to make that happen.

Let me conclude. I think we are in a very interesting and, in fact, momentous moment in the history of the United States of America. The people are coming together to say we have enormous crises in our own country and if we don't get our act together, we are going to see the decline of a once-great Nation. We are going to see, for the first time in the modern history of our country, our children having a lower standard of living than we do.

I would hope the lesson we learned of this entire episode is the American people do not want us unilaterally getting involved in another war in the Middle East. I would hope also the lesson we learned is the American people are saying very loudly and clearly this country faces enormous crises: economically, global warming, health care, education, income and wealth inequality, and they want us to start addressing those needs. I hope that out of this very difficult moment the silver lining is we learn something from what the American people want and we begin to do what they say.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN.) The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the very serious vote before us—the vote to authorize force against Syria. Let's be clear: This is a vote to authorize an act of war. The American people are watching. They know what this is—a dilemma with no easy answers. They know it could spiral out of control. It has happened before and it could happen again.

The use of chemical weapons is an outrage. What happened in Syria was despicable. The horror is clear. The world cannot look away. This crime is a crime against humanity. It demands an international response—strong and unequivocal. On this we can all agree. However, what should that response be?

The President has presented a plan for military strikes on the Syrian regime—an attack that has been presented to the American people as limited in scope but with very great consequences. So we are confronted with urgent appeals to strike, but I believe there are strong reasons not to do so.

First, we should pursue all diplomatic and economic options to pressure both Asad and his backers to change course. We have not yet done that to the fullest extent.

We all know the Russian Government is aiding and abetting the criminal regime in Syria, supplying military support, providing diplomatic cover, and preventing an international response to this atrocity. The world is rightly outraged. That outrage should be loud and clear, and the full force of international condemnation must be exerted, not just against Asad.

As of this week there are signs Russia may be getting the message. If their proposal to help secure Syria's chemical weapons is sincere, then we should welcome this opportunity. We should work with the international community to make this a reality. The inability to use chemical weapons in this conflict will restore the international norm we seek to uphold and prevent a recurrence of the horrors we have seen.

If Russia aims to be a responsible world power and not a rogue nation, they will seek solutions, not obstruction. They are a signatory to the Chemical Weapons Convention. Let's hold their feet to the fire to do what is right. The President's mandate is stronger with congressional approval, and the mandate of the United States is stronger with international support. I would urge Ambassador Power and Secretary Kerry to keep up the pressure on Russia. Make the forceful case to the Security Council. Continue to share the evidence with the people of the world.

This situation will not be solved with Tomahawk cruise missiles fired into Syria. It will require a concerted international effort to push Asad and the various rebels to pursue a political solution. For us to go it alone, to take unilateral action, will put us on shaky ground legally and strategically.

Second, the proposal to use military force could embroil the United States in a complex Middle Eastern civil war. There is a cancer in Syria, from Asad to Al Qaeda. The civil war is a twilight zone comprised of multiple players internationally, regionally, and within Syria. Many of the rebels do not share our values. Some—we don't know how many—are enemies of the United States and our allies. Many of these rebel groups have also committed terrible atrocities. Tilting the balance too far in their favor is not in our Nation's interest and will not leave Syria safer for innocent civilians.

These strikes have been presented as limited and targeted, but last week there were reports about expanding military targets, of regime change. Even the resolution we are considering today includes veiled language—the language that could make it the policy of the United States to tilt the momentum in the civil war and endorse the policy of arming the Syrian rebels—a policy I and others believe is very dangerous—about whom we know too little.

Third, there is a real risk that even limited U.S. military involvement may make Asad feel more desperate, putting our allies—Israel, Turkey, and Jordan—at risk of attack. This could spark a regional war, creating a situation on the ground where Asad may be more, not less, inclined to use chemical weapons.

As with so many elements here, the question occurs, what then? Here is the reality. There is no simple solution, and the American people know this. I understand there is a natural instinct to want to retaliate, to strike out. No one can forget the horrific images, the terrible suffering of the victims. But we need a clear strategy that will not mire the United States in a bloody and uncertain civil war. I remain unconvinced that we have such a strategy in place.

The Iraq war, which I voted against, began as an international effort to kick Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. There followed years of a no-fly zone and airstrikes to prevent Saddam from threatening his neighbors or reconstituting his arsenal of chemical weapons. As we all know, these limited military actions led to one of the biggest blunders in U.S. history.

Americans are understandably skeptical after the fiasco of Iraq. They want to know if we are going down the same path in Syria, into a civil war that is more complex and potentially damaging to the United States and its interests. Limited attack or broader, there is no easy way out of the quicksand. Have we not learned at least that after 12 years of war?

I have listened to the administration's arguments closely, as well as the opinions of New Mexicans. The American people do not believe a limited strike will deter Asad; they fear this strike will just lead us further toward direct involvement. They rightly ask, for what purpose and to what end? Public officials should not always let polls be their guide before making important decisions for our country, but I agree with the majority of Americans and New Mexicans—we must exhaust our political, diplomatic, and economic options first. This is not a lack of resolve. America has the greatest military on Earth. No one should doubt that we will defend our interests and our allies. But a military strike in Syria is the wrong response in the wrong place at the wrong time.

I come to the floor not to push my colleagues one way or another. Each of us must make up his or her own mind. I come here simply to explain my reasons for voting no on this authorization for the use of military force in Syria.

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. CARDIN. 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. CARDIN. Mr. President, make no mistake about it, the resolution before us, in my judgment, is one of the most difficult decisions a Member of the Senate will ever have to make. The authorization of force is an awesome responsibility that each of us has. None of us wants to see American troops in harm's way. None of us wants to see the need for the use of military force. This is a difficult judgment for us to make.

The Constitution envisions that both the President and Congress are involved in the deploying of U.S. military. Certainly the President, as Commander in Chief, and the Congress, under the War Powers Act, have a responsibility to authorize the use of force. Today in this country Americans are tired of war. We have been involved in Iraq and Afghanistan for way too long. We thought these campaigns would be short campaigns. They turned out to be very long. There has been a tremendous loss in human life and fiscal resources as a result of the wars in which the United States has participated. But the public also understands that we have a responsibility to use our military to protect the national interests of the people of this country. They understand that America's military strength keeps the people in this country safe, and they expect that the President and the Congress will use that military force in order to protect the national security of the people of this country.

What is in our national security interest and why would the President come to Congress asking us to consider the use of military force in the current circumstances in Syria? People understand, they recognize that if we are about to be attacked, there is a need to use force.

The United States plays a unique role in the international community, for we understand that standing up for basic internationally recognized human rights is a responsibility we all have. I supported President Clinton when he asked for the authorization of force for the United States, along with the international community, to be involved in restoring order in the republics of the former Yugoslavia, where there was ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and Kosovo. But for the leadership of the United States additional communities would have been destroyed and people would have lost their lives. We stood up because it was in the interests of the United States to stand up for the enforcement of basic internationally established human rights.

Let's evaluate what is happening in Syria today and understand that although what is happening there may be far from our shores, the impact very much could be felt here in the United States. I serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We were called back into session last week because of the President's request for the Congress to act on his request for the use of force. We held hearings that were open to the public, and we held classified hearings in order to better understand what had happened in Syria.

I think it is now clear beyond any doubt that the Asad regime in Syria used chemical weapons. The evidence is clear. It was not the first occasion they used chemical weapons. They had used chemical weapons in the past but not to the magnitude they did on August 21 of this year which resulted in more than 1,400 deaths, many of whom were children. The videos of that image are now available publicly. People can see the horrific act that was imposed upon the people of Syria by its President, President Asad.

The action of Syria on August 21 violated international norm. Since chemical weapons were used in World War I, the international community has come together and said: Even in war we will not permit the use of chemical weapons. It is so horrific, so indiscriminate in its killing and in its maiming that as an international community we will stand and say: No, you cannot use chemical weapons.

The evidence is clear that President Asad of Syria used chemical weapons in a mass way and killed over 1,400 people. That action requires the response of the international community, for if it goes unchallenged it is more likely President Asad will continue to use chemical weapons. He just considers it one of the weapons in his toolbox, and he will call it out more and more if it goes unchallenged by the international community.

The people of Syria are not the only ones at risk. These chemical weapons could easily be used against American allies in that region. It could be used against Turkey. It could be used against Jordan. It could be used against Israel.

If the use of weapons of mass destruction in Syria goes unchallenged and if President Asad can get away with the use of chemical weapons, what message does that send to the regime in Iran and its ambition to become a nuclear weapons state and perhaps use nuclear weapons? What message does it send to the Government of North Korea, which is openly testing the use of nuclear weapons?

We have a direct interest in preventing the use of weapons of mass destruction, and we have to work with the international community to say this will not go unchallenged. We not only have a moral imperative—and we do have a moral imperative—but we also have an issue of our national security interest. If these weapons of mass destruction get in the hands of terrorist organizations and groups, it threatens the security of Americans and it threatens the security of our allies. We have a responsibility to protect the national security of the people of this country.

I have engaged many people in Maryland who have talked to me about their concerns about the use of the American military in Syria. They recall what happened when the Congress authorized the use of force in Iraq where there was evidence of chemical weapons, and then we went in and found no chemical weapons. There were statements made about how this would be a limited operation. Our troops were there for a decade. So there is obviously concern about the information being made available to us and what is being asked of the Congress of the United States.

When force was authorized against Iraq and that resolution was pending on the floor, I served in the other body, in the House of Representatives. I had a chance to see firsthand the information about Iraq and its risk factors to the interest of the United States. Some may recall that the popular sentiment was for America to authorize the use of force—for Congress to authorize the use of force. I voted no on that resolution because I was convinced America did not have a national security interest to use military force. So I will explain the difference between the circumstances in Iraq over a decade ago and what we are facing today in Syria.

The original justification for the United States entering its combat troops in Iraq was that Iraq was deeply involved with the then-government of Afghanistan and the attack on our country on September 11. I looked for that information, and I saw no information between the Iraqi Government and the attack on our government. Yet those statements were made and it was used as justification for the use of military force.

Here the justification is the use by Syria of chemical weapons, and that has been established. I believe the international community has now understood the evidence is clear that the Asad regime used chemical weapons in contravention to international norm.

When we were authorizing the Iraq use of force, there were no restrictions on the U.S. military. As everyone knows, we used ground troops. We used hundreds of thousands of ground troops in our campaign in Iraq. American lives were put directly at risk, and it put America directly in harm's way.

The request made by the President of the United States for military action in Syria does not include—and, in fact, the resolution that has come out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee makes it clear that there will be no ground combat troops from the United States of America. We will not be drawn into a ground war.

The Iraqi resolution that was approved over a decade ago had no time limit on that authorization. As we saw with that authorization and with the Afghanistan authorization, those campaigns went for over a decade, with American troops at risk.

The authorization that has come out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee contains a 60-day limitation on the authorization of the use of force. It can be extended once for an additional

30 days. This is a limited campaign. It is very clear this authorization is restricted to the specific objective to degrade and deter the use of chemical weapons by the Syrian regime and to prevent the transfer of chemical weapons to terrorist organizations.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommended resolution is limited. It is limited to that mission. It is limited in the type of military operation—no ground troops. It is limited in time and is not to exceed 60 to 90 days. It is limited to the fact that use of force should be the last option—not the first but the last option.

I have said many times on the floor of the House, and now on the floor of the Senate, that the use of military should be the last resort. There are other options that need to be explored first. So the resolution that has come out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee requires the President to pursue diplomatic ways to resolve the issue before he can use force. He must certify to Congress that he has done that before he can use force.

Mr. President, you understand this directly because you raised some of these issues. We now have an opportunity that we hope will work. We now have the attention of Russia and Syria since they know America is serious about reacting to Syria's use of chemical weapons. They know we will not stand by.

They have now acknowledged that chemical weapons in great numbers exist in Syria. And, quite frankly, I think they have acknowledged the use of chemical weapons in Syria. Of course, the videos speak for themselves and the physical evidence is overwhelming.

Now the suggestion is they will turn over those chemical weapons to the international community. If that is done, we have achieved our objective in the resolution that is before us. The resolution before us is to degrade and deter the use of chemical weapons by Syria. If they turn their chemical weapons over to the international community, we have achieved our objective. However, any such plan must be verifiable, enforceable, and timely.

Excuse me if I seem a little bit suspicious of the suggestions made by Russia and Syria. I want to make sure they are verifiable, they are enforceable, and that they are timely. We anticipated a diplomatic effort when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommended this resolution to the floor of the Senate.

There are many Members of the Senate, including the Presiding Officer, who are looking at ways we can come together to support the President's effort to stand up against the use of chemical weapons. I hope we will be able to come together with language in this resolution that will allow the Syrian Government to turn over its chemical weapons in a timely and enforceable way so military force will not be necessary.

Make no mistake about it, but for the leadership of President Obama and their fear of the use of American military force, we would never be at this opportunity right now where we have a viable diplomatic channel we can pursue. I wanted to acknowledge that we anticipated diplomacy would be used, as it always should be, before the use of our military. We hope our military will not be necessary, but we have to react to the use of chemical weapons.

Let me explain some of what we don't want to see happen. Earlier I referenced the hearings we had in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I congratulate Senator MENENDEZ and Senator CORKER, the chairman and ranking Republican on our committee. We had a very open hearing, we had access to classified information, and then we had an open discussion in our committee where all views were heard.

We tried to recommend a resolution we thought was responsible for the Congress to weigh in on. It was not the resolution the President submitted to us. It was one that was much more limited to the authorization we thought was appropriate. I think it has served its purpose from the point of view of putting Syria on notice that the United States is prepared to join the international community to say: Chemical weapons will not be allowed to be used. We also made it clear we will not be drawn into a civil war.

President Asad has done some horrible things in that country. In my view, he has lost the legitimacy of leading the country, but it is up to the Syrians to solve their civil conflict. American troops will not be drawn into the civil problems within Syria itself. They are going to have to resolve that issue.

As the United States has said, and as the international community has said, there needs to be a political solution to the future of Syria. Yes, there are some good people in the opposition and there are some people we are concerned about in the opposition. At the end of the day, it is up to the Syrians, through a political process, to determine their own government. What we should expect is a government that will respect the human rights of all the people of Syria and will respect the right of Syrians to determine who their leader should be. All ethnic communities should be able to live in peace in Syria, and that is our objective, to get to that political solution. We will not be drawn into a broader conflict.

As I said earlier, the people I have talked to in Maryland don't want war. The people I have talked to in this Nation do not want the United States drawn into another war, and neither do I.

One more point about the response to the use of chemical weapons. Yes, our first priority is to make sure these chemical weapons aren't used again. The best way to do that is to get control of the weapons and make sure they are not used and, hopefully, destroyed.

President Asad needs to be held accountable. He has committed war crimes. He has committed crimes against humanity. He needs to be held accountable for the criminal actions he has perpetrated on the people of Syria. As we know, over 100,000 have lost their lives, many of whom were civilians who were put in harm's way by the Syrian Government against international norms. I encourage my colleagues to join me in the effort of calling on an international tribunal to take President Asad, in this case, and establish the international justice so that he is held accountable for his actions.

One last point about the resolution before us. It is important to work with the international community. I hope we will find more countries standing up for the importance of international participation regarding condemning the use of chemical weapons. One of the hopes we have in this new opportunity for a diplomatic solution is for the United Nations to assume its appropriate role. The United Nations Security Council will have an opportunity as early as today to pass an enforceable resolution condemning what happened in Syria and accepting the offer to take control of all of its chemical weapons and do it in a way that is enforceable and in a way that accomplishes its goal. I hope the United Nations Security Council will act. I hope the international community will join us. United States leadership is needed, and President Obama is providing it. But the key point is we must respond to the use of chemical weapons.

I think this debate is strengthening our country. I understand there are different views. I urge my colleagues to come together to support a resolution that puts America on record supporting President Obama in saying we will not permit the use of chemical weapons to go unchallenged, that our objective is to make sure the world is safer, and we are prepared to work with the international community in order to achieve those objectives.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the time until 7 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my dear friend Senator

HEITKAMP of North Dakota so we can talk about the serious situation we have before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MANCHIN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. MANCHIN and Ms. HEITKAMP pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 22 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. MANCHIN. I thank the Senator and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I come to speak to the important debate we are having about the most sobering issue I face as a Senator, as a Wisconsinite, and as an American—the issue of military action by the United States.

Let me start by saying that the Asad regime's use of chemical weapons against the Syrian people is morally reprehensible and a serious violation of longstanding international law. The various treaties and conventions addressing these issues have been ratified by most of the world's nations. There is a reason why almost the entire world has gathered under the Chemical Weapons Convention to ban these weapons. It is because chemical weapons are truly barbaric in nature. They are a global threat, and they therefore require a global response.

The President has made the right choice to seek congressional authorization for any potential military action in Syria. The gravity of these issues before us is significant and they deserve a full debate. President Obama should be praised for understanding and appreciating that fact. We must demand that all Presidents—not just this President—come to Congress to get approval before taking military action in another country in instances where we are not facing an imminent threat. I have made that case with both Democratic and Republican Presidents.

I strongly believe our response to this situation must not be a unilateral military action. This is not America's responsibility alone, and it is not in our interest to set the precedent that it is our responsibility alone.

Syria violated international laws and should be held accountable by the international community. America must not act alone. The use of chemical weapons is a global atrocity that demands a global response, and that is why I oppose going to war in Syria and I oppose authorizing military involvement in Syria's civil war—not for 1 day, not for 60 days, not for a decade. I do not believe we should involve ourselves militarily in the middle of a brutal years-long civil war. That would not strengthen America's national security. But the answer is not to do nothing. The answer, rather, is to create a situation where these violations of humanitarian norms and crimes against humanity can be dealt with effectively by the U.N. and other international institutions.

We must continue to focus on building a global coalition to support the encouraging developments in the past few days and to resolve this crisis without the use of unilateral military engagement in Syria. By working through the United Nations and its institutions, we strengthen international frameworks that can help resolve the conflict in Syria and build a safer and stronger international community moving forward.

I firmly believe that the recent potential for progress in today's U.N. discussions is a testament to American democracy. By President Obama fulfilling his constitutional duties to come to Congress and by our serious debate here on Capitol Hill, I believe America has helped drive a more constructive international debate and engagement on Asad's regime's atrocities. We must now give the opportunity of a path forward without military involvement in Syria a chance to succeed.

Madam President, I yield back my time and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, we are back from the August recess, and I am here now for the 42nd time to try to awaken this body to the threat of climate change. Today I have come to talk about some of what went on during the recess while we were away in my home State of Rhode Island and around the globe.

Here is some of what happened in Rhode Island.

On August 14, Nancy Sutley, Chair of the White House Council on Environmental Quality, joined me in Rhode Island to deliver a clear message. As she said: ''Climate change poses a very real threat to public health, both now and in the future.''

Warmer temperatures in the Northeast mean harmful ozone can form very quickly. That leads to the bad air days we hear about on the news, when children with asthma and other vulnerable citizens are urged to stay indoors, often on what appear to be beautiful, sunny, summer days. Nancy Sutley and I heard from Nick Friend, a 15-year-old from East Providence, and Kenyatta Richards, an 8-year-old from Warwick, about the six Rhode Island bad air days we have had already this year that threatened Nick's and Kenyatta's health, and thousands more children.

In Narragansett, a lovely Rhode Island beach town, I visited two sites that sustained significant damage during Hurricane Sandy to see how that town is using recovery aid to repair roads and public housing. People in Narragansett realize rebuilding is not enough; that we need to start adapting for future storms.

The oceans are warming, undeniably, and as they warm they expand. So sea levels rise, leading to more erosion and flooding. Tide gauges in Newport show an average sea level increase of nearly 10 inches since 1930. So storm surges such as the damaging surge last year from Hurricane Sandy will batter our shores further inland, and we have to adapt to that.

In Westerly, RI, town officials and the University of Rhode Island's Coastal Resources Center held an informational meeting about the effects of sea level rise on the town's coastal wetlands, planning for 1, 3, and 5 feet of coastal sea level rise, so Westerly can create a communitywide adaptation plan.

Cranston, RI, was hit hard by the floods of 2010. In August, during this recess, demolition crews began tearing down homes in a neighborhood near the Pawtuxet River to buffer the surrounding homes to protect against future flooding. Cranston also announced a series of climate change workshops to increase awareness about the threats facing city residents and to help them plan ahead. So that is some of what happened in Rhode Island.

Nationally, in August the Rim Fire burned in California near Yosemite National Park, the third largest wildfire on record in California. No one can say climate change caused this fire. Wildfires have been happening forever. But hotter, drier years make for worse wildfire seasons. Spring and summer temperatures are edging up, snow is melting earlier, wildfire season is lengthening, and the intensity of the wildfire season is increasing, as State and Federal fire and forest managers forewarned our bicameral task force in a hearing just before the recess.

During August, nearly all of New Mexico experienced drought, with the majority of that State in severe, extreme or exceptional drought. In late August, the Bureau of Reclamation announced the first reduction of outflows from Lake Powell since the reservoir was filled in the early 1960s. Tens of millions of people who rely on the Colorado River for water will be affected.

Reports are that a late August heat wave in the Midwest caused school closures in Minnesota, and students were released early from schools in Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Again, it is the loaded dice phenomenon. We can't

assign specific blame for this heat wave to climate change, but on a planet with hotter summers, we can expect worse and more frequent heat waves. So that is nationally.

Globally, NOAA announced that July 2013 was the sixth warmest July on record.

I was traveling in Asia during the recess with Senator JOHN MCCAIN immediately following record-setting heat. In mid-August temperatures passed 105 degrees Fahrenheit in Shanghai, China, the hottest temperature measured in the city since records began to be kept about 140 years ago. The temperature in Shimanto, Japan, hit 105 degrees Fahrenheit, the hottest ever recorded in that Nation.

South Korea's President Park talked with us about climate change and its importance in Northeast Asia. While we were there in South Korea, the Ministry of Trade, Industry, and Energy had warned of power shortages due to high temperatures, and we met with public officials in rooms with air-conditioners shut off to save power.

Senator MCCAIN and I heard from China's leading climate official, Vice Chairman Xie, about China's plan to invest almost $475 billion on clean energy and emissions-reducing projects through 2015—nearly $500 billion between now and 2015 and about seven regional cap-and-trade programs that will eventually include other large cities such as Shanghai, Beijing, and Tianjin. For my colleagues who say China must act first on climate change: They are acting, and we should not look to them for an excuse to delay action here at home.

Indeed, a report recently by the Pew Charitable Trusts described China as—let me quote this—China: ''The epicenter of clean energy finance, attracting $65.1 billion in investment . . . it garnered 25 percent of all solar energy investment . . . 37 percent of all wind energy investment . . . and 47 percent of the investment in the 'other renewable energy category.' ''

That is what the Pew Report said about China.

The report compared that to the ''disappointing U.S. performance in the worldwide race for clean energy jobs, manufacturing, and market share.'' That is not a race we want to lose. Yet we are exhibiting disappointing performance against China.

August was also a month for the usual climate denial. One of our Senate colleagues reportedly self-declared that he was a global warming denier and said he believes evidence points to the Earth entering a mini ice age.

One California Representative told constituents: ''Just so you know, global warming is a total fraud.''

A conservative Representative from Iowa told his constituents:

> [Climate change] is not science. It's more of a religion than science.

A Representative from Florida said: ''Our climate will continue to change because of the way God formed the Earth.''

August even brought a climate denier opinion piece to my home State ''Providence Journal:'' ''Climate science is in turmoil,'' the piece said, ''because global surface temperatures have been flat for 16 years.''

Rhode Island's PolitiFact unit quickly determined that this claim ''cherry-picked numbers and leaves out important details that would give a very different impression.''

In truth, there have been steps in the upward march of global surface temperature before. My skeptical colleagues should read about these steps and what may cause them in mainstream news outlets, which explain that while these pauses do happen, they have not and do not herald the end of climate change. Setting aside surface temperature for a moment, we continue to see warming, rising, and acidifying oceans.

The recess brought the latest issue, for instance, of ''National Geographic,'' whose cover story is ''Rising Seas.'' Let me read two excerpts:

> A profoundly altered planet is what our fossil-fuel-driven civilization is creating, a planet where Sandy-scale flooding will become more common and more destructive for the world's coastal cities. By releasing carbon dioxide and other heat-trapping gases into the atmosphere, we have warmed the Earth by more than a full degree Fahrenheit over the past century and raised sea level by about eight inches. Even if we stopped burning all fossil fuels tomorrow, the existing greenhouse gases would continue to warm the Earth for centuries. We have irreversibly committed future generations to a hotter world and rising seas.

Here, focusing on a specific location:

> Among the most vulnerable cities is Miami. I cannot envision southeastern Florida having many people at the end of this century, says Hal Wanless, chairman of the department of geological sciences at the University of Miami. We're sitting in his basement office, looking at maps of Florida on his computer. At each click of the mouse, the years pass, the ocean rises, and the peninsula shrinks. Freshwater wetlands and mangrove swamps collapse—a death spiral that has already started on the southern tip of the peninsula. With seas four feet higher than they are today—a distinct possibility by 2100—about two-thirds of southeastern Florida is inundated. The Florida Keys have almost vanished. Miami is an island.

That is from that extremist publication National Geographic.

August also brought news that the IPCC will announce that it is now more certain than ever that human activity is the main cause of recent climate change. Let me be very clear about this: There is a broad and strong scientific consensus that climate change is ongoing and that human actions are a cause. It is a consensus of a breadth and strength that it is disgraceful and stupid for us to ignore it. That consensus should come as no surprise because the science behind it—behind the proposition that carbon dioxide in the atmosphere warms the Earth—dates back to the Civil War. It ain't news. We have known it for more than a century. Even the contrarian scientists brought in by the deniers to testify in Congress agree that carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas that warms the Earth.

The science is credible. The danger is credible. Now it is about time for Congress to become credible. It is time to wake up. It is time to do our duty here in Congress to our country and to our fellow man. It is time for us to get serious and protect Americans from the looming harms of climate change.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam 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. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now 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.

16TH STREET CHURCH BOMBING

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, two weeks ago, thousands of people gathered on the National Mall in front of the Lincoln Memorial to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington, where Martin Luther King, Jr. gave his historic ''I Have a Dream'' speech. That remarkable moment in this Nation's history was a peaceful day of unity and we rightfully remember the inspiring words of Dr. King.

We are reminded this week of just how quickly that hope and positive signs of progress were challenged by a stunning act of violence. Just a few days after Dr. King inspired a nation with his dream for his four children, four other children in Birmingham were killed at their church because of the color of their skin. On September 15, 1963, a bomb was planted by members of the Ku Klux Klan at the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama. Addie Mae Collins, 14, Denise McNair, 11, Carole Robertson, 14, and Cynthia Wesley, 14, were innocent victims of racial hatred. The inhumanity of those who conspired and killed children in a church may seem unimaginable in our Nation today, but, as Colbert King of the Washington Post noted recently, ''Before al-Qaeda, there was the Ku Klux Klan.''

We celebrate the significant strides we have made with determined efforts in forging a more just and equal America since the KKK's reign of terror, and yet we cannot forget that these events occurred just days after the March on Washington. It occurred in the lifetime of 88 of 100 members of this Senate body. It is our recent history, not ancient history.

The tragic deaths of those four little girls, along with the other shining examples of bravery, patriotism and resolve during the Civil Rights movement, catalyzed passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. These laws helped to transform our Nation and ensure that our most basic promises to our citizens are more than just words on a page, honored only in their breach.

The inspiring possibilities described so eloquently by Dr. King, and the depravity and horror of the Birmingham church bombing just weeks later, reveal an important lesson about our history. The path to progress in our Democracy is winding, and sometimes very, very difficult. We know from our shared experience that we cannot be the Nation that we strive to be by setting the dial on autopilot and assuming that all will be well. There are so many reminders of the winding path to progress, and recently we experienced a considerable detour.

Three months ago, a narrow majority of the Supreme Court held that the coverage provision of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act was unconstitutional. Section 5, often called the ''heart of the Voting Rights Act,'' provided a remedy for unconstitutional discrimination in voting by requiring jurisdictions with the worst histories of discrimination to ''preclear'' all voting changes before they could take effect. The remedy is both necessary and important because it stops the discriminatory voting practice before our fellow Americans' rights are violated. By striking down the coverage provision for Section 5, the Supreme Court's ruling leaves this vital protection unenforceable.

While certain barriers to participation have been eliminated, we continue to see discriminatory voting measures such as arbitrary registration rules, polling-place manipulation, voter purges, challenges or other devices to deny access to the ballot, as well as vote dilution tactics. Since the Court's recent decision in Shelby County, several states have already decided to impose new barriers to voting, thereby reversing the gains that we have made through the last five decades.

These include measures taken by Texas, North Carolina, and Florida to undermine their citizens' right to vote and to participate in our democracy. But on this day, when we reflect on the contributions of our children to the cause of liberty, perhaps no story is more worth retelling than the story of the Prairie View A&M students. It is a story that bridges the past with both the present and the future. Students from that historically black university have been fighting for their voting rights for more than four decades now, and if not for the Voting Rights Act, many of these students would have been denied their fundamental right to vote.

The history is well-documented in a recent Houston Chronicle article by Renée Lee. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. In the 1970s, the Justice Department filed an action against Waller County and its state officials for using a questionnaire to deny Prairie View students the right to vote. In 1992, 19 students were indicted for improperly voting, which ultimately led to a U.S. Supreme Court ruling that authorized college students to register and vote in communities where they live while at school.

In 2004, the NAACP and four Prairie View students filed a federal case after the county district attorney tried to enforce residency requirements that would keep students from voting. A Section 5 enforcement suit was filed by civil rights organizations around the same time after county officials shortened the early voting period at the campus in violation of Section 5. This effort to narrow student participation came at a time when a student leader sought elective office. Testimony about this recent chapter at Prairie View A&M was submitted to Congress in support of the 2006 Reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act. It was compelling evidence that voting discrimination persists in that community and that even a Supreme Court ruling was not sufficient protection.

Two years after the reauthorization of Section 5, in 2008, nearly 1,000 Prairie View students marched in protest for the lack of an early voting place on campus. The county had reduced the number of early voting polling sites from six to one, requiring students to walk miles to the nearest polling location. If you did not know the long and tortured history of the schemes to block Prairie View A&M voters from their constitutionally protected rights, moving a polling place may seem like merely a matter of administrative convenience, but in voting, both history and context matter. The Justice Department under Attorney General Michael Mukasey ultimately entered into a consent decree with Waller County that required officials to restore three polling sites. And now, the students from this historically black university are once again fighting to exercise their fundamental right to vote by demanding an accessible polling place. The Prairie View A&M story illustrates that sometimes discrimination starts early, and that some officials are surprisingly persistent in their efforts to erect barriers in the path of our youngest voters. The Voting Rights Act stands as a guardian against these schemes to discourage young voter participation.

But now, following the Shelby County ruling, and with a college leader seeking elective office in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, local officials have borrowed the Prairie View A&M disenfranchisement playbook. There, a party chairman challenged the eligibility of Montravius King from standing for office by claiming that Mr. King did not meet the residency requirement because he lived in a dorm. The premise of this challenge is flatly contradicted by Supreme Court precedent and the decades of advocacy over Prairie View A&M students' voter access. Nevertheless, North Carolina local officials were initially able to disqualify Mr. King's candidacy. There were also indications that some in Elizabeth City, North Carolina intended to employ new voter challenge procedures in the state to prevent students from the historically black college from voting. It is perhaps no wonder, then, that part of the officials' plan also involved removing the polling place from the campus. Last week, local election board reversed itself only after a huge public outcry, but these events reveal that some things have changed and some, unfortunately, have not. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post by Mary Curtis, which documents the efforts by North Carolina's state officials to infringe on the fundamental right to vote.

When President Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act into law in 1965, he declared that: ''Through this act, and its enforcement, an important instrument of freedom passes into the hands of millions of our citizens.'' We must remain vigilant and protect the rights of all Americans to exercise this fundamental right.

The recent Supreme Court decision placed the burden on Congress to respond with a legislative fix. It is therefore our duty and constitutional obligation to not waver from the path of greater political inclusion that we have set for ourselves and the Nation through our bipartisan support of the Voting Rights Act.

We must restore the vital protections that were weakened by the Supreme Court's ruling. We must provide additional remedies for states and counties, anywhere in the Nation, that not only have a history of discriminating against their voters, but continue to do so. We must extend the reach of these protections to states that commit serious voting rights violations in the future. We must amend the existing provisions of the Act to make those protections more effective. And we must provide greater transparency for changes to voting procedures so that voters are made aware of these changes. These are the kinds of bipartisan solutions that we should all be able to agree on.

As we continue the fight to combat discrimination, we should remember the words of Dr. King. We should remember the aspirations of students like Montravius King. We should remember the contributions of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and Congressional leader JOHN LEWIS. And we should remember that those four girls who died in the 16th Street Baptist Church Bombing, and who are being posthumously honored today with Congressional Gold Medals, were part of a movement that helped make America better, stronger and

more just. The way to truly honor them is not by words alone but through our actions and leadership. While we commemorate the sacrifice of these four girls, our work does not end with this commemoration. Our work is ahead of us and we must act together in a bipartisan manner to protect the fundamental right to vote for all Americans. All of our children are depending on it.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 29, 2013]

PAST IS PRESENT AS NORTH CAROLINA HONORS 1963 MARCH AND BATTLES VOTING LAWS

(By Mary C. Curtis)

CHARLOTTE.—In North Carolina, commemorations of the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington and Martin Luther King's dream credited past struggles while a current battle over voting laws took center stage.

In an uptown Charlotte park Wednesday, the crowd used the examples of civil rights pioneers in a continuation of the Moral Monday protests against conservative laws from the Republican-controlled state legislature. Similar gatherings were planned in each of the state's 13 congressional districts. While many issues, including education and health care spending, were reflected in comments and emblazoned on signs, the new state voter-ID bill was a unifying cause.

Later Wednesday evening, several Democratic and Republican legislators took questions from their Mecklenburg County constituents in a raucous forum called, ironically as it turned out, ''Solving It Together.'' At the top of the list in hundreds of questions submitted beforehand—voter-ID laws.

The new laws have already garnered national publicity, and not the kind North Carolina likes. At the state CEO Forum in Raleigh last week, former secretary of state Colin Powell criticized the voting legislation, saying, ''These kinds of actions do not build on the base.'' He made those remarks after GOP Gov. Pat McCrory, who had signed the bill into law, addressed the group, though McCrory later said he left before the retired general spoke.

Besides requiring photo ID, the bill shortens early voting by a week, ends preregistration for 16- and 17-year-olds, eliminates same-day voter registration, Sunday voting and straight-ticket voting, prohibits university students from using their college IDs and increases the number of poll watchers who can challenge a voter's eligibility, among other provisions. It is currently being challenged in court and Sen. Kay Hagan (D–N.C.) has asked Attorney General Eric Holder to take action as the Justice Department has in Texas.

Actions of GOP-controlled elections boards in North Carolina have also been grabbing headlines, from the closing of a polling place at Appalachian State University to the ruling that a student at historically black Elizabeth City State University cannot run for city council using his college address to establish residency.

At Charlotte's Marshall Park, a program of speakers and singers, as well as the sunny weather, duplicated the mood of the 1963 Washington march. Under a voter registration tent, a pledge card from the state NAACP urged attendees to be part of the ''Forward Together, Not One Step Back'' movement voter empowerment effort. The Rev. William Barber, head of the state NAACP, was on the program.

Amy Gollinger, a physician from Davidson, N.C., held a sign reading ''Protect every American's Right to Vote,'' which she alternated with ones that said ''Protect women's rights'' and ''Why deny Medicaid to struggling families?'' referencing McCrory's decision to refuse federal Medicaid funds. She said Wednesday was a ''perfect time'' to protest. ''Even though we've come far since 1963, our state legislature has shown we have much further to go, '' she said. ''It's unbelievable we've gone from one of the most progressive states to one of the most regressive. I hope it empowers voters to get out and make a change.''

Sitting next to Gollinger with a sign reading ''Stop the attacks on public education!'' James Davidson of Charlotte said, ''I'm here for Martin Luther King,'' and called proposals from the legislature ''going back to Jim Crow.'' He said he hoped new laws would spur citizens to action. ''They went to sleep and didn't get out to vote,'' he said.

At the Mecklenburg legislators' forum at Central Piedmont Community College, the crowd in the packed auditorium loudly registered its approval, disapproval or disbelief as representatives of the state House and Senate explained actions on voting, education and the back-and-forth over attempts to change control of Charlotte Douglas International Airport from the city to a state authority to a commission.

In heavily Democratic Charlotte, audience sentiment at the forum, sponsored in part by local media outlets, was loudly skeptical of the Republican-led changes.

Voting rights led the discussion, with one questioner at the microphone asking for data on the fraud that is given as reason for the photo-ID law (the answer came in anecdotal examples) and another quoting former president Bill Clinton's words at the Washington commemoration of the 1963 march, ''A great democracy does not make it harder to vote than to buy an assault weapon.''

From somewhere in the crowd came the tweet that there was much more debate onstage than in the North Carolina General Assembly, where GOP super-majorities were accused of rushing through bills.

It seemed less Old South vs. New South than voter voices vs. ALEC (the American Legislative Exchange Council), with one question comparing North Carolina's bills to model legislation from the conservative nonprofit. State Rep. Bill Brawley, a Republican and active ALEC member, said he believed in the organization's goals of limited government, free market capitalism and federalism; Rep. Ruth Samuelson, a Charlotte Republican, said she has attended one of the group's meetings. All of the legislators said they serve their constituents, not any organization.

State Sen. Dan Clodfelter, a Charlotte Democrat, said he remembered a time when ''we weren't afraid in this state to be different from the states around us,'' when ideas ''didn't come out of anybody's playbook.''

After the forum, voters lingered to continue the contact with officials some thought had not been listening closely enough during the legislative session. Clodfelter was wistful as he spoke of the times North Carolina passed pioneering laws, such as the Racial Justice Act, which allowed death-row inmates to appeal their sentences and have them converted to life in prison without parole if they could prove racial bias in their cases. (It was repealed this year.) ''Now we're known for the wrong kind of things,'' he said. When one of his Republican colleagues noted that the Democrat had Wednesday's crowd on his side, Clodfelter said he answered, ''You made them that way.''

State Sen. Jeff Tarte, a Republican who had managed to be conciliatory in his conservatism during the panel, insisted he ''loved'' the night's verbal battles. ''It's what the American system is all about,'' he said, though since his party passed its legislative agenda, it was easy for him to be magnanimous.

Samuelson sat on the edge of the stage as the crowd filtered out. She defended her support of the voting bill, and noted a New York Times editorial ''The Decline of North Carolina'' that criticized the general Assembly's actions and caused quite a stir in this image-conscious state. She said studies have found that ''after this bill,'' it's easier to vote in North Carolina than New York.

When asked what she thought of congressman and civil rights veteran John Lewis's attack on voter-ID laws, particularly on the date marking the 50th anniversary of his appearance with other civil rights leaders at the 1963 March on Washington, she said, ''I appreciate the sacrifices they made, I appreciate the emotion around this issue,'' then added, ''I'm trying to protect the integrity of their vote. . . . They worked hard for that vote; I want to make sure it doesn't get stolen.''

State Sen. Malcolm Graham, a Charlotte Democrat, had said onstage that in North Carolina you're more likely to get struck by lightning than be affected by voter fraud. He said that when his daughter returned to historically black Winston-Salem State University this year, she and other students were greeted with stories that a county board of elections chair wanted to eliminate the school's early voting site. ''Our national brand as a state has been tarnished,'' he said.

After the forum, Graham said he believed the passion would extend past Wednesday night. ''This thing has legs,'' he said. The test, he said, would be the tough reelection Hagan faces in 2014. ''That's the line in the sand the Democrats have to draw.''

[From the Houston Chronicle, Aug. 1, 2013]

PRAIRIE VIEW A&M STUDENT FIGHTS FOR VOTING POLL SITE ON CAMPUS

(By Renée C. Lee)

A Prairie View A&M University student leader is calling on officials to add a campus polling place to remedy what she and a civil rights leader described as decades of voter suppression.

Priscilla Barbour, president of the Student Government Association at the historically black university, sent a letter to Texas Secretary of State John Steen and Waller County Registrar Robyn German last week requesting that action be taken by Oct. 1. Barbour says students' voting rights are being violated because the nearest polling location is more than a mile away.

The Oct. 1 first deadline, she said, would allow time to make students aware of the new polling place before the November elections.

Barbour, a senior, hopes her request will end a battle that former Prairie View students have failed to win over the years.

''We've always had problems,'' said Barbour, who is active with the Texas League of Young Voters. ''Voting is supposed to be something that's convenient, something you have the right to do without walking a great distance or standing in line.''

The political science major said students were forced during last year's general election to wait in a long line to vote at the polling location at the local community center.

The city of Prairie View accommodates students by placing a polling location on campus, but Waller County officials have refused to do the same, she said.

German, the county's new registrar, could not be reached for comment Wednesday.

Steen's spokeswoman, Alicia Pierce, said Steen was drafting a letter to German.

''We don't generally determine polling locations,'' Pierce said. ''That decision is made at the county level, but the secretary is willing to meet with Miss Barbour. We'll be glad to work with her.''

Gary Bledsoe, president of the NAACP state chapter, said Waller County has a history of voter intimidation and suppression of black voters.

REPEATED COMPLAINTS

The lack of polling places on campus, lost voter registration applications and problems with ballot boxes are among the many voting issues that have come up time and again in the county, he said.

''Students are entitled to a voting poll on campus,'' Bledsoe said. ''They have been fighting for one for many years. It's a righteous request.''

Barbour's action follows a recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling that struck down a key provision in the Voting Rights Act. The law protects minority voters from discrimination at the polls and, until June, required nine states with a discriminatory history, including Texas, to get federal approval before making changes to election laws.

The ruling gave Texas and other states the green light to push through voter ID laws, which civil rights leaders say will inhibit minority voting.

Prairie View has been at the center of voting right issues as far back as the 1970s, when the U.S. attorney general filed action against Waller County and state officials for the use a questionnaire that denied Prairie View students the right to vote.

In 1992, 19 students were indicted for improperly voting, which led to a Supreme Court ruling that authorized students to register and vote in communities where they live.

The NAACP and four students filed a federal lawsuit in 2004 after the county district attorney tried to enforce residency requirements that would keep students from voting. Another suit was filed around the same time after county officials shortened the early voting period at the campus without Justice Department approval.

The district attorney rescinded his action as part of a settlement and county officials added an extra early voting day on campus after being questioned by the Justice Department.

PREVIOUS PROTEST

In 2008, nearly 1,000 Prairie View students marched in protest of the lack of an early voting place on campus. The county, citing budget concerns, reduced the number of early voting polling sites from six to one, requiring students to walk miles to the polling location. The Justice Department instructed county officials to add three polling sites.

Barbour said she was a apprehensive about sending her letters but figured she had nothing to lose.

''Even if nothing's accomplished, now the tone is set,'' she said. ''I'm not the first to tackle the issue and I'm sure I won't be the last. This gives students a chance to be knowledgeable and take a stand.''

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW WHITEFORD

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am proud to recognize Andrew Whiteford of Richmond, VT, owner of Andy's Dandys, maker of all-natural dog treats.

Marcelle and I had the pleasure of meeting Andrew and his mother Lucie Whiteford at the bicentennial celebration for Richmond's Old Round Church, and we were so impressed with him. Andrew was born with Down syndrome, and his family started Andy's Dandys as a means for Andrew to have meaningful employment and to provide jobs for other young adults with special needs. His work is in line with the best of Vermont's spirit of service to others, and for that I ask that the article by Lynn Monty from the August 22, 2013, edition of the Burlington Free Press be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, Aug. 22, 2013]

RICHMOND BAKERY COOKS UP JOB-TRAINING PROGRAM AND SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS

A mother's creative approach to helping her son transition to adulthood, and all-natural dog treats, are the recipe for success at Andy's Dandys.

Lucie Whiteford launched the Richmond bakery to help her son Andrew (Andy) Whiteford, 21, who was born with Down syndrome, find meaningful employment after high school graduation.

The business was inspired by her boy's affection for his rescued hound named Rosie and his love for reading recipes and baking.

''I hope for him to be fulfilled, happy, healthy, as independent as he wants to be, and to continue to be in a social environment surrounded by people who understand him and love him,'' Whiteford said of her son.

This Bridge Street bakery is on a mission to illustrate employability, while producing a high-quality Vermont product. The original goal of supporting Whiteford in his growth from high school to adult work life has evolved to serving other young adults with special needs, and teaching them real work-based skills that they can take with them in their job search for future employment.

''The mission of Andy's Dandys is to employ and train people to be employable,'' business partner Lesha Rasco said. She is Whiteford's special educator at Mount Mansfield Union High School where he will graduate next year.

''It's the revenue stream that makes the mission part possible,'' Rasco said. ''In the future we hope that it will build.''

Rasco designs and implements individualized work training programs at Andy's Dandys for other young adults with special needs. She has been an instrumental part of Whiteford's growth and of developing his business.

The business has grown organically, Rasco said. ''Lucie has been buying things and paying herself back.''

BAKER, DECORATER, DELIVERER

Andrew Whiteford bakes and decorates Andy's Dandy treats and also makes deliveries and works to promote the business at trade shows and seasonal events.

Andy actually goes by Andrew.

''His name is Andrew. We don't call him Andy,'' Lucie Whiteford said.

''Call me Andy,'' Andrew Whiteford said with a smile.

''He is yanking my chain,'' Lucie Whiteford said. ''The business was named Andy's Dandys because we wanted some link to Andrew, because this was for him, and because it has a nice ring to it. Should we decide to one day make something other than pet treats, we won't have to change the name.''

On a recent morning, a baker's apron was folded in half, and tied around his waist, not around his neck, just the way he requested. Andrew Whiteford was just as meticulous about dipping each one of the many freshly baked molasses dog bones into bright orange yogurt frosting, as he was about donning his apron.

''There are all kinds of colors, like blue, orange, and sometimes brown,'' he said. ''I want to sell these in Las Vegas and on a Hawaii beach someday. I am not joking. It's true.''

PRESERVATIVE FREE TREATS

Joking or not, Andy's Dandys has taken off.

The business started in 2008. Andrew Whiteford began by selling the treats in school and at Saint Michaels's College, where his father Tim Whiteford is an associate professor of education.

By fall of that year a few hundred of the colorful dog treats sold from a couple Chittenden County convenience stores. Overall, 8,500 treats sold that year.

The bakery uses human-grade ingredients and the treats are preservative-free.

Today, the bakery turns out thousands of treats each week, which sell at about 95 stores in Vermont, New Hampshire, upstate New York, and Maine. Thirty-two thousand treats sold in 2012.

''This year we are pacing about 20 percent ahead of where we were last year, and last year was a 100 percent increase over 2011,'' Lucie Whiteford said.

CUSTOM SHAPED FOR YOUR BUSINESS

The bakery has started offering custom-shaped treats that reflect a business' name or product. For example, a flying pig dog treat for the Northfield Savings Bank instead of the standard milk-bone biscuit, she said.

''It's about offering customers a Vermont-made product to demonstrate support for a small Vermont business such as ours,'' she said. ''They gave us a shot, and I understand that customers really love them.''

Lucie Whiteford came on staff full-time last month after leaving her position as an account executive at Fox 44 TV. She hopes to begin drawing a salary as the new quarter starts in September.

''It's profitable now which is why I was able to leave my job to do this full time,'' she said. ''Now that I can work on this business full time, I expect to be able to double sales again in a year's time.''

THE BIGGEST REWARD

More than revenues, Lucie Whiteford's biggest reward is watching her son succeed in adulthood. She said raising a child with a disability has been enlightening and rewarding.

''We celebrate what most people consider mundane accomplishments, such as learning to speak well enough to be understood, learning to button a shirt or tie a shoe,'' she said.

Andrew Whiteford has always pushed himself to achieve goals singing a solo at the senior recital, snowboarding down a black diamond trail, and teaching himself how to dip dog treats with two hands at once, his mother said.

''He continues to exceed our expectations, reminding us that we should be mindful about not setting the bar low just because he has a disability,'' she said. ''As a family we have all grown so much in terms of learning patience, patience and more patience.''

Andrew Whiteford has come into his own in the past few years, his sister Marie Johnson said. ''He has a definite interest in this business now,'' she said. ''He has developed a sense of ownership.''

Their mother agreed. ''Andrew turned a corner this summer. He decided he wanted to

come here and work with me. It was what it was all for, and me sticking with it, and having it be a part of our lives, and having it become the thing he has decided to do it, I couldn't be happier,'' she said.

Andy's Dandys manufactures and packages the treats at the Bridge Street shop, and will be opening a retail store at that location in mid-September.

CORRECTION

This story has been updated to reflect the following correction: Lucie Whiteford launched the Richmond bakery Andy's Dandys. Her name was misspelled in two instances in a previous version of this story.

TRIBUTE TO MARK WOODS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to congratulate my good friend Mr. Mark Woods. Mark is currently the superintendent of one of the Commonwealth of Kentucky's most important preserves of natural beauty, the Cumberland Gap National Historic Park, a post he's held for 16 years. The Cumberland Gap National Historic Park sits at the border of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia, although of course, the most breathtaking parts are within the Bluegrass State.

Kentuckians will be sorry to see Mark go due to his recent and much deserved promotion: Later this month, Mark will assume his new duties as superintendent of the Blue Ridge Parkway. The Blue Ridge Parkway runs for over 450 miles through Virginia and North Carolina along the Blue Ridge Mountains. It is the most visited attraction of the entire U.S. National Park Service—more than Yellowstone, Yosemite, or the Grand Canyon.

Mark is a 33-year veteran of the National Park Service and has worked in parks in South Carolina, Tennessee, and Georgia as well as Kentucky. I am sure his family is very proud of him for this career accomplishment. Although I will miss working with Mark in Kentucky, I am pleased that citizens everywhere can still benefit from his knowledge and experience when they visit our national parks.

I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Mr. Mark Woods for this opportunity and thanking him for his dedication to the National Park Service. Mr. Woods's career and accomplishments to date were recently profiled in a newspaper article. I ask unanimous consent that said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to appear as follows:

[From the Asheville Citizen-Times, Aug. 7, 2013]

SC NATIVE NAMED NEW PARKWAY SUPERINTENDENT

(By Karen Chávez)

ASHEVILLE.—A 33-year National Park Service veteran with Southern Appalachian roots has been chosen as the new superintendent of the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Mark Woods, 53, now superintendent at Cumberland Gap National Historic Park, which sits in Kentucky, Virginia and Tennessee, will take over leadership of the busiest national park site in the country September 22 at parkway headquarters in Asheville.

''Mark has got some great experience,'' said Bill Reynolds, National Park Service spokesman in Atlanta. ''He spent most of his career in the Southeast.''

Woods, who was raised in Greenville, S.C., received a bachelor's degree in sociology from Lander University in Greenwood, S.C., in 1982. He is married and has three children.

He began working as an interpretive ranger for the National Park Service in 1980 at parks including Ninety Six National Historic Site (Ninety Six, S.C.), Kings Mountain National Military Park (Blacksburg, S.C.), Andrew Johnson National Historic Site (Greeneville, Tenn.), and Cumberland Island National Seashore (St. Mary's, Ga.)

Woods will replace Phil Francis, who retired as superintendent of the parkway in April. Monika Mayr, deputy superintendent since 2009, has been acting superintendent since April, and had applied for the position.

The parkway has not had a female superintendent in its 78 years.

Mayr, a 30-year park service veteran, said she has known Woods for many years and thinks he will be a good fit.

''He's a very good leader,'' she said. ''He has always wanted to work at the parkway because he loves the resources here and he knows the staff is really good.''

Woods also gets a hearty endorsement from Francis, who oversaw the parkway for eight years and still lives in Asheville.

''I've known him over 20 years. He's well respected,'' Francis said.

''He's a very able leader of Cumberland Gap. It's not as big as the parkway, but he's already had to deal with some of the same issues on a different scale. Sequestration cuts happened at all national parks, so he's had to make those same kinds of decisions.''

The federal sequester forced all national parks to reduce their budgets by 5 percent for the remainder of the year, starting in March.

Woods will inherit the aftermath of the nearly $800,000 budget cut, which was accomplished through facility closures, cuts to seasonal and permanent staff, cutbacks on visitor services such as ranger programs and a decrease in the mowing operation and maintenance of the parkway's scenic overlooks.

He must also contend with a $450 million deferred maintenance backlog, which has been growing for more than a decade.

''Mark has a tremendous background in working with gateway communities,'' Reynolds said. ''He also has background in facility design and construction, viewshed protection, wilderness management and general management planning. A broad range of excellent knowledge and experience has made him well suited for this job.''

SIMILAR PARKS ON DIFFERENT SCALES

Woods has been superintendent of Cumberland Gap, known as the gateway to the western frontier, since 1997.

''Cumberland Gap is the first doorway to the West, the path that Daniel Boone and the pioneers used to access the West,'' said Carol Borneman, supervisory park ranger at Cumberland.

The park and the parkway have some similarities. Much like the parkway, Cumberland Gap sits in the Appalachian Mountains, and is steeped in Southern Appalachian history and culture.

Cumberland Gap was authorized by Congress in 1940 to preserve the natural gap through the mountain that pioneers used to reach the western frontier centuries ago. It contains 24,000 acres with nearly 85 miles of forested hiking trails. For 50 years, a major highway passed through the Gap.

But in one of the largest restoration projects undertaken by the National Park Service, Borneman said, a highway tunnel was built through the Gap in 1996, the old highway was ripped out and the Gap restored to its Daniel Boone days as a walking path. From one overlook in the park, Borneman said, the Smokies can be seen on a clear day.

The culture, history and views drew 860,000 visitors in 2012.

Things will likely seem a little more crowded for Woods when he gets to the Blue Ridge Parkway. The most visited of the more than 400 units of the National Park Service, including such popular parks as Yellowstone, Yosemite, the Grand Canyon and the Great Smoky Mountains national parks, the parkway had 15.2 million visitors in 2012.

The parkway stretches 469 miles from Shenandoah National Park in Virginia through the Blue Ridge Mountains, ending in Cherokee, and contains 81,000 acres of land and 1,200 miles of boundary.

Established in 1935 as a scenic motor road, cars and traffic continue to be one of its biggest issues. October is generally the busiest month on the parkway, and Woods will arrive just in time for the heavy fall foliage traffic.

He will also face a major closure in one of the parkway's most popular areas in the height of summer tourist season. A 20-mile stretch just north of Asheville, through the Craggy Gardens area to Mount Mitchell State Park, has been closed to traffic since July 12 due to slope failure, presumably from the excessive spring and summer rain, staff say.

Crews are now working on a temporary fix to open the roadway by Labor Day for the fall leaf-peeping traffic, then will close again while the road is permanently fixed.

Borneman said Cumberland Gap is sad to see Woods leave.

''He is an incredible superintendent, so in tune to park resources, and such a proponent of working with local communities,'' she said. ''The parkway is lucky to be getting him.''

ARIEL RIOS REFLECTING POOL

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I would like to recognize Ariel Rios, a man who made the ultimate sacrifice while protecting our country and who is being honored today at a special dedication ceremony here in Washington, DC.

On September 10, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—ATF—is honoring Special Agent Ariel Rios, who gave his life in the line of duty, by dedicating the Ariel Rios Reflecting Pool at the ATF Headquarters in Washington, DC.

On December 2, 1982, while conducting an undercover operation in support of an investigation into illegal drug and firearms violations, Agent Rios was shot and killed. At the time of his death, Agent Rios was 28 years old and had worked for ATF for 4 years. His killers were sentenced to life in prison, plus 50 years. Agent Rios was survived by his wife Elsie and their young children Eileen and Francisco.

Naming the reflecting pool at the ATF Headquarters, which is located at 99 New York Avenue NE, in honor of Agent Rios brings him home to his ATF family. This memorial will forever provide ATF employees with a place to honor and reflect on the life of an agent who made the ultimate sacrifice.

This dedication also provides an opportunity for us to honor all the brave men and women who wear the badge and put their lives on the line every day to protect this great Nation.

THE MISSING CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the Missing Children's Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2013.

This bill will reauthorize the efforts of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. This legislation will ensure that NCMEC will continue to be able to receive reports of missing children for law enforcement, provide DNA analysis to locate missing children, partner with the FBI and Department of Justice to combat child sex trafficking, fight child pornography. NCMEC also should be allowed to continue to perform its role as the congressionally-authorized national clearinghouse to assist missing and exploited children, working with agents from the FBI, Secret Service, Marshals Service, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the Postal Inspection Service, and the Naval Criminal Investigative Services.

There is a greater need than ever before for transparency and accountability when taxpayer moneys are granted to private, nonprofit, and other governmental agencies. I am pleased that the bill contains the accountability measures that I demand for all grants that are awarded by the Department of Justice. These include two audits of NCMEC use of these funds over the life of the reauthorization, penalties for misuse of funds, prohibition on receipt of funds by an organization that holds offshore accounts to avoid taxes, limitations on conference expenditures, and prohibition of the use of taxpayer funds to lobby for grant funding. These provisions will ensure that taxpayers can have confidence that their money will be used properly and for public purposes.

NCMEC performs important services to combat terrible crimes against vulnerable victims. With the inclusion of transparency and accountability safeguards, I look forward to the enactment of this legislation in advance of the expiration of the current authorization.

TRIBUTE TO NICK GEALE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I am pleased today to praise the service of Nick Geale, who was until July the director of oversight and investigations on the minority staff of the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions—HELP—Committee, of which I am ranking member. In July, Nick was confirmed by this body as a member of the National Mediation Board, where he will surely continue his hard work, thoughtful deliberation, and fair application of the law on behalf of workers and employers in the railroad and airline industries.

Nick joined the HELP Committee in 2009 under the previous ranking member, Senator MIKE ENZI of Wyoming, for whom he first served as oversight and investigations counsel before becoming director of oversight and investigations. I was fortunate that he agreed to stay when I became the Ranking Member and appreciate his service. In his role here, Nick investigated waste, fraud, and abuse in government programs and agencies, often working with agency inspectors general and the Government Accountability Office in that capacity. He also led the HELP Committee's investigations into the implementation of Federal programs and to ensure proper enforcement of Federal laws. He thoroughly evaluated and advised the HELP Committee on the President's nominees and assisted the HELP Committee's staff in policy matters and hearings.

Nick came to the HELP Committee from the U.S. Department of Labor, where he served as an attorney to the Solicitor and then as counsel to the Deputy Secretary under the leadership of Secretary Elaine L. Chao. In both those roles, he assisted the agency in implementing labor policies for the more than 180 laws under its jurisdiction and helped manage the Department's 15,000 employees. Nick also has a distinguished academic background. He graduated cum laude from Claremont McKenna College in 1996 and received a J.D. from Georgetown University Law Center in 1999.

Maybe more important than noting his worthy accomplishments in public service is to note his character and his attitude toward his work, the taxpayers he served, and the colleagues he worked alongside. Nick worked hard to ensure that every taxpayer is treated fairly. With his practical experience in labor and employment matters, litigation, and alternative dispute resolution, Nick has been an eloquent and effective help to the committee. His dedication and friendship to those he worked with, on both sides of the aisle, is a testament to the character he has and will continue to have as he transitions to this next phase of his career.

I thank him for the passionate service on behalf of the HELP Committee, the U.S. Senate, and the American taxpayer. I wish him the best in his service on the National Mediation Board.

WORLD WAR II VETERANS VISIT

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, today I wish to pay tribute to the outstanding military service of a group of incredible Coloradans. At critical times in our Nation's history, these veterans each played a role in defending the world from tyranny, truly earning their reputation as guardians of peace and democracy through their service and sacrifice. Now, thanks to Honor Flight, these combat veterans came to Washington, DC, to visit the national memorials built to honor those who served and those who fell. They have also come to share their experiences with later generations and to pay tribute to those who gave their lives. I am proud to welcome them here, and I join with all Coloradans in thanking them for all they have done for us.

I also want to thank the volunteers from Honor Flight of Northern Colorado who made this trip possible. These volunteers are great Coloradans in their own right, and their mission to bring our veterans to Washington, DC, is truly commendable.

I wish to publicly recognize the veterans who visited our Nation's Capital, many seeing for the first time the memorials built as a tribute to their selfless service. Today, I honor these Colorado veterans on their visit to Washington, DC, and I join them in paying tribute to those who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of liberty.

Veterans from World War II include: Donald Benson, Joe Blossom, Hobert Bodkins, Robert Beuker, George Carlson, Wayne Clausen, Maurice Dragoo, Homer Dye, Karl Easterly, James English, George Flaig, Stuart Gordon, Dale Gruber, Frank Gunter, Vern Hammond, Robert Henderson, Otto Hindman, Lawrence Jackson, John Jobson, Elvin Kahl, Doward Kilmer, Thomas Kokjer, Edward Kooper, Raymond Kusmirek, Ralph Leckler, George Lichter, Lyle Lukas, Alfred Marez, Richard Marquart, Maregito Martinez, LeRoy Marx, Hugh McGinty, Damon McMahan, Robert Minnick, Allen Oakley, Gerald Oakley, Vernon Rand, Gerald Rennels, Carol Rhoades, Elmer Rose, Donald Smith, Walter Sparrow, George Stager, Clarence Streit, Richard Tedesco, Sr., Rueben Ulrich, Howard Walter, Raymond Yost, Robert Yost, Thomas Youree, and Joseph Zito.

Veterans from the Korean War include: Charles Adams, Joseph Beaulieu, David Beldus, John Bevins, James Blue, William Cecil, Thomas Clements, Clifford Closson, Donald Dalton, Stanley Davies, Jerry Delcamp, Leonard Dickey Jr., Robert Eddy, Dale Erickson, Ann Evans, Lemuel Evans, Frank Faucett, Byron Foster, Kent Foutz, Jerry Galpern, Wayne Gibb, Thomas Gordon, Oscar Haake, Doyle Hall, William Harte, William Hitchcock, Claire Hoffman, Raymond Horton, Carl Houkom, Bennett Houston, Eugene Johnson, Richard Kekar, Marvin Kembel, Ralph Knoll, Tom Mandis, George Mason, Alvin Mosch, Doyle Myers, Richard Oversteg, David Owen, Johnnie Prock, Duane Purcell, Herbert Reimer, John Rinne, John Rust, Jr., Darrel Schafer, Leonard Schmitz, Virgil Scott, Robert Scott, Herbert Shevins, Wayne Small, Frank Stiver, Robert Stoll, Bernard Streit, Ernest Stumpf, Walter Sutton, Norman Swanson, Arthur Trevarton, Junior Weisshaar, Raymond Williams, George Wilson and Harry Wisell.

Veterans from other conflicts include: Jerol Arguello, Zachary

Dinsmore, William Frank, Allen Laible, Dennis Lee, Lonnie Sebold, Allan Silk, Saxton Wiley and Salvador Velasquez.

Our Nation asked a great deal of these individuals—to leave their families to fight in unknown lands and put their lives on the line. Each one of these brave Coloradans bravely answered the call. They served our country with courage, and in return, let us ensure they are shown the honor and appreciation they deserve. Please join me in thanking these Colorado veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Northern Colorado for their tremendous service.

RECOGNIZING THE SUMMIT PROJECT

Mr. KING. Madam President, I wish to commend the Summit Project and its leader Maj. David Cote for their meaningful effort to sustain and honor the memories of Maine's veterans who have fallen since September 11, 2001. Founded on Memorial Day, 2013, the Summit Project aims to carry stone memorials representing each of those heroes up mountains in Maine beginning on Memorial Day, 2014, and continuing annually. This thoughtful endeavor is already helping Gold Star families heal and will undoubtedly preserve the memory of their loved ones as the years pass.

Maine servicemembers and their families have made monumental sacrifices during the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq. To date, 68 Mainers or members of the Armed Forces with ties to Maine have made the ultimate sacrifice during the wars in those countries. I am profoundly grateful for the service of these brave Americans and for the service of their fellow soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who continue to protect our freedom on battlefields far from home.

Preserving a living memory of our fallen heroes is especially important in my home State of Maine. As Major Cote writes on the Summit Project's Web site, ''Mainers are veterans. Maine's patriotism and commitment to service in our Armed Forces is nothing short of extraordinary.''

The Department of Veterans Affairs reports that 130,196 veterans live in our State, which means that nearly one in every ten Mainers is a veteran. These distinguished citizens, their families, and their friends know that, to paraphrase the words of President Kennedy, ''A nation reveals itself not only by the men and women that it produces, but also by the men and women it honors, the men and women it remembers.'' The Summit Project reveals the character of Maine: a character notable for its integrity, service to others, honor, and loyalty.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RIDE OF THE BROTHERHOOD

• Mr. VITTER. Madam President, today I wish to honor a very special organization, Ride of the Brotherhood. Established earlier this year by Air Force veteran and Louisiana native Ed Lewis, Ride of the Brotherhood, seeks to raise funds for our Nation's veterans and children's charities. In March 2015, the organization will hold its first major event called ''The Return'' to honor the 50-year anniversary of those who bravely served in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War.

On March 8, 1965, American troops landed on China Beach and marched to Da Nang Air Force Base to secure the air base, freeing South Vietnamese troops fighting against the Viet Cong. Those 3,500 Marines were the first combat troops dispatched to support the Saigon government's efforts to defeat the Communist insurgency.

To mark this occasion, 10 Vietnam veterans will travel on motorcycles from Louisiana to California, fly to Vietnam, and ride along the coast stopping at important locations to pay respects to those lost during the war. On March 8, 2013, the 50-year anniversary, the group intends to be at China Beach before traveling to Da Nang. Upon their return, they will ride cross-country from California to the Vietnam Memorial here in Washington, DC, before returning to New Orleans for a ''Welcome Home'' celebration.

''The Return'' will provide closure for those veterans making the trip, and for some, their only opportunity to see the great memorials dedicated to their service. Because the entire journey will be documented, family, friends, and many others will have an opportunity to witness the experiences of the men who fought in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. In addition, the trip will highlight the positive relations that now exist between the United States and the Vietnamese people.

I am humbled to have the opportunity to express my appreciation to Mr. Ed Lewis for his service to our country and I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these great Americans and thanking them for their devotion to our Nation.•

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001—PM 17

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared in Proclamation 7463 with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, is to continue in effect for an additional year.

The terrorist threat that led to the declaration on September 14, 2001, of a national emergency continues. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect after September 14, 2013, the national emergency with respect to the terrorist threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 10, 2013.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

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

H.R. 2844. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

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

H.R. 2844. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following measure was discharged from the Committee on Finance and referred as indicated:

S. 1427. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment:

S. 289. A bill to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration (Rept. No. 113–89).

S. 511. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to enhance the Small Business Investment Company Program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–90).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with amendments:

S. 537. A bill to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–91).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments and an amendment to the title:

S. 28. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in Utah to Brigham Young University, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–92).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 155. A bill to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Denali (Rept. No. 113–93).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 159. A bill to designate the Wovoka Wilderness and provide for certain land conveyances in Lyon County, Nevada, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–94).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 255. A bill to withdraw certain Federal land and interests in that land from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under the mineral and geothermal leasing laws (Rept. No. 113–95).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 285. A bill to designate the Valles Caldera National Preserve as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–96).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 327. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with State foresters authorizing State foresters to provide certain forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services (Rept. No. 113–97).

S. 340. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–98).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 341. A bill to designate certain lands in San Miguel, Ouray, and San Juan Counties, Colorado, as wilderness, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–99).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 353. A bill to designate certain land in the State of Oregon as wilderness, to make additional wild and scenic river designations in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–100).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 360. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service (Rept. No. 113–101).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 486. A bill to authorize pedestrian and motorized vehicular access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–102).

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 718. A bill to create jobs in the United States by increasing United States exports to Africa by at least 200 percent in real dollar value within 10 years, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–103).

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. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1489. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to notify the taxpayer each time the taxpayer's information is accessed by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1490. A bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1491. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to improve United States-Israel energy cooperation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1492. A bill for the relief of Vichai Sae Tung (also known as Chai Chaowasaree); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1493. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage the use of dispensing techniques that foster efficiency and reduce wasteful dispensing of outpatient prescription drugs in long-term care facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S.J. Res. 22. A joint resolution to promote a diplomatic solution in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. Res. 221. A resolution designating the week of October 7 through October 13, 2013, as ''Naturopathic Medicine Week'' to recognize the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 150

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 150, a bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes.

S. 168

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 168, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit discrimination in the payment of wages on account of sex, race, or national origin, and for other purposes.

S. 209

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 209, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 313, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 322

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to set the United States on track to ensure children are ready to learn when they begin kindergarten.

S. 325

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico

(Mr. HEINRICH) 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. 357

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the ''Doolittle Tokyo Raiders'', for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 501

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 501, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) 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. 602

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 602, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 623, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 669

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 669, a bill to make permanent the Internal Revenue Service Free File program.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 833

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 833, a bill to amend subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to provide education for homeless children and youths, and for other purposes.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 915, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to update reporting requirements for institutions of higher education and provide for more accurate and complete data on student retention, graduation, and earnings outcomes at all levels of postsecondary enrollment.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1181

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 1208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1208, a bill to require meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 1251, a bill to establish programs with respect to childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer.

S. 1306

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1306, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1441

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1441, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate water leasing and water transfers to promote conservation and efficiency.

S. 1455

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1455, a bill to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income is operational.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1487

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1487, a bill to limit the availability of tax credits and reductions in cost-sharing under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to individuals who receive health insurance coverage pursuant to the provisions of a Taft-Hartley plan.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1488, a bill to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 128

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 128, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that supporting seniors and individuals with disabilities is an important responsibility of the United States, and that a comprehensive approach to expanding and supporting a strong home care workforce and making long-term services and supports affordable and accessible in communities is necessary to uphold the right of seniors and individuals with disabilities in the United States to a dignified quality of life.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1491. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to improve United States-Israel energy cooperation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak for a few minutes about an exciting new area of collaboration between the United States and Israel, our critical ally and friend in the Middle East. Especially given the current state of affairs in the Middle East, the United States' clear and unyielding support for Israel is more important now than ever before. For the past few years, I have been a leader in the effort to enhance US-Israel collaboration on energy development, which is why I am excited today to introduce a bill that will expand this critical relationship, along with Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI.

In December 2010, Israel made the largest natural gas discovery in the world in the past decade off its coast in the Mediterranean. The discovery, known as the Leviathan field, is estimated at 16 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, bringing Israel's total natural gas reserves to an estimated 30 trillion cubic feet. This will likely be able to satisfy Israel's domestic gas demand with enough left over to export for years to come—in fact, it is estimated that if only half of this natural gas was produced, Israel would have 100 years of its natural gas needs met.

Not only is the Leviathan discovery a game changer for Israel, both economically and geopolitically, but it is also an incredible chance for the U.S. to share our energy expertise to support a critical ally while creating economic opportunities here at home. The Gulf Coast, which provides one third of all domestically produced oil in the nation, arguably has the most advanced offshore energy industry in the world; Israel, until very recently has had almost none. With limited domestic production capacity, a non-existent regulatory framework, and a lack of related academic programs, Israel can greatly benefit from collaboration with the U.S., and we are uniquely qualified to lead this effort to help Israel successfully develop this natural resource. As Israel is a leader in the research and development, hi-tech and startup spaces, enhanced collaboration between the two countries can be mutually beneficial.

The United States-Israel Energy Cooperation Enhancement Bill recognizes the important relationship and potential for further collaboration between the United States and Israel on energy development, including natural gas and alternative fuels, and seeks to bolster that relationship by encouraging increased cooperation in the academic, business, governmental, and other sectors.

The bill first recognizes energy collaboration with Israel as a strategic interest of the United States and officially encourages collaboration between the U.S. National Science Foundation and the Israel Science Foundation. It then further encourages cooperation between both countries' academic communities in energy innovation technology, technology transfer, and analysis of the geopolitical implications of new natural resource development. It also urges business development engagement in the private sectors and regular engagement between the two countries' relevant agencies, departments and ministries to share best practices.

Additionally, the United States-Israel Energy Cooperation Enhancement Bill expands two already existing joint grant making programs, the Binational Industrial Research and Development Program, BIRD, and the Binational Science Foundation, BSF. Under the bill, these two programs would now include projects focused on natural gas, which are expected given Israel's recent discoveries, as well as entrepreneurial development and the advanced hi-tech sector. The legislation also reauthorizes the BIRD and BSF programs through fiscal year 2024.

Finally, the bill allows for the authorization of a United States-Israel Offshore Technology Center to further academic and technology research and development collaboration. This is the direct result of numerous conversations, meetings, and visits I have had over the past few years, and I am especially excited about the potential of this type of formal academic collaboration. Israeli universities have some of the world's leading engineering departments, but have no petroleum engineering faculty. Imagine the synergy if we could combine Israeli engineering expertise with our universities, who have the leading petroleum engineering departments in the world.

This bill builds off of my previous efforts to enhance collaboration between the United States and Israel on energy development and exploration. For several years, I have been working to strengthen the relationship between our two countries and to help our domestic energy industry. In October 2011, with the help of the Department

of Commerce and the Southwest Louisiana Economic Development Alliance, I organized the first ever oil and gas trade mission to Israel and brought 12 Louisiana oil and gas companies to the region. The mission was such a success that the Department of Commerce and I ran another trip in October 2012 that brought 15 American companies and universities. Additionally, in June of 2012, I hosted a delegation of 10 high-ranking Israeli officials in Washington and Louisiana to meet with US industry experts and federal officials, including then Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar. The delegation also attended the Central Gulf of Mexico oil and gas lease sale in New Orleans and visited Port Fourchon and the Liquified Natural Gas, LNG, facility in Cameron Parish. By seeing our work first-hand and learning about the US regulatory framework, they left with a keener understanding of our industry.

The United States-Israel Energy Cooperation Enhancement Bill will continue to advance this important goal. Through energy collaboration, academic cooperation, and continued government dialogue, we will create jobs for our domestic oil and gas industry and support a critical ally in the Middle East in its quest for energy independence and security. I thank my colleagues Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for their leadership on this issue and for cosponsoring the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1491

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

SECTION 1. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENERGY COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 917(a) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''renewable'' and inserting ''covered'';

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking ''possible many'' and inserting ''possible—

''(A) many'';

(B) by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) significant contributions to the development of renewable energy and energy efficiency through the established programs of the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation;'';

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking ''renewable'' and inserting ''covered''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking ''renewable'' and inserting ''covered''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) United States-Israel energy cooperation, and the development of natural resources by Israel, are strategic interests of the United States;

''(9) Israel is a strategic partner of the United States in water technology;

''(10) the United States can play a role in assisting Israel with regional safety and security issues;

''(11) the National Science Foundation of the United States should collaborate with the Israel Science Foundation;

''(12) the United States and Israel should strive to develop more robust academic cooperation in energy innovation technology and engineering, water science, technology transfer, and analysis of geopolitical implications of new natural resource development and associated areas;

''(13) the United States supports the goals of the Alternative Fuels Administration of Israel;

''(14) the United States strongly urges open dialogue and continued mechanisms for regular engagement and encourages further cooperation between applicable departments, agencies, ministries, institutions of higher education, and the private sector of the United States and Israel on energy security issues, including—

''(A) identifying policy priorities associated with the development of natural resources of Israel;

''(B) discussing best practices to secure cyber energy infrastructure;

''(C) best practice sharing;

''(D) leveraging natural gas to positively impact regional stability;

''(E) improving energy efficiency and the overall performance of water technologies through research and development in water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, and other water treatment refiners;

''(F) technical and environmental management of deep-water exploration and production;

''(G) coastal protection and restoration;

''(H) academic outreach and engagement;

''(I) private sector and business development engagement;

''(J) regulatory consultations;

''(K) leveraging alternative transportation fuels and technologies; and

''(L) any other areas determined appropriate by United States and Israel; and

''(15) the United States acknowledges the achievements and importance of the Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation (BIRD) and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF) and supports continued multiyear funding to ensure the continuity of the programs of the Foundations.''.

(b) TYPES OF ENERGY.—Section 917(b)(2) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) natural gas energy, including natural gas projects conducted by or in conjunction with the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation;

''(I) improvement of energy efficiency and the overall performance of water technologies through research and development in water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, and other water treatment refiners; and

''(J) conventional and unconventional oil and gas technologies.''.

(c) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—Section 917(b)(3) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''energy efficiency or renewable'' and inserting ''covered''.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 917 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d);

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

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

''(c) INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, subject to appropriations, enter into cooperative agreements supporting and enhancing dialogue and planning involving international partnerships between the Department, including National Laboratories of the Department, and the Government of Israel and its ministries, offices, and institutions.

''(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Secretary may not pay more than 50 percent of Federal share of the costs described in paragraph (1).

''(3) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary may submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an annual report that describes—

''(A) actions taken to carry out this subsection; and

''(B) any projects under this subsection for which the Secretary requests funding.

''(d) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL CENTER.—The Secretary may establish a joint United States-Israel Center based in an area of the United States with the experience, knowledge, and expertise in offshore energy development to further dialogue and collaboration to develop more robust academic cooperation in energy innovation technology and engineering, water science, technology transfer, and analysis of geopolitical implications of new natural resource development and associated areas.''.

(e) TERMINATION.—Subsection (e) of section 917 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337) (as redesignated by subsection (d)(2)) is amended by striking ''the date that is 7 years after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''September 30, 2024''.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S.J. Res. 22. A joint resolution to promote a diplomatic solution in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, approximately 9 days ago most of us were on call and being briefed by the administration on what was evolving and how desperate and dire the situation was. At the time it was being proposed as an imminent strike that had to be done for the defense of this Nation, and we listened to that.

Immediately after that conversation we had with many Senators and Secretary Kerry, my dear friend Senator HEITKAMP called me and said: I would hope we have another option. We were looking for an option. The only thing we had before us was a vote to either support an imminent strike or not support a strike. It has been proposed if we don't show the strength of this great country of ours that it could weaken our standing in the world and our intentions might not be taken seriously the next time and also weaken the Presidency, which none of us want to do, no matter what side of the fence you might be on.

So we kept looking and talking. I canceled all my appointments in West

Virginia and Senator HEITKAMP did the same in North Dakota and we came back as soon as possible. We attended every meeting, every briefing. I went to my Armed Services Committee meeting and also the Foreign Relations Committee meeting to hear the testimony from all of the people in the administration who were making their case.

At the end of the day, it still did not rise to the level, in my mind and I think in the mind of Senator HEITKAMP as well, that we were at a point to where it would be of imminent danger to the United States. So with that, we brought all the people together, and Senator HEITKAMP—and I want her to chime in here—and myself kept pushing and pushing the people who had the knowledge and who had been down that road before—military leaders, past and present, diplomats, and also think tanks—and we finally came up with something that could be done.

I would defer to Senator HEITKAMP on this, but we kept saying if the problem is chemical weapons, why haven't we addressed that? All we knew was there was an imminent strike. We were not going to be able to take out, nor did we intend to take out or change the regime. We could not put boots on the ground, nor did we have a desire—nobody had a desire—for our military men and women to go back in. So we couldn't secure those weapons.

Senator HEITKAMP might want to say how we came to the position we came to and why we felt it was so important.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I think the first thing to talk about is the ability, first and foremost, to look at the mission and look at the event that led to the need for a discussion in this body and a discussion in this country about our relationship in Syria, and that was the use of chemical weapons by the Asad regime in their own home country against their own people.

We know that activity is not only a crime against the Syrian people, but it is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against an international standard that has been in place since World War I and has been greatly honored because of the devastating effects of using chemical weapons.

So when Senator MANCHIN and I looked at this—and we had long discussions with experts in the region—our first concern was securing those chemical weapons and what we could do to make sure those weapons would never again be used on any citizen of Syria and that we would not encourage or in any way give permission to another country to engage in that activity. That is fundamentally the greatest interest we have in securing some kind of resolution in the Congress—to address that concern.

Unfortunately, what we saw was not a targeted resolution that addressed that specific problem. Plus, what we were presented with when we returned were two options: Do nothing, which both of us concluded we could not let an attack such as this go unresponded to. So do nothing or agree to imminent strikes, and that was not an option either of us saw as appropriate, nor was that an option we could agree to, so we looked for common ground, listening not only to the experts in the administration—the diplomats, the military experts, the national security folks—but also bringing a broader group of people together to discuss what is our mission, how do we accomplish this. The result of all of that is the resolution the Senator has before him, the resolution he and I have advanced for a discussion in this body.

It seems critical to me that 1 week ago the interjecting of the chemical weapons ban and the Chemical Weapons Convention into this discussion in a very meaningful way, looking at what is in fact international law, was absolutely critical. Today, we have a very fluid and much different landscape diplomatically. We would like to think these kinds of discussions that have occurred all across the country have driven this, along with the President's discussion with Putin, along with the administration's efforts.

So today we have a situation where we are glad to see some involvement, we are glad to see some movement, but it is absolutely critical we remind everyone that actions speak louder than words. We cannot trust, I don't think, agreements between Russia or Syria until we actually see Syria surrendering these weapons. But today we have an option on the table that is what we call the Manchin–Heitkamp alternative resolution, which can in fact engage us in a broader discussion, engage the international community.

I would say that truly was the motivation behind our work. I think the Senator would agree with that.

Mr. MANCHIN. I sure do. First of all, we all applaud President Obama for bringing it to Congress. We think this is the right place for these types of decisions, with the consequences we are facing and what the repercussions could be. But we have come to a conclusion that any type of imminent strike and the reaction from that would be greater than inaction right now. But doing nothing is unacceptable, which is how we came to this.

Basically, we call this the Chemical Weapons Control Act. The thing about the Chemical Weapons Convention, we felt—and we have heard from diplomats on this—this was the proper course. It was basically giving the Asad regime 45 days. Our resolution is very straightforward. The Asad regime has 45 days to sign and comply, and that means to identify, to secure, and to start eliminating and destroying. He cannot use, nor can he continue to produce, these types of weapons.

Also, in that 45-day period, we have asked the administration and the President to lay forth a plan for Congress to evaluate what Syria would look like at the end. If they do not sign, what are we to do and how would Syria look? If they do sign and that still hasn't brought any peace and an end to a civil war, that needs to be looked at also.

We have all heard from our constituents. In talking to our colleagues we have even heard a lot more. We have had some who have said: Listen, we don't want a strike under any circumstances. No way on God's green Earth do we believe a strike will produce anything but repercussions.

I have said this, and the Senator and I have talked about this: If you believe that money or military might would change the course and direction of that part of the world, which we define as the Middle East or North Africa, then we would have had success by now. We have spent 12 years—the longest war in our history—and we have spent over $1.6 trillion and the results have not been beneficial whatsoever and we have lost thousands of lives.

I have also said being a superpower means more than showing the rest of the world we have the super might to use whenever we feel it is necessary. Being a superpower comes with not only having the super military power, it comes with having the super negotiation ability, the super diplomacy, the super patience, and the super humanitarian aid, as needed. We have the ability to do all of that.

That is what we have asked for. Now we are seeing an evolving situation—not only in 24 hours, but with every 24 minutes it seems like something is changing. The Russians have said they would ask Asad's regime in Syria to sign or be involved. Syria says they have accepted. We have heard now they have said they will comply and join the CWC. These are the changes we have to continue to try to bring to fruition.

On that, we are very happy. I know the Senator and I have spoken about that—and our colleagues are looking at different options—that we didn't have different options as of Monday morning. There were no options. It was are you going to vote to strike or not vote to strike. I am pleased we are moving and I think cooler heads will prevail.

I believe the President is open to making sure the players are sincere and real, meaning what they are saying. I believe now that they have announced to the entire world, the international world, that we will sign and be honest brokers, let's put them on the spot and see if they will sign that and be part of this and become part of the 21st century, if you will.

I have and I will continue to work with my colleague. I think the Geneva Protocol of 1925 prohibits the use of chemical and biological weapons in conflict, but it did not go far enough. We know that. Syria signed the Geneva Protocol in December of 1969. They signed that one, but then they would not and have not been a signatory of the Chemical Weapons Convention of 1993. That is what we are speaking of. That one is the modern-day equivalent of the Geneva Protocol. The international community began negotiating

the CWC in 1980 to close the loopholes of the Geneva Protocol. The CWC opened for signature in 1963 and after the required 65 ratifications were received, entered into force in 1997. We have, I think, five countries that have not signed. Most countries, 191, have signed. That is what we are asking for them to comply with, which we think is the best way, because there is an implementation organization which oversees it and it is not the United States or Russia or not any other country taking the lead but basically it is a way to have the entire international community come back into play.

Ms. HEITKAMP. To add another point to what Senator MANCHIN has spoken about, which is that the results have not been satisfactory—I think the other point we need to make is the results of all that interaction over this decade-plus of activity in this region have not been what was promised. It has made the American people perhaps cynical and very hesitant to rely on what is being said today.

As one of the great honors, but also amazing pieces of sadness in my first days of being a Senator-elect, I attended two funerals for two National Guardsmen who were killed in action in Afghanistan. I remember sitting at the funerals and remember telling myself: Before you vote ever to engage in that kind of conflict, you absolutely need to look at alternatives. You owe it to our men and women in uniform. You owe it to the people of this country who have lost not only the lives of their brothers and sisters and family and friends but the people who have also invested American treasure.

What we are seeking is a discussion, a broader discussion beyond two opposite and unacceptable alternatives. What we are seeing this week—much to our appreciation—is in fact not just our proposal but other proposals coming forth, a broader discussion about what all the options are, and taking a look at how we can work together as a United States government, speak with one voice, and walk together to resolve this conflict.

We cannot ignore that we have a national security interest in working together. We have a national security interest in addressing and resolving the current issues in front of us. That discussion cannot be done among a small group of Senators. It cannot be done in back rooms with a promise of ''trust us,'' because some of that trust has been broken over time. So a broad, open discussion as we are having here today I think is absolutely critical to reestablishing Americans' trust that we can in fact make the right decision in their interests and really in the interests of protecting our servicemen from chemical weapon attacks.

That is obviously a great concern of ours. We need to continue to have this dialog and we need some kind of response. The question is how measured and what that response should be.

I have very much appreciated the Senator's willingness to work with me and I thank the rest of the Members who have approached us who want to talk about this proposal and other proposals for their willingness to broaden their thinking about what those options are.

Mr. MANCHIN. I am so proud to be working on this with the Senator. Our staffs have worked well together. They are most competent and they have done a yeoman job. The resolution we have come with basically is the only one out there, an option today that basically controls the chemical weapons. It actually controls these chemical weapons from ever being used on another human being—which we all deplore. With that, maybe we can help, now, move on to trying to help resolve this civil war. The carnage is unbelievable.

They said there were 99,000 people killed in Syria with conventional weapons and 1,000 with chemicals. To me, every person is a life we could save, we ought to try to save. With that being said, we have to give them a chance to come be involved, and that is what we have done.

At this time last week we never thought we would have been here. This time 2 days ago we would not have thought we could be here. But we are moving in the right direction.

Let me make it clear what the resolution the Senator and our staffs have worked on does. The section, our title, is this, basically:

> Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

The section of our coining, this section of our title

> . . . may be cited as the ''Chemical Weapons Control and Accountability Resolution of 2013.''

Basically exactly what it says. The statement of policy is this:

> It is the policy of the United States that
>
> (1) the Government of Syria must become a signatory to the Chemical Weapons Convention and take concrete steps to comply with the terms and conditions of the Convention;
>
> (2) the failure by the government of Bashar al-Assad to sign and comply with the Convention clearly demonstrates a willful disregard of international norms on the use of chemical weapons; and
>
> (3) if the Government of Syria does not sign and comply with the convention within 45 days after the date of the enactment of this resolution, all elements of national power will be considered by the United States Government.

That reaffirms the war powers the President has. I know there are some who do not believe that is constitutional or do not believe it is law, but we have checked it and researched it, and it is. We reconfirm that. It does not say that imminent strikes will happen at the end of 45 days. It will be up to the President to determine whether negotiations are moving in the right direction, if all players are being sincere in coming on board, but it gives him the chance to be the President, to do whatever he is elected to do. Whomever he or she may be, you want the President's office to be able to exercise the powers they have by law. That is what we have done here.

Everybody has a different approach. Some may say 45 days or you don't need that. Fine. We are open to all that. We have said that before. But the experts who helped us put this together put in timetables they believed were reasonable and believed they were attainable.

Ms. HEITKAMP. There are some who may question whether this is capitulation or whether in fact this is a lack of showing of American unity. How would the Senator respond to those concerns?

Mr. MANCHIN. We have heard our colleagues and had some good conversations with our colleagues. We have had other people saying for real, all you are doing is trying to stall.

I said no. I don't believe anyone really questions the might of the government. I don't think it weakens the U.S. Government, to show super restraint, knowing the volatility of that part of the world.

Also, past experience in my State of West Virginia—and I know in the great State of North Dakota—we know when you try something and put in so much effort trying to change that part of the world and have not had the success, nowhere near, and spent $1.6 trillion and the sacrifice of Americans—maybe that is not something we should repeat. We all know that. We get no support basically from our constituents.

Those of us who are privy to all these high-powered meetings, if you will, have not been convinced that there will be change. With that being said, I say to my friends, if you believe anyone would discount the might of this Nation? I don't think so. The resolve of us to protect our country and our Americans? I don't think so. Or to support our allies, our true friends and allies? I don't think so.

But you know, back home we have a saying: Sometimes you don't have a dog in the fight. We can't really find a friend in that fight. That is the problem. That is the hard sell. With that being said—I have said this before—the Arab League, they should step forward. That is in their backyard. We should give all the support. We have humanitarian aid. We will give all the support we possibly can, but they need to take the lead. It cannot always be the Americans being the policemen of the world and everyone saying: OK, call 911, which goes right to Washington. They will take care of it.

I discount it when they start saying it doesn't show your strength, we might not have that strength of reputation or it might weaken the President. No, I don't think so. Not at all.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I think what we would say to the enemies of this country: Do not take from this democratic process and discussion a lack of resolve. We will stand together shoulder to shoulder. This is the process the Constitution gave us and the President

has asked us to engage in. It shows the strength of this country, that we can have open debate, open disagreements, but at the end of the day we will stand together and stand strongly against our enemies. There should be no comfort taken in any way, shape, or form by the enemies of our country that it somehow weakens our country. In fact it strengthens our country to have this discussion and then stand shoulder to shoulder together.

I do want to mention that during those times last week when we were attending the classified briefings, and a lot of those briefings were bicameral as well as bipartisan—I know we have that reputation today of being hyperpartisan and we cannot have meaningful and open discussion, it degenerates into pettiness and partisanship. I can tell you from my experience of sitting through every one of those briefings what I heard was reasoned discussion. What I heard was rational questioning. What I heard was an equal measure of restraint on both the Democrat and the Republican side and a search for common answers and commonality. It was that discussion that led us to introducing this type of resolution.

For those who say this is just another example of dysfunctionality, it is too bad they could not look in at those discussions because I think they would have seen a Congress that was very engaged. They would have seen individual Members who were not looking to score political points but were looking for information so they could exercise the judgment that their people, their districts, or their States elected them to exercise.

That is the process going through. It is a critical process but it cannot be done yes or no, no other options, and we are not going to have a broader discussion. That is why we are grateful for what is happening on the ground. We will wait to see if it is real. We will wait to see. It is not enough—talk is never enough. We have to see action.

But in the meantime we will continue to have these discussions about what is in America's national security interests and how we exercise our collective will with a resolution that reflects our values and our commitment to this country and its national security.

Mr. MANCHIN. I believe that as the world watches what is unfolding now, they are watching a superpower make a decision. We are using super restraint. We are using super compassion, if you will. But we are super resolved and we have the super might to do what we need to do. I don't think anyone should take that lightly.

I do not think anyone would take for granted that we will not defend this country and every citizen of this country with everything we have and try to spread humanity, if you will, all over the world. But it takes more than us as we move outside the borders of the United States of America. We need an international community working with us. We need some of them stepping to the plate; not just the rhetoric that we hear but basic stuff. We need the United Nations to be functioning again, to have a functioning role and have a strong support role and be able to step to the plate and do it in a fashion that protects the civilized world. Those are the things we have asked for.

I think this gives it a chance. Today we have seen a breakthrough, if President Asad has said: I will sign and I will be a member and I will comply and I will have inspectors come in and I will make sure these weapons are secure and we will start destroying them, taking them off the shelf. Russia can play a part in that. They can pull their ships up, load them up, take them out, take them to a secured area. That is getting them out of that part of the world, and then hopefully we can get people working together to stop the war we have, to stop the carnage, too.

It starts here. People are looking to the United States and I think they have been looking for the leadership we have been able to give, not just in the military and not just in financial, but in some good, solid, concrete decisions that bring this suffering that is going on in Syria to an end.

I am very proud to work with the Senator from North Dakota on this issue. We are asking all of our colleagues to be involved in any way, shape, or form. We will work with them. If there is anyone who has ideas that can make this better and an even more perfect document, then we are all for that. I know the Senator from North Dakota feels that way, and I know her team feels that way also.

I thank Senator HEITKAMP for the work she has done and also the friend she has been. I believe we are close to getting this in the right direction where cooler heads prevail, and I think the world will be safer.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for the work he has done and the leadership he has shown. I believe that when we work together, collaborate, and actually begin the discussion about what is in America's national security interest and how we can fashion a position and a resolution that reflects that national security interest and open the opportunity for a broader dialog—not just two choices but a broader dialog—we can build consensus in this body. If we can build consensus in this body and if we can work forward to build consensus in America, we can, in fact, move this issue forward, and it might be an example of what we can do with our future.

Again, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his participation, inclusion, and the work he has done. I believe it has not only offered a very significant alternative, but it has also set an example of where we can go.

Mr. MANCHIN. I don't believe military action is going to correct what is going on with Syria. It is going to be diplomacy and democracy that will hopefully work there. We are trying to put that forward first. More people are coming on board, and we appreciate that. We thank all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

This is not a partisan issue. It truly has not been a partisan issue, and it won't be a partisan issue. This is an American issue that involves all of us, and it is a world issue. The world has great interest, but they also have to have participation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 221—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 7 THROUGH OCTOBER 13, 2013, AS ''NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE WEEK'' TO RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE IN PROVIDING SAFE, EFFECTIVE, AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

Ms. MIKULSKI submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 221

Whereas, in the United States, more than 75 percent of health care costs are due to preventable chronic illnesses, including high blood pressure, which affects 88,000,000 people in the United States, and diabetes, which affects 26,000,000 people in the United States;

Whereas nearly two-thirds of adults in the United States are overweight or obese and, consequently, at risk for serious health conditions, such as high blood pressure, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, arthritis, and depression;

Whereas 70 percent of people in the United States experience physical or nonphysical symptoms of stress, and stress can contribute to the development of major illnesses, such as cardiovascular disease, depression, and diabetes;

Whereas the aforementioned chronic health conditions are among the most common, costly, and preventable health conditions;

Whereas naturopathic medicine provides noninvasive, holistic treatments that support the inherent self-healing capacity of the human body and encourage self-responsibility in health care;

Whereas naturopathic medicine focuses on patient-centered care, the prevention of chronic illnesses, and early intervention in the treatment of chronic illnesses;

Whereas naturopathic physicians attend 4-year, graduate level programs that are accredited by agencies approved by the Department of Education;

Whereas aspects of naturopathic medicine have been shown to lower the risk of major illnesses such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes;

Whereas naturopathic physicians can help address the shortage of primary care providers in the United States;

Whereas naturopathic physicians are trained to refer patients to conventional physicians and specialists when necessary;

Whereas the profession of naturopathic medicine is dedicated to providing health care to underserved populations; and

Whereas naturopathic medicine provides consumers in the United States with more choice in health care, in line with the increased use of a variety of integrative medical treatments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 7 through October 13, 2013, as ''Naturopathic Medicine Week'';

(2) recognizes the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to learn about naturopathic medicine and the role that naturopathic physicians play in preventing chronic and debilitating illnesses and conditions.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1850. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1851. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1850. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

SEC. 4___. NATURAL GAS VEHICLES.

(a) MAXIMUM FUEL ECONOMY INCREASE FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32906(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''(except an electric automobile)'' and inserting ''(except an electric or natural gas automobile)''.

(b) AUTOMOBILE FUEL ECONOMY DEFINITIONS.—Section 32901(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by inserting '', but the inclusion of a reserve gasoline tank for incidental or emergency use in the event of alternative fuel depletion shall not detract from the dedicated nature of the automobile'' before the period at the end; and

(2) in paragraph (9)(B), by striking ''provides equal or superior energy efficiency'' and inserting ''provides reasonably comparable energy efficiency''.

(c) MINIMUM DRIVING RANGES FOR DUAL FUELED PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32901(c)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''(except electric automobiles)'' and inserting ''(except electric or natural gas automobiles)''; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''(except electric automobiles)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(except electric or natural gas automobiles)''.

(d) MANUFACTURING PROVISION FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32905(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

''(1) the percentage utilization of the model on gasoline or diesel fuel, as determined by a formula based on the model's alternative fuel range, divided by the fuel economy measured under section 32904(c); and

''(2) the percentage utilization of the model on gaseous fuel, as determined by a formula based on the model's alternative fuel range, divided by the fuel economy measured under subsection (c).''.

SA 1851. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 30___. FEDERAL PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.

Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The term 'renewable energy' means electric or thermal energy, generated from or avoided by solar, wind, biomass, landfill gas, ocean (including tidal, wave, current, and thermal), geothermal (including ground source, reclaimed water, or ground water), municipal solid waste, or new hydroelectric generation capacity achieved from increased efficiency or additions of new capacity at an existing hydroelectric project.''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking ''For purposes'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) SEPARATE CALCULATION.—For purposes of determining compliance with the requirements of this section, any energy consumption that is avoided through the use of renewable energy shall be considered to be renewable energy produced.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Conflicts between State and Federal Marijuana Laws.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, at 10:15 a.m. in room SD–650 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY AND THE COURTS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Federal Judgeship Act of 2013.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, let me announce now, we had an all-Senators briefing scheduled for 2:30 tomorrow. We are not going to do that. I have just spoken to the President's Chief of Staff. There are too many things moving. There are a lot of moving targets here. I think it will be better for the Senate if we do not have that briefing tomorrow.

There are a lot of things going on. We have had many briefings. We have had committee hearings. But tomorrow I think to have this with what is going on—it is my understanding the Secretary of State is going to be in Geneva to meet with his Russian counterpart. So there are a lot of things going on. I think the briefing tomorrow would be very premature with all of the, as I said before, moving targets.

So everyone should know that the 2:30 all-Senators briefing will not occur. So everyone knows the schedule a little bit tomorrow.

NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE WEEK

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 221.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 221) designating the week of October 7 through October 13, 2013 as ''Naturopathic Medicine Week'' to recognize

the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 221) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—S. 1427

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 1427 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, September 11, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following the prayer and pledge, there be a moment of silence to pay tribute to the thousands of Americans whose lives were taken on September 11, 2001. Of course, there were other casualties. Some people are still suffering the ravages of that sinister attack; that following any leader remarks, the time until 2:30 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. In addition to the moment of silence at 10 a.m., there will be a bipartisan, bicameral remembrance ceremony of the 12th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, attacks at 11 a.m. tomorrow. Members will gather in the Rotunda at 10:45 a.m. Senators will gather in the Rotunda, but then they will walk out and we will have a few speeches on the east front of the Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. 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 6:22 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, September 11, 2013, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 10, 2013:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

MARILYN A. BROWN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2017.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXTENDING RECOGNITION TO THE BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize America's victory at the Battle of Lake Erie during the War of 1812.

On September 10, 1813, Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry led the American Navy into battle against the British Navy. At the beginning of the battle, Perry hoisted his battle flag which read, "Don't Give up the Ship." Commodore Perry along with 557 patriots succeeded with a significant victory which ensured America's control of Lake Erie for the remainder of the war.

200 years later, we are recognizing this battle near Put-In-Bay for securing the Northern Frontier. We gather at Lake Erie to celebrate Commodore Perry's victory, the impact this battle had in the War of 1812, and the long-lasting peace between nations.

We remember that freedom is never free and that many have made the ultimate sacrifice, so that we may enjoy the freedoms our forefathers envisioned. Their service and dedication to country breathes life into the fabric of our nation.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I proudly salute Commodore Perry, the American Navy, and the American people on the Battle of Lake Erie Bicentennial Celebration.

A TRIBUTE TO BARBARA CHASE RIBOUD

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Barbara Chase Riboud who is truly a renaissance women. Her talent as a novelist, poet, scholar and artist of the highest order, is recognized around the world. We are happy to claim her as a Philadelphian and are excited about the exhibition of the first comprehensive retrospective of her iconic Malcolm X Steles at the Philadelphia Art Museum. In short, we are deeply honored by her work, accomplishments and presence once again in Philadelphia.

Educated at the Philadelphia High School for Girls', Temple University's Tyler School of Art and the Yale University of Art, she is an internationally acclaimed visual artist whose work has been exhibited throughout Europe and America. Her public sculpture, Africa Rising, at the African Burial Ground National Monument in Lower Manhattan expressed as poetry, sculpture and historical novel is in tribute to the 17th and 18th century burial ground that yielded the remains of more than 400 mostly enslaved Africans in America.

Among her prestigious awards are the Carl Sandburg Prize for Best American Poet and being knighted in the Order of Arts and Letters by the French government. Her talent is only eclipsed by her career long commitment to make known the story of those who came to America, ". . . a stunned string of Black pearls like a hundred year centipede: one thousand. One thousand thousand. one million, three, six, nine, thirty million."

IN RECOGNITION OF MARIBEL P. CHAVEZ

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished career of Maribel P. Chavez. After committing 31 years to public service with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), Mrs. Chavez retires as Fort Worth District Engineer.

During her tenure, Mrs. Chavez has worked collaboratively with local, state, and federal partners to streamline and implement innovative projects in the Fort Worth District. Her oversight of the combined $3 billion DFW Connector and North Tarrant Express projects reflects her ability to manage complex regional highway projects through environmental clearance and construction.

Mrs. Chavez was diligent on smaller projects that were no less complex, but every bit as important to Tarrant County communities. Her cooperative effort with the City of Fort Worth to complete the long-awaited widening of East Rosedale, improvements at the Hwy. 287 and Berry St. interchange, and assistance to facilitate completion of Fort Worth's new Veterans Outpatient Clinic on Interstate 20 underscore her commitment and responsiveness.

Mrs. Chavez's career was also notable as she was the first female engineer hired by TxDOT and the first female TxDOT District Engineer. Additionally, she has been recognized for her many achievements including Woman of the Year by the Dallas-Fort Worth Chapter of the Women's Transportation Seminar, Preservation Leadership Award by Historic Fort Worth, Inc., and by the Fort Worth Star-Telegram for her guidance on the DFW Connector Project.

Her invaluable contribution to my annual Transportation Summits will be sincerely missed. It is my privilege to commend Maribel P. Chavez and wish her well in retirement. Her work will stand as a monument to her dedication for years to come.

100 YEARS OF MORONGO BASIN HISTORY; 2009 IN FOCUS

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th Anniversary of the Morongo Basin. It is the honor of a life time to be able to serve the people of the Eight Congressional District in Washington, D.C. As seen over the course of the Basin's 100 year history, this region maintains a strong sense of community and upholds many noble traditions. Today I am here to talk specifically about Ms. Mara Cantelo and the strong sense of volunteerism she brings to the community.

Over the past 100 years, there have been many shining moments to which we can remember the Basin. The year 2009 comes to mind when I think of its altruistic spirit. It was in 2009 that Mara Cantelo, a Coachella Valley native, received the Jefferson Award from the American Institute of Public Service in recognition of her steadfast and selfless efforts to help those who are less fortunate. Mara has been a paragon of benevolence in her community since 1984 when she co-founded Tender Loving Christmas with her mother Julie Tunstall.

As the name suggests, Tender Loving Christmas was dedicated to giving care and compassion, in the form of food, to those who needed it most in the holiday season. Since then it has grown to become Tender Loving Cause, and has taken to providing for the poor year round. This charitable labor of love has successfully fed nearly 3,500 impoverished people since its inception, and will undoubtedly serve thousands more in the future.

To the people of the Morongo Basin, thank you for including me in your 100 year project. The sense of volunteerism you and Mara bring to your community is admirable and a true beacon of inspiration to us all.

IN RECOGNITION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VILLAGE OF ORION

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the village of Orion, Illinois on the occasion of the 100th Anniversary of their Central Park Band Shell.

Orion's Central Park Band Shell is the center piece of their village. It is a place where families and friends gather to enjoy the company of each other, their neighbors, and to take part in various events, including outdoor movies and concerts. It has hosted notable guests including Bill Allred's Jazz Band and Chris Vallillo, a nationally recognized folk singer and historian who proclaimed it one of the finest venues he had ever used.

The Central Park Band Shell has twice been threatened by demolition. It has survived all these years and is now listed on the National Register of Historic Places, which has proved to be the catalyst for a community-wide preservation effort. In 2004, the Orion Band Shell was awarded Illinois' highest preservation honor, the Richard Driehaus Project of the Year Award, by Landmarks Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to recognize the village of Orion on this notable event, and am glad that places like this exist, helping to bring people together.

HONORING DR. WILLIAM A. ''BILL'' CRAIG

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to recognize Dr. William A. ''Bill'' Craig and his many accomplishments during his career.

After receiving a bachelors degree in electrical engineering from Mississippi State University, Dr. Craig began his civil service career in 1960 with Dr. Werhner Von Braun's Astrionics Laboratory before moving to the Army Ballistic Missile Defense Agency in 1970, and then as a charter member to the Army Missile Command's Missile System Software Center when it was established in 1976.

Since 1988, Bill Craig has served as the Director of the U.S. Army Research, Development and Engineering Command, Aviation and Missile Research, Development and Engineering Center, Software Engineering Directorate (SED). Through his leadership, the SED, as an organization, attained a Level 4 rating against the Software Engineering Institute's (SEI's) Software Capability Maturity Model in 2000. During Dr. Craig's tenure, the SED has experienced significant growth, greatly expanding its customer base as well as enlarging its facilities. As one of only three Life Cycle Software Engineering Centers in the Army, the SED provides software and systems engineering support for most of the Army's major weapon and aviation systems. Under the leadership of Dr. Craig, the SED organization is the responsible agent for the development and fielding of numerous Army Systems, including: Joint Battle Command-Platform and the Aviation Mission Planning System. Also, the SED, in partnership with the Program.

Executive Officers and Program Mangers, has established numerous Aviation and Missile System Integration Laboratories for the analysis and test of tactical systems and software. These laboratories provide the capability for Joint Services Interoperability Certification as well as Intra Army Certification. The SED also is responsible for development and deployment of the America's Army Program. This program includes the public game, weapon systems trainers, and Army recruiting applications.

The SED collaborates with a number of other organizations/agencies, including: Space and Missile Defense Command for Cyber Security, Jackson State University for Homeland Security, and as a Technology Transition Partner with the Software Engineering Institute. The SED has also made significant progress in workforce development, in partnership with the University of Alabama in Huntsville, including a very robust Co-op Program, and advanced degrees in Software Engineering and Systems Engineering. These opportunities allow the expansion and growth of the SED workforce to remain relevant in the complex areas of the digital world.

Dr. Craig is a highly respected leader and visionary in the community and a strong proponent of the greater Tennessee Valley area. In 2004, he received an honorary doctorate degree from the University of Alabama in Huntsville. Additionally he serves on the advisory board for the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. Other honors include induction into the Order of Saint Barbara, an honorary military society of the United States Field Artillery Association, recognition as supervisor of the year in 1985 by the North Alabama Chapter of Federally Employed Women, and the first recipient of the Joseph C. Moquin Award given by the Huntsville Association of Technology Societies in 2006. In 2010, the Tennessee Valley National Defense Industrial Association presented Dr. Craig with the Medaris Award for demonstrating technical excellence in promoting the defense preparedness for the nation.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIREMAN'S FUND

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. McCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the anniversary of a California company that has dedicated itself to serving the residents of our state for 150 years. Founded in San Francisco, the Fireman's Fund Insurance Company has been protecting the future for individuals, families and businesses since 1863. The Fireman's Fund name, which is well-known across California, emanates from the founder's arrangement to pay 10 percent of the company's profits to support the widows and orphans of firefighters who died in the line of duty. That tradition continues today through the company's Heritage Program, providing fire departments throughout the nation with life-saving equipment and training. Working in combination with its employees, agents and brokers, the company has distributed more than $30 million to support firefighters for safer communities since 2004, with over $8 million contributed in California. The company has also been a benefactor for numerous charities in the San Francisco Bay Area and its generosity has added tremendously to the vitality of our communities.

Over the past 150 years, Fireman's Fund's contribution to our nation's history extends far beyond California. The Fireman's Fund has insured the construction of some of our nation's most treasured landmarks, including the Hoover Dam, the Golden Gate Bridge and even Charles Lindbergh's Spirit of St. Louis. During our nation's most trying times of crisis, the company delivered on its promises. Following the Chicago Fire of 1871 and the San Francisco Earthquake of 1906, the Fireman's Fund played a critical role in rebuilding after the devastation. The company was also present when needed most for many displaced people after the Northridge earthquake of 1994, which devastated much of Southern California.

Throughout its history, the Fireman's Fund has prided itself on also being innovative; it prides itself on being the first insurance provider to write a standing grain policy in the U.S., the first carrier to offer nationwide automobile insurance and standardized homeowners insurance, and the first company to add ''green rebuild'' insurance to their offerings for homes and businesses. Back in my hometown of Bakersfield, California, Fireman's Fund remains one of our region's largest agricultural insurers, providing essential risk control services to hundreds of farm producers in my Congressional District. Its 150 years of service has established a name and reputation which resonates well with insurance agents and brokers who distribute their product in our local communities.

Today there are more than 1,200 Californians working for Fireman's Fund. Together they make up a great company that remains one of California's most enduring financial institutions. Given the time of rapid change in which we live, it is comforting to know that companies like Fireman's Fund still endure, and I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing them well with the hope that they will still be protecting the future for individuals, families and businesses for another 150 years.

HONORING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF HUMANITIES WASHINGTON AND THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS BEDTIME STORIES LITERARY GALA

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 40th anniversary of Humanities Washington and the 15th anniversary of its Bedtime Stories literary gala in Seattle.

Since its founding in 1973, Humanities Washington has served the state with humanities programming, sparking conversation and critical thinking using story as a catalyst, nurturing thoughtful and engaged communities across Washington State. As Washington State's flagship non-profit for the humanities, it plays a critical role in addressing an immediate and growing crisis concerning community identity and understanding, respect for other perspectives, and the ability of communities to work together to shape a better future.

Humanities Washington's work in cultural education—ranging from Speakers Bureau to Traveling Exhibits to Family Reading—promotes awareness of the history of local communities and its residents, provides opportunities for people to gather and learn more about their unique past and shared present, and nurtures relationships that enable us to move forward towards a more prosperous future.

The humanities—including history, literature, philosophy, ethics, law, and other fields of inquiry—encourage us to investigate, speak, listen, read, reflect, question, think, grow, and act. Using the disciplines of the humanities, Humanities Washington provides programs and experiences of lasting value, creating insight, understanding, wisdom, and a deeper

appreciation for a variety of perspectives and all that we share as Washingtonians and Americans.

This year also marks the 15th anniversary of one of Humanities Washington's signature events: Bedtime Stories. Bedtime Stories is an annual literary celebration featuring critically acclaimed Northwest writers unveiling new short stories created specifically for dinner galas in Spokane and Seattle. National Book Award Winner Charles Johnson has called it ''the region's premier literary event.'' Johnson is one of the founders of the gala, and will receive the 2013 Humanities Washington Award at Bedtime Stories in Seattle on October 4.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to convey my congratulations to Humanities Washington for 40 years of excellent, necessary work sharing the humanities with Washingtonians. I salute Humanities Washington as it works to ensure that the humanities are key to civic life for generations to come.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM—CONGRESSIONAL PRAYER CAUCUS

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about one of our Nation's most coveted rights. The freedom of religion granted to all Americans by the First Amendment. Our Founders knew this was one of the freedoms worth fighting for.

In 1775 the Continental Congress under the advisement of General Washington created the chaplaincy. They knew the war ahead would not only try every Soldier physically, but also spiritually. They knew these Soldiers would need guidance, sound advice, and a helping hand to discharge their duties.

Many times throughout the early beginnings of this nation the Congress has come together to reaffirm the importance of the Chaplaincy. In 1791 the Congress empowered the President to employ a chaplain. Since then the chaplaincy has been an intricate part of our Nation's service men and women. The task of these chaplains has long been to facilitate the religious and spiritual needs of the Armed Services.

Recently members of the House of Representatives repelled an attack on the Chaplain Corps, led by senior leaders in the Pentagon. Leaders in the Pentagon attempted to circumvent current DoD regulations by allowing Atheist Chaplains to serve in the military. Such a policy destroys the historical intent of the Corps, and its current ability to address service member's spiritual needs. Pentagon leadership has no right to bypass DoD regulations as it deems fit.

This episode brings to mind a quote I heard from an Army Soldier, ''A Service member's faith is not a weapon but a shield.'' It is no secret that many people going to war encounter some type of religious conversion. Those already observing a religion attribute their successful return from combat to their deity. Why put someone's religious guidance in the hands of a counselor with indifferent feeling towards a belief system.

A chaplain's duty puts him in the foxhole, the cockpit, or at sea. I listen to a service member's deepest fears and often present when they celebrate their highest moments. In both, their handling of the situation is dictated by faith. Congress needs to adhere to a new battle cry; faith under fire is faith worth fighting for.

I stand today with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to remind Congress of the free exercise clause in the constitution that ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion prohibiting the exercise thereof.''

COMMEMORATING THE 230TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE TREATY OF PARIS

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize September 3, 2013, as the 230th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Paris. The Treaty of Paris was signed on September 3, 1783, thus ending American Revolutionary War and declaring the ''United States to be free, sovereign and independent states.'' The Continental Congress ratified the Treaty of Paris on January 14, 1784.

I am proud to represent Virginia's First District, frequently referred to as ''America's First District,'' which is home to Yorktown where the Revolutionary War ended on October 19, 1781. With the help of our French allies, the decisive Battle of Yorktown resulted in the surrender of the British Army commanded by British lord and Lieutenant General Lord Cornwallis.

A resolution of the Continental Congress, dated October 29, 1781, called for a ''Yorktown Monument to the Alliance and Victory''. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs in its report dated March 16, 1880, stated that ''the surrender at Yorktown was the crowning success of the revolution, and its event should be commemorated by national authority.'' The grounds were secured and the cornerstone laid on October 18, 1881. Today, the Yorktown Battlefield, site of the last major battle of the American Revolutionary War, is administered by the National Park Service and is part of Colonial National Historical Park.

Virginia's First District has a rich history of military service, beginning with the Revolutionary War and continuing today. I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating the 230th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Paris and recognizing the significance of the Battle of Yorktown.

IN HONOR OF AZEM HAJDARI: LEADER OF ALBANIA'S DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Azem Hajdari, an Albanian democratic leader and parliamentarian who was assassinated in 1998. Today, September 12, marks the 15th anniversary of his tragic death.

Born in 1963 into a working class family, Azem Hajdari grew up in Albania's mountainous northern region of Bajram Curr. While he was a student in Tirana, Albania's capital, the collapse of the Soviet Union led to increased popular unrest in the communist states in Central and Eastern Europe. In Albania, thousands took to foreign embassies in an effort to escape the country. As political and social tensions continued to escalate, in December 1990, students began protests against their worsening living conditions.

Azem Hajdari was committed to democratic change in Albania and quickly emerged as a leader of the student movement. The student demonstrations helped to precipitate the fall of the regime, and Azem then became one of the founders of the Democratic Party, the first non-Communist political party in Albania since the Second World War. He became the Democratic Party's first chairman and was elected in 1991 to the Albanian parliament, where he championed democratic reforms.

In 1997, Azem was shot inside the Albanian parliament and severely injured, yet he refused to be intimidated. He persisted in his mission to build democracy in Albania despite several additional attempts on his life. However, on September 12, 1998, Azem was murdered as he stepped out of his party's offices in Tirana.

Azem Hajdari's death shocked the nation and he was posthumously recognized as a martyr for democracy. Through his words and actions, he taught the people of Albania that freedom is not given—it must be won, through struggle, determination, and faith.

During the conflict in Kosova, Azem also supported the Kosova Freedom and Independence Movement. He was a close friend of Kosova's President Ibrahim Rugova and dedicated significant time and energy to the Kosovar cause.

Today, Albania has made great strides. It has a vibrant political system and is a member of NATO, and Albanians are able to travel freely throughout Europe. Kosova also is a free and independent country, aspiring to join the European Union. Both Albania and Kosova are building strong democracies, just as Azem dreamed.

Azem Hajdari has received many awards after his death, including Albania's ''Order of the Flag'' on what would have been his 50th birthday earlier this year, the ''Honor of the Nation'' award, and the ''Gjergj Katriot Skenderbeu'' (''Skanderbeg's Order''), which was conferred by Albanian President Bujar Nishani and former presidents Alfred Moisiu and Bamir Topi.

On the 15th anniversary of Azem Hajdari's untimely death, the Albanian people will once more honor a truly historic leader of Albania's democratic movement. On this day, September 12, Albanians from across the country and from around the world, including Albanian Kosovars, will gather to remember Azem and escort him to his final resting place in Tirana's Martyr's Cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, Azem Hajdari was a stalwart champion of democratic values and hero to many Albanians. I respectfully ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing Azem Hajdari for his historic contributions to building democracy in Albania.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 448. I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 2052.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

TRIBUTE TO THE HISTORIC PILGRIM BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Pilgrim Baptist Church was founded in September of 1916, as a part of the dreams and work of the Union Grove Prayer Meeting Club who met in the home of Deacon John A. Finnie at 242 East 42nd Street. Because of its steady growth the club was constantly seeking larger space and after three months the founder and first Chairman of the Deacon Board, Mr. John A. Finnie, his wife, Juanita, Georgia Hansberry, L. Whitley and S.S. Harkness joined together to organize a Church. The group asked for and received help from several ministers. Mrs. Finnie suggested the name, Pilgrim Baptist Church and organized the Pilgrim Senior Choir.

The Church immediately took off and in January 1917, Reverend Jessie D. Luck of New York became its first Pastor. Pilgrim experienced great growth and in 1922 Pilgrim Baptist Church purchased Kehilath Anshe Ma'ariv Synagogue located at 3301 S. Indiana Avenue. This edifice had been constructed in 1891, and designed by the famed architect Louis Sullivan and engineer Dankmar Adler. The initial drawings were prepared by draftsman Frank Lloyd Wright. Upon the passing of Reverend Watson, Reverend R.T. Schell and Assistant Pastor, Reverend C.L. Franklin carried on until the Pulpit Committee found what they considered to be the right man who could handle the continued growth and expansion of the Church. That man was masterful, the Reverend Junius Caesar Austin, a nationally known pulpiteer pastor, financier, organizer and Convention President. He liquidated the debt, renovated the structure and bought a house for the church's founder, built a community center, gymnasium and housing project and established missions in Africa.

In 1931, Thomas A. Dorsey known as the "father of Gospel Music" joined Pilgrim and organized the Pilgrim Baptist Church Gospel Chorus at the request of Pastor Austin. Some of the members of that chorus were legendary singers such as Mahalia Jackson, Sally Martin, Roberta Martin and Clara Ward.

During Pilgrim's ninety-six year history nine Pastors have served:

Jessie D. Luck—January 1917–July 1917

J.E. Jones—July 1917–October 1919

Samuel E.J. Watson—May 1920–July 1925

Junius C. Austin, Sr.—January 1926–August 1968

Junius C. Austin, Jr.—February 1969–December 1991

Floyd W. Davis—February 1992–April 1999

Hycel B. Taylor—November 2001–May 2005

Keith E. Gordon—January 2007–March 2010

Tyrone E. Jordan—October 2010 to Present

The Historic Pilgrim Baptist Church has been home to many renowned and distinguished people, among them are:

Ministers: Reverend Clarence Cobbs, Reverend J.B. Felker, Reverend Elmer L. Fowler, Reverend Stroy Freeman, Reverend Louis Rawls, Reverend Richard Keller (Pastor of Pilgrim Jr. Church).

Entrepreneurs: Oscar Brown, Attorney/Real Estate, Delois Barrett-Campbell, Barrett Sisters, Bessie Coleman, First Black Woman Aviator, S.B. Fuller, Fuller Products Company, Mahalia Jackson, Gospel Singer, Sally Martin, Gospel Singer, Lee Randolph, Professor, Jack Johnson, First Heavyweight Boxing Champion, Claude Holman, President Pro-Tem of the Chicago City Council.

Outstanding Artists who have performed at Pilgrim: James Cleveland, Aretha Franklin, The Edwin Hawkins Singers, The Staple Singers, Albertina Walker, Inez Andrews.

Pilgrim was actively involved in the Civil Rights Movement and on many occasions the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King delivered sermons at the church.

In 1973, Pilgrim Baptist Church was listed on the National Register of Historic Places by Chicago's City Council and was later designated a Chicago Landmark on December 18, 1981. In December 2001, the Church was placed on the National Ten Sacred Places to save list by Partners for Sacred Places, a Philadelphia based religious preservationist group.

In January 2006, the Historic Pilgrim Church was ravaged by fire. The fire virtually destroyed the interior; but the exterior walls are still standing.

In 2010, designs were unveiled to raise Pilgrim Baptist Church, a historic architectural landmark from ashes. Pilgrim has been rolling for 97 years and will keep on rolling. I salute you.

CONGRATULATING SUNNYSIDE LITTLE LEAGUE GIRLS SOFTBALL TEAM

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to Congratulate Tucson's Sunnyside Little League girls' softball team on winning the 12–and-under Little League World Series.

On August 14, 2013, the Sunnyside Little League became the 2013 Little League Softball World Series champions by defeating the McLean Little League (Virginia) team 9–0. This victory marks the first West Coast team to win the Little League Softball World Series in more than 23 years.

These extraordinary young ladies finished the Little League World Series with a 5–1 record and became the first team in Arizona to win a title in this division and only the third to win it all in any softball division.

In the championship game, the girls from Sunnyside put on a show in front of a crowd of about 2,300 people at Alpenrose Stadium in Portland, Oregon by scoring two runs in the bottom of the first inning and not letting up. Arizona's red-hot offense blew the game wide open in the bottom of the fourth inning, nearly reaching the 10-run rule.

I like to extend my deepest congratulations to the Sunnyside Little League girls and to the coaches that contributed to the overall success and victory of the team.

I give my most sincere thanks to the Sunnyside girls for representing Tucson, AZ with such great pride and passion. These girls are heroes and role models and deserve recognition for their accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on September 9th, I was unavoidably detained and missed Roll Nos. 448 and 449. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both Roll No. 448 and Roll No. 449.

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE THOMPSON

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Wayne Thompson of Denver, Colorado as he will be honored later this week by the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW), Post #5061, for over 40 years of committed service to Colorado's neediest veterans. Wayne Thompson's is one of the exceptional stories of lifelong dedication to public service. Mr. Thompson enlisted in the Navy in 1951 and was stationed in Korea, Japan, and Vietnam over his four-year military career.

Born in Lincoln, Nebraska in 1932, Mr. Thompson began his career in public service in 1960 at the U.S. Department of Labor. While there, he worked on a task force dedicated to helping veterans find jobs. In 1974, Mr. Thompson was assigned to work in Denver and has called the Centennial State home ever since. Mr. Thompson served under multiple Governors of Colorado over the course of thirty years as a top advisor on veterans' health and employment issues. As a member of the VFW for nearly fifty years, Mr. Thompson played key roles in the establishment of numerous veterans' homes in Colorado, the funding of the Western Slope Military Cemetery, and the long-awaited construction of the new veterans' hospital in Denver.

Mr. Thompson's commitment to veterans extended beyond his work in government. In 1972, Mr. Thompson co-founded the United Veterans Committee, a non-profit coalition of veteran service organization which advocates for veterans and their families in Colorado. From 1980–1990, Mr. Thompson served on the Colorado Board of Veterans' Affairs and from 1986–1990, he was its Chairman. He has also served on the board of the Fitzsimmons State Veterans Nursing home since its opening.

Since coming to Colorado, Mr. Thompson has been a devoted champion of the state's veterans at every level and continues to work for the people of Colorado every day. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Mr. Wayne Thompson for his unwavering support of the veteran community in Colorado and a lifetime of public service.

H.R. 3069—THE SHIELD OUR STREET ACT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, introduced on September 9, 2013, would establish two public safety grant programs.

Section 2 establishes Shield Police Hiring Grants, to be implemented by the Attorney General, to provide grants to law enforcement agencies that operate in Elevated Need Localities. An ''Elevated Need Locality'' is a county (or unit of local government which is not part of a county) which (1) has a crime rate above the national average, and (2) has had budget reductions during the most recent 5-year period. These law enforcement agencies could apply to the Attorney General to receive funds to hire law enforcement officers, or to rehire officers who have been laid off due to budget reductions.

Grants would last for three years and may be extended by two years at the discretion of the Attorney General.

One hundred million dollars for each fiscal year 2014 through 2019 are authorized to be appropriated for this program.

Section 3 establishes Shield Public Safety Enhancement Grants, to be implemented by the Attorney General, to provide grants to units of local government that has jurisdiction over all or part of an Elevated Need Locality. Local governments could apply to the Attorney General to receive funds to enhance public safety in a number of ways, such as purchasing public safety equipment, funding public safety programs, making infrastructure improvements for the purpose of enhancing public safety, purchasing and installing street lights to deter crime, funding activities related to crime labs, and funding public defender programs. Non-profit organizations operating in Elevated Need Localities may also apply for grants under this program to fund initiatives designed to reduce crime in these jurisdictions.

Grants would be for one year but may be extended at the discretion of the Attorney General.

One hundred million dollars for each fiscal year 2014 through 2019 are authorized to be appropriated for this program.

IN HONOR OF MOLLY SALMI AND HER 25 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

HON. JOHN KLINE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Molly Salmi for her 25 years of dedicated service to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce—and the American people.

Molly Salmi, who joined the Committee as a Staff Assistant, has continued to advance through the ranks to her current position as Deputy Director of Workforce Policy thanks to her unparalleled professionalism and extensive knowledge of the policies that affect literally every working American.

Molly personifies the best qualities of public service—demonstrating tireless enthusiasm and an unyielding commitment to sound public policy. Beyond her contributions to policy, Molly has invested in the lives of countless young staffers and interns, offering advice, guidance, and direction, while setting an example of decorum and grace.

Molly's great work through the years has earned her the respect of seven separate Committee Chairmen—Republicans and Democrats alike—as well as her colleagues on both sides of the aisle, which is no small feat in a world too often mired in partisan posturing.

For all of the above—and so much more—Molly is more than a trusted colleague: she is an invaluable member of our committee family.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, due to attending a classified briefing on the use of chemical weapons in Syria, I missed one recorded vote on September 9. I would like to indicate how I would have voted had I been present for that vote.

On rollcall No. 448, H.R. 2052, the Global Investment in American Jobs Act of 2013, I would have voted ''yea'' to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report to Congress on ways to increase the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF ANN MAGGIO

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life and service of Ann Maggio, who passed away at age 90 on July 6, 2013. Ann left behind her daughter JoAnn, son Anthony, daughter-in-law Tracy, and grandson Andrew and the Suydam Street home she lived in for 75 years.

Ann, a longtime civic leader, moved to Ridgewood in 1938 when her parents bought a house on Suydam Street, where she lived for the remainder of her life. In 1944, after graduating from Hunter College, Ann went on to work for the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company before she married Anthony Maggio in 1948. Together they had two children, Joann and Anthony.

As a resident of Ridgewood, Queens, she witnessed dramatic changes and became an instrumental part of her community. Ann first made her mark in Ridgewood's civic life by transforming the Grover Cleveland High School athletic field. Working with the police to establish a baseball and softball program, Ann kept the area from being vacant and was instrumental in making the athletic fields a reality for the community.

Ann continued to be an active member of the community, dedicating much of her time to a better Ridgewood. Whether it was keeping the neighborhood free from graffiti or promoting the safety of residents, Ann Maggio truly defined what it meant to be a civic leader.

The legacy she leaves behind exhibits the love she had for her community. Besides her family, nothing was more important to Ann than her love for her neighborhood.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me now in honoring Ann Maggio for her service to the people of Ridgewood.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MONARCAS ACADEMY

HON. JERRY McNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and celebrating the accomplishments of Monarcas Academy, a non-profit organization dedicated to adolescent soccer teams in Stockton, California. In July of 2013, a Monarcas Academy team won the U.S. National Cup XII in the under age 15 (U15) group. This team also won the 2013 California State Championship, 2013 San Diego Surf Cup, and the 2013 Santa Clara Sporting Invitational.

Year after year, Monarcas Academy athletes compete at high level soccer tournaments throughout California and the nation. The staff and players at the Academy helped create the Central Valley Soccer League, composed of 95 teams that provide youth development to local student athletes. In addition, Monarcas Academy works with Bfut Soccer Academy in Brazil on international soccer principles.

These efforts benefit our region's youth by promoting physical activity, team spirit, and community involvement. I am proud to represent the Monarcas Academy in Congress, and wish the Academy continued success.

I urge my colleagues to join me in commending Monarcas Academy, its U15 championship team, and its dedication to helping the youth in California.

HONORING THE VETERANS OF THE SEPTEMBER 10, 2013 EASTERN IOWA HONOR FLIGHT

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, today, over eighty-five Iowa World War II and Korean War veterans will travel to our nation's capital. Accompanied by volunteer guardians, they will visit the monuments that were built in their honor.

For many, today will be the first time they will see the National World War II Memorial and the Korean War Veterans Memorial. On behalf of every Iowan I represent, I thank these heroes for their service to our nation and pay tribute to the incredible sacrifice that they made for our country.

This trip was made possible by the dedicated workforce at Quaker Oats' Cedar Rapids facility who raised all of the funds necessary to send these heroes to the nation's capital. The generosity of the Quaker Oats' workforce and those who donated to this effort demonstrates Iowans' commitment to honoring those who have served our nation in uniform.

Iowans know that we owe our veterans a debt of gratitude. As a reminder of the service and sacrifice of the Greatest Generation, I am proud to have a piece of marble in my office from the quarry that was used to build the World War II Memorial. Our World War II and Korean War veterans rose to defend not just our nation, but the freedoms, democracy, and values that make our country the greatest nation on earth. They did so as one people and one country. Their sacrifices and determination in the face of great threats to our way of life are both humbling and inspiring.

The sheer magnitude of what the Greatest Generation accomplished, not just in war but in the peace that followed, continues to inspire us today. Their generation and our country did not seek to be tested both abroad by a war that fundamentally challenged our way of life and at home by the Great Depression and the rebuilding of our economy that followed. But, when called upon to do so, the Greatest Generation defended and then rebuilt our nation to make it even stronger. Their patriotism, service, and sacrifice not only defined their generation—they stand as a testament to the fortitude of our nation and the American people. Their legacy endures today.

I am tremendously proud to welcome the Eastern Iowa Honor Flight and Iowa's veterans of the Second World War and the Korean War to our nation's capital today. On behalf of every Iowan I represent, I thank them for their service to our country.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 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 $16,738,567,425,782.46. We've added $6,111,690,376,869.38 to our debt in 4 years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN RECOGNITION OF DOUG VERBOON

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Doug Verboon, an important figure in California's Central Valley who was recently named the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce's 2013 Agriculturalist and Ag Supporter of the Year.

Doug is a lifelong resident of Hanford, California and a fellow graduate of Hanford High School. Born into a farming family, agriculture is more than just his vocation; it is his way of life. He began his agricultural career alongside his father and grandfather as a third generation farmer on the Gold Top Ranch, located in Hanford.

Doug has been an active member of his local community for many years. He has been a trustee of the Pioneer School District for 16 years where he played an important role in establishing the Pioneer School District as the first charter school district in the State of California.

Doug is also a member of the Kings County Board of Supervisors, representing District 3. Additionally, he is a member of the Kings County Farm Bureau, the District Advisory Council for Sequoia Walnut, and the Future Leaders Board for Diamond Walnuts.

The Lemoore Chamber of Commerce's Agriculturalist and Ag Supporter of the Year Award is given to a local community member who has made immeasurable contributions to the agricultural community in Lemoore. I appreciate the time and effort Doug has enthusiastically devoted to the communities within the Central Valley. I am pleased that his service and commitment to agriculture, and his community as a whole, is being recognized with this prestigious award.

INTRODUCTION OF THE IRS ABUSE PROTECTION ACT OF 2013

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my bill, the IRS Abuse Protection Act of 2013, which requires the IRS to notify taxpayers when their records are accessed. Taxpayer information is the private information of the taxpayer and they have a right to know when, who, why, and what that information is used for.

Mr. Speaker, by introducing this bill we hope to ensure people will not be threatened or intimidated by the federal government. This bill presses forth transparency and accountability. Despite what the President has said, the targeting of conservative organizations for extra scrutiny is a real scandal and is simply reprehensible. The thin line of trust between the individual and their government has been broken and we must work to rebuild it. I am strongly urging Congress to continue its investigation into the IRS and to make sure those responsibly are held accountable to the fullest extent of the law. I am also joining other Members of Congress calling on Treasury Secretary Jack Lew to investigate the actions of the IRS.

I am committed to making sure the IRS is never again used as a political weapon against any group, conservative or otherwise and my bill will ensure that those responsible for using private information to quiet individuals and organizations that disagree with the President can no longer hide behind the wall of Washington secrecy and are held accountable for their actions.

Simply put, I believe when personal information is accessed; taxpayers have a right to know who accessed the information, why it was accessed, and what the information is used for as well as having access to the information and any reports generated from it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House (and Senate) to support me in passing the IRS Abuse Protection Act of 2013 in order to ensure American families and taxpayers have trust in their government.

A TRIBUTE TO THE 2013 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2013 recipients of the coveted Ellis Island Medal of Honor. Presented annually by the National Ethnic Coalition or Organizations (NECO), the Ellis Island Medal of Honor pays tribute to our Nation's immigrant heritage, as well as individual achievement. The medals are awarded to U.S. citizens from various ethnic backgrounds who exemplify outstanding qualities in both their personal and professional lives, while continuing to preserve the richness of their particular heritage. We honor these outstanding individuals because they create a better world for all of us in the future by the work they do today. Since the Medal's founding in 1986, more than 2,000 American citizens have received Ellis Island Medals of Honor, including six American Presidents, several United States Senators, Congressmen, Nobel Laureates, outstanding athletes, artists, clergy, and military leaders.

This medal is not about money, but about people who seized the opportunities this great country has to offer and who used those opportunities to not only better their own lives but make a difference in the lives of those around them. As we all know, citizens of the United States can trace their ancestry to many nations. The richness and diversity of American life makes us unique among the Nations of the world and is in many ways the key to why America is the most innovative country in the world. The Ellis Island Medals of Honor not only celebrate select individuals but also the pluralism and democracy that enabled our ancestors to celebrate their cultural identities while still embracing the American way of life.

Even in the midst of difficult financial times, this award serves to remind us all that with hard work and perseverance anyone can achieve the American dream. In addition, by honoring these remarkable Americans, we honor all who share their origins and we acknowledge the contributions they and other groups have made to America.

I commend NECO and its Board of Directors headed by my good friend, Nasser J. Kazeminy, for honoring these truly outstanding individuals for their tireless efforts to foster dialogue and build bridges between different ethnic groups, as well as promote unity and a sense of common purpose in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the good works of NECO, and in congratulating all of the 2012 recipients of the Ellis Island Medals of Honor.

2013 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Mohamed Mike Ahmar, Varoujan Altebarmakian, MD, William C. Anton, Bharat H. Barai, MD, Brian Boitano, Noreen Salah Burpee, Hon. Woody Burton, Wendy Y. Chao, Melvin L. Cheatham, MD, Alina Cho, Byung Chang Cho, Im Ja P. Choi, Jerry L. Chong, Esq., Candice Chulee, Seamus Connolly, David C. Dauch, Warren Will David, Vidyasagar Dharmapuri, MD, Alexander W. Dreyfoos, Russell J. Ebeid, John David Eckstein, MD, Dr. Jamshid Ehsani, Mia Farrow, Joseph Fiorentino, RADM Moira N. Flanders, USN (Ret.), LTG Michael Flynn, USA, Jamshid Ghajar, MD, PhD, Hossein Gharib, MD, MACP, MACE, Dore J. Gilbert, MD, LTC USAR, Hubert Guerrand-Hermes, Xavier Guerrand-Hermes, Yong Hwa Ha, Kenneth S. Hershon, MD, Victoria Shoghag Hovanessian, Yousef Javadi, Hratch Kaprielian, Ara Kevork Karajerjian, AIC, CPC, Patricia J. Kennedy, Rep. Peter T. King, Michelle King Robson, Vahid Kooros, Kenneth Julius Kovach, Jackson H. Kuan, MD, Christopher J. Kuelling, Esq., Arthur Bihua Liu, Captain Gordon A. Loebl, USCG, Dr. J. Phillip London, RADM Brian Losey, USN, James Lu, Col. Robert M. Lucania, USAF (Ret.), Christine Eliska Lynn, Fasha (Farshad) Mahjoor, Dertad Manguikian, MD, Yvonne Marceau, Danny Masterson, Gail J. McGovern, Hon. Gregory J. Melikian, USAF (Ret.), Mark R. Melton, David Merage, Gary Mervis, Robert S. Milligan, H.E. Albert Alexander Montague, MG Patrick A. Murphy, USA, Kikanza Nuri-Robins, EdD, MDiv, 1st Lt Steven Ortiz, MA ANG, Mahendra R. Patel, Ramesh J. Patel, David Anthony Pope, John Psaras, Bruce Ramer, Alma Rangel, Assistant Chief Joseph J. Reznick, Monsignor Robert J. Romano, Ronald J. Ross, M.D., F.A.C.R., Pardis Sabeti, MD, DPhil, Homa Sarshar, Kamala Saxena, MD, Jack G. Shaheen, PhD, H. John Shammas, MD, Thomas Sherak, Deputy Chief Steven J. Silks, Anthony Spavone, Stephen J. Squeri, Valavanur A. Subramanian, MD, Aso O. Tavitian, Silvia Tchakmakjian, George Solon Tsandikos, Russell Thayer Tutt, Jr., Col. Lee A. Van Arsdale, USA, (Ret.), Argyris ''RJ'' Vassiliou, Richard A. Vermeil, Frank A. Visco, Wyan Hua Wang, Dionne Warwick, Wim Wiewel, PhD, Dar-yih David Wu, Vahe Stephan Yacoubian, MD, Christopher G. Zizza.

HONORING KIMBERLY DOUMA, NAPA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kimberly Douma, who has been chosen as Napa County Teacher of the Year for 2014.

Since 1991, Ms. Douma has taught kindergarten, first, and second grades at West Park Elementary School in Napa, California. Throughout her teaching career, Ms. Douma has worked hard to serve her school community in the Napa Valley. She has been a member of the Napa Valley Unified School District Professional Standards Committee since 2010, served eight years as the West Park Leadership Teacher Representative, six years as the West Park Family Club Teacher Representative, and six years as the West Park School Site Council Teacher Representative. Further, Ms. Douma has offered free tutoring to at-risk children for the past three years and taught Before School Language Arts Intervention. Ms. Douma has co-chaired the West Park Elementary Carnival for the last 22 years, initiating various activities including the Visual and Performing Arts program, and the Food Booths and the Book Booth. She has been a member of the California Teachers Association and Napa Valley Educators Association for 22 years.

As a member of Covenant Presbyterian Church Ms. Douma has participated on the Long Life Learning Committee for five years, served as a Sunday School Teacher, a Vacation Bible School Chair, and hosted five years of Christmas and Easter Pageants.

Ms. Douma has received accolades for her outstanding contributions as an educator in Napa from various community organizations, including Teacher of the Year from the Napa Rotary Club, and the Young Church Woman Award from the Women United of the Napa Valley.

Mr. Speaker, Kimberly Douma grew up believing that teachers could be tour guides to adventure. Inspired by her late father who was also a teacher, Kimberly is beginning to teach the children of students she had early in her career, and continues to inspire and engage every child that has the privilege to call her ''Teacher''. It is fitting that today we honor her ongoing commitment to excellence in education.

RECOGNIZING COBRA MOTO

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Cobra Moto, a manufacturer of premium race-ready mini motocross bikes for youth riders that are proudly made in the U.S.A.

Designed and produced in Hillsdale, Michigan, Cobra bikes were recently ridden to victory by three youth national champions at the 2013 Red Bull Amateur National Motocross Championship in Hurricane Mills, Tennessee. While I know the folks at Cobra were very excited at the results, this success doesn't come as a surprise to anyone in the motorcycling community.

Since 1993, Cobra has consistently delivered the most successful line of competition mini bikes in the country. Riders have driven these iconic little yellow bikes to more than 300 titles, a testament to the high standards Cobra demands from each one of their machines.

In this 20th year of producing quality competition dirt bikes, I offer my sincere congratulations and best wishes to the people of Cobra and the riders who enjoy their quality machines.

CONGRATULATIONS DR. CHERYL A. MARSHALL

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Dr. Cheryl A. Marshall who will be inducted as the seventh president of Crafton Hills College on September 27, 2013.

Dr. Marshall has had a distinguished career in the field of education. Having received her doctorate of education from the University of Southern California, Dr. Marshall has spent ten of the last twenty years as an educator in positions of leadership, changing the lives of her students for the better. As a member of the Inland Empire Economic Partnership's Education Council, she has contributed to the region-wide effort to address educational gaps and prepare our students for a strong presence in the workforce. As a former educator, I believe it is her specialization in educational management, strategic planning, and performance management that sets her apart.

A firm believer in the intrinsic value of education, Dr. Marshall fully understands and appreciates the vital role that education plays in our society. Having secured close to $9 million dollars in grant funding during her career, she has been able to safeguard various programs and services would always be available in order for her students to succeed. During her tenure as Vice President of Instruction, Dr. Marshall ensured Crafton Hills College received full accreditation within just two years. Such dedication, exemplified by Dr. Marshall, makes Crafton Hills College an excellent institution of higher learning.

In closing, I'd like to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Dr. Marshall, her husband Patrick and their two children on her inauguration. I look forward to seeing Crafton Hills College grow and prosper under her experienced direction.

IN RECOGNITION OF COL. CHARLES JACKSON

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exemplary career of Col. Charles

Jackson who recently retired from his position as Assistant Vice President for Facilities at the University of North Texas (UNT) in Denton, Texas. For over a decade, he has competently overseen the rapid growth of new construction and renovation of numerous campus buildings. Prior to his work at UNT, Col. Jackson spent the majority of his career serving his country on active duty with the United States Air Force (USAF). As a registered professional engineer and member of the Association of Physical Plant Administrators, Col. Jackson has distinguished himself as an accomplished military and civilian engineer through his successful direction of numerous projects and developments, domestically and abroad.

Col. Jackson received a B.A. in civil engineering from the U.S. Air Force Academy and a M.A. in engineering/facilities from the Air Force Institute of Technology. He served as the commander of the 7th Engineering Squadron at Carswell Air Force Base at Fort Worth, Texas. His civil engineer leadership positions include duty assignments stateside in Colorado, Texas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma and overseas in Japan, Germany and Belgium. Col. Jackson dedicated 30 years of his life as a civil engineer in the Air Force and achieved the rank of Colonel upon his retirement in May 1998.

Following his departure from the Air Force, Col. Jackson began employment at UNT as Facilities Maintenance Manager and was selected for his current position in 2005. Since 2000, the UNT campus has rapidly expanded to accommodate the growing number of incoming students. Col. Jackson has overseen the construction of four residence halls, seven major buildings and additional renovation projects. His proudest accomplishments include the Library Mall, the Net Zero Energy Lab, and the recent completion of the SMART project which will have a long-term beneficial impact for the UNT campus. Col. Jackson acted as a vital proponent of this project that will save the University over $3 million in utility and operation costs annually and ensure reliable systems to support UNT into the future. The SMART project recently received a Green Ribbon Award in the infrastructure category from the U.S. Green Building Council North Texas as the best example of the implementation of sustainable infrastructure design, construction or management practices.

On a personal level, I am grateful to Col. Jackson for his advice and expertise as a member of my Service Academy Board. As a USAF Academy graduate and higher education representative, Col. Jackson's role was to comprehensively screen and interview high school and college applicants wishing to receive a congressional nomination and to advise me upon the selection of qualified service academy candidates.

I join his family, friends and colleagues in congratulating Col. Charles Jackson upon his exemplary service to our community, state and Nation and extend my warmest wishes upon a well-earned retirement. His positive contributions and dedicated efforts will continue to enhance the University of North Texas for years to come, and I am privileged to represent the University of North Texas in the U.S. House of Representatives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 449, I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 2844.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

CONGRATULATING THE RIO RICO LITTLE LEAGUE JUNIORS

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Rio Rico Little League Juniors, this year's National Champions.

On August 16, 2013, Rio Rico (4–1) beat Goodlettsville, Tennessee 7–3 to capture the United States Championship at the Junior League World Series.

The Rio Rico Little League Juniors advanced through the state, regionals, and won the National Championship and represented the United States against the undefeated Asia Pacific Baseball Academy team from Taiyuan, Chinese Taipei (Taiwan).

On August 18, 2013, Nogales and Rio Rico both came together in celebration of the Little League's success. The streets were filled with fire trucks, fans, and family members who eagerly and fondly received the team for the champions they are.

I like to extend my deepest congratulations to the Rio Rico Little League boys and to the coaches that contributed to the very success and victory of the team.

I also give my most sincere thanks to the Rio Rico Little League juniors for their wonderful performance and for representing all of Arizona with such pride, dignity, and courage.

HONORING CITY MANAGER TOM ROBINSON

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tom Robinson for his public service to the people of La Mirada, California. Tom began with the city in 1985 as the Community Resource Manager and, in 2008, Tom was appointed City Manager. After 27 productive years of service to La Mirada and its residents, Tom has retired.

During his tenure with the City of La Mirada, Tom always provided strong leadership and knowledgeable direction for major projects. Those numerous projects included the City's Community Services Master Plan, the Social Services Model Plan, and the development of the Splash! La Mirada Regional Aquatics Center.

Over the past decade, Tom has worked tirelessly to ensure La Mirada operates on firm financial footing and never outside its fiscal means. While the struggling economy has impacted many cities throughout Southern California, La Mirada has managed to maintain funding for all city services and capital improvement projects and Tom is a big reason why. It's no surprise La Mirada was listed by CNN and Money Magazine as one of the "Best Places to Live" in 2007.

As an active civic member, he has served as a member of the American Society for Public Administration, an accredited member of the Public Relations Society of America, and a member and former president of the Rotary Club of La Mirada. Robinson has been recognized by the California Association of Public Information Officials (CAPIO). The award recognizes exceptional service and career achievement by public communicators.

From one public servant to another, I praise Tom Robinson and commend him on his many years of outstanding public service and dedication to the City of La Mirada and its residents. Let us wish him and his family the very best in retirement.

HONORING CRISTIAN ROLDAN, RECIPIENT OF THE 2012–2013 GATORADE NATIONAL BOYS SOCCER PLAYER OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am here to congratulate Cristian Roldan, who is the recipient of the 2012–2013 Gatorade National Boys Soccer Player of the Year Award. This is an amazing feat that deserves our recognition.

In 1985, The Gatorade Company established an award to recognize high school athletes across the country. Since then, more than 12,500 students have been honored with the award of State Player of the Year and 250 National Players of the Year. This prestigious list includes many top professional athletes such as Payton Manning, Lisa Leslie, and Derek Jeter. The Gatorade Player of the Year award is presented to high school athletes that have achieved athletic excellence as well as high standards of academic achievement and model character on and off the field. Cristian was selected as the National Player of the Year out of 400,000 boys high school soccer players.

Cristian, recently graduated from El Rancho High School in Pico Rivera, CA. Cristian; a 5-foot-7, 165-pound midfielder; was without a doubt the catalyst of the El Rancho Dons boys' soccer team this past season leading them to a 29–2–1 record and the California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) Southern Section Division III title. Scoring 54 goals and 31 assists, he also helped the Dons capture the Division I title at the CIF Southern California Regional Soccer Championships. As the season came to a successful end, Cristian was awarded Most Valuable Player of the CIF Southern Section Division III.

In addition to his success on the soccer field, Cristian was a three-year varsity volleyball player, all while earning a 3.74 GPA his senior year. Cristian is a member of the California Scholarship Federation for his academic excellence and serves as a peer mentor in his spare time. Cristian has displayed

his exemplary character by serving as a volunteer coach for the American Youth Soccer Organization, participating in the El Rancho's Blue Pride service project, and for being a member of the Dons' College Bound Athletes Committee.

Cristian is the fourth boys Gatorade National Player of the Year from California and the first from Los Angeles County. Cristian intends to play soccer on an athletic scholarship at the University of Washington this fall.

What Cristian has achieved is something that deserves our recognition today. Cristian has displayed great academic and athletic achievement. I would like to recognize and congratulate Cristian Roldan for receiving the Gatorade National Player of the Year Award. I wish him a successful college career at the University of Washington.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6301–S6335

Measures Introduced: Five bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1489–1493, S.J. Res. 22, and S. Res. 221. **Page S6327**

Measures Reported:

S. 289, to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 113–89)

S. 511, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to enhance the Small Business Investment Company Program, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 113–90)

S. 537, to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 113–91)

S. 28, to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in Utah to Brigham Young University, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 113–92)

S. 155, to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Denali. (S. Rept. No. 113–93)

S. 159, to designate the Wovoka Wilderness and provide for certain land conveyances in Lyon County, Nevada, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 113–94)

S. 255, to withdraw certain Federal land and interests in that land from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under the mineral and geothermal leasing laws, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 113–95)

S. 285, to designate the Valles Caldera National Preserve as a unit of the National Park System, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 113–96)

S. 327, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with State foresters authorizing State foresters to provide certain forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 113–97)

S. 340, to provide for the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 113–98)

S. 341, to designate certain lands in San Miguel, Ouray, and San Juan Counties, Colorado, as wilderness, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 113–99)

S. 353, to designate certain land in the State of Oregon as wilderness, to make additional wild and scenic river designations in the State of Oregon, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 113–100)

S. 360, to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 113–101)

S. 486, to authorize pedestrian and motorized vehicular access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 113–102)

S. 718, to create jobs in the United States by increasing United States exports to Africa by at least 200 percent in real dollar value within 10 years, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 113–103) **Page S6327**

Measures Passed:

Naturopathic Medicine Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 221, designating the week of October 7 through October 13, 2013, as "Naturopathic Medicine Week" to recognize the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care. **Pages S6334–35**

Measures Considered:

Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against the Government of Syria to Respond to Use of Chemical Weapons: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 21, to authorize the limited and specified use of the United States Armed Forces against Syria. **Pages S6301–04, S6307–21**

Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the order of Thursday, August 1, 2013, with respect to S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, be modified so that the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill be agreed to at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader with the concurrence of the Republican Leader. **Page S6302**

Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act—Referral Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 1427, to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies, and the bill then be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. **Page S6335**

Moment of Silence for 9/11 Victims—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that following the prayer and pledge on Wednesday, September 11, 2013, there be a moment of silence to pay tribute to the thousands of Americans whose lives were taken on September 11, 2001. **Page S6335**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–17) **Page S6326**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

Marilyn A. Brown, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2017. **Pages S6307, S6335**

Messages from the House: **Page S6326**

Measures Referred: **Page S6326**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6327–29**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6329–34**

Additional Statements: **Page S6326**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S6334**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S6334**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:22 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, September 11, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's RECORD on page S6335.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Wanda Felton, of New York, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and Katherine M. O'Regan, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

INDIAN AFFAIRS LEGISLATION

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 1448, to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, S. 1219, to authorize the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement, and S. 1447, to make technical corrections to certain Native American water rights settlements in the State of New Mexico, after receiving testimony from Kevin K. Washburn, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs; Rudy J. Peone, and Marian Wynecoop, both of the Spokane Tribe of Indians, Wellpinit, Washington; and Mark Macarro, Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, and Matthew G. Stone, Rancho California Water District, both of Temecula.

FEDERAL JUDGESHIP ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts concluded a hearing to examine S. 1385, to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges, after receiving testimony from Timothy M. Tymkovich, United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, on behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States; Sue L. Robinson, United States District Judge, United States District Court for the District of Delaware; Jay Alan Sekulow, American Center for Law and Justice, Washington, D.C.; and Michael H. Reed, Pepper Hamilton LLP, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on behalf of the American Bar Association.

CONFLICTS BETWEEN STATE AND FEDERAL MARIJUANA LAWS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine conflicts between state and Federal marijuana laws, after receiving testimony from

James M. Cole, Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice; John Urquhart, Sheriff of King County, Seattle, Washington; Jack Finlaw, Colorado Governor John W. Hickenlooper Chief Legal Counsel, Denver; and Kevin A. Sabet, University of Florida Drug Policy Institute, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

AMERICAN LEGION LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the American Legion, after receiving testimony from Daniel M. Dellinger, Brett Reistad, Louis Celli, Ralph Bozella, Verna Jones, Dale Barnett, and Mark Walker, all of the American Legion, Washington, D.C.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 6 public bills, H.R. 3073–3078; 1 private bill, H.R. 3079; and 3 resolutions, H.J. Res. 59; and H. Res. 338, 340 were introduced. **Pages H5475–76**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5476–77**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

S. 130, to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming (H. Rept. 113–190);

S. 304, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–191);

S. 157, to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–192);

S. 459, to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–193);

H.R. 2650, to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land (H. Rept. 113–194);

H.R. 2388, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take certain Federal lands located in El Dorado County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 113–195);

H.R. 2337, to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado (H. Rept. 113–196);

H.R. 1964, to amend the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, including at least one lease sale in the Reserve each year in the period 2013 through 2023, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–197);

H.R. 1684, to convey certain property to the State of Wyoming to consolidate the historic Ranch A, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–198);

H.R. 1394, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish goals for an all-of-the-above energy production plan strategy on a 4-year basis on all onshore Federal lands managed by the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service (H. Rept. 113–199);

H.R. 255, to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–200);

H.R. 555, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct onshore oil and gas lease sales through Internet-based live lease sales, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–201);

H.R. 1818, to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada before the date the polar bear was determined to be a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (H. Rept. 113–202);

H.R. 740, to provide for the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–203);

H.R. 553, to designate the exclusive economic zone of the United States as the "Ronald Wilson

Reagan Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States" (H. Rept. 113–204);

H.R. 2637, 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, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–205); and

H. Res. 339, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–206). **Page H5475**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Ros-Lehtinen to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5437**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:27 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5440**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Rev. Dr. Harmon E. Stockdale, Mt. Vernon Missionary Baptist Church, Rochester, New York. **Page H5440**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:22 p.m. and reconvened at 1:38 p.m. **Page H5455**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013: H.R. 1155, amended, to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 397 yeas to 6 nays, Roll No. 450; **Pages H5443–49, H5455–56**

Streamlining Claims Processing for Federal Contractor Employees Act: H.R. 2747, to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 396 yeas to 10 nays, Roll No. 451; **Pages H5449–50, H5456**

Powell Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act: S. 130, to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 408 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 452; **Pages H5450–51, H5456–57**

Denali National Park Improvement Act: S. 157, to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska; **Pages H5451–52**

Natchez Trace Parkway Land Conveyance Act of 2013: S. 304, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 419 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 453; **Pages H5452–53, H5458**

Amending Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands: S. 256, to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 415 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 454; and **Pages H5453–54, H5458–59**

Minuteman Missile National Historic Site Boundary Modification Act: S. 459, to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 414 yeas to 5 nays, Roll No. 455. **Pages H5454–55, H5459–60**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan, their families, and all who serve in our armed forces and their families. **Page H5456**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:25 p.m. and reconvened at 4:30 p.m. **Page H5457**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the emergency declared in Proclamation 7463 with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001 is to continue in effect for an additional year—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 113–59). **Page H5460**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5455–56, H5456, H5457, H5458, H5458–59 and H5459–60. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

Committee Hearings

PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION TO USE MILITARY FORCE IN SYRIA

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing on Proposed Authorization to Use Military Force in Syria. Testimony was heard from John F. Kerry, Secretary, Department of State; Chuck Hagel, Secretary, Department of Defense; and General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense.

EXPLORING OPPORTUNITIES TO STRENGTHEN THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Education Research: Exploring Opportunities to Strengthen the Institute of Education Sciences''. Testimony was heard from George A. Scott, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

IMPLEMENTING THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT—NEXT STEPS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing entitled ''Implementing the Nuclear Waste Policy Act—Next Steps''. Testimony was heard from Allison Macfarlane, Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission; and Peter Lyons, Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy, Department of Energy.

PPACA PULSE CHECK: PART 2

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''PPACA Pulse Check: Part 2''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

REDUCING WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN HOUSING PROGRAMS: INSPECTOR GENERAL PERSPECTIVES

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Reducing Waste, Fraud, and Abuse in Housing Programs: Inspector General Perspectives''. Testimony was heard from David A. Montoya, Inspector General, Office of the Inspector General, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

CHALLENGES TO DEMOCRACY IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere held a hearing entitled ''Challenges to Democracy in the Western Hemisphere''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

INDIA'S MISSING GIRLS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled ''India's Missing Girls''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CRISIS IN SYRIA: IMPLICATIONS FOR HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Crisis In Syria: Implications for Homeland Security''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SATELLITE TELEVISION LAWS IN TITLE 17

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''Satellite Television Laws In Title 17''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SCHOOL TRUST LANDS OWNERSHIP WITHIN FEDERAL CONSERVATION AREAS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation held a hearing entitled ''School Trust Lands Ownership Within Federal Conservation Areas''. Testimony was heard from Mary Abrams, Director of State Lands, State of Oregon; Tim Donaldson, School Children's Trust Director, Office of Education, State of Utah; Kathy Opp, Deputy Director Department of Lands, State of Idaho; and a public witness.

PREVENTING VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL TRANSPARENCY LAWS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Preventing Violations of Federal Transparency Laws''. Testimony was heard from Gary Gensler, Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission; David S. Ferriero, Archivist of the United States; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 2775, to condition the provision of premium and costsharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes. The Committee granted, by voice vote, a closed rule for H.R. 2775. The rule provides one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Ellmers and Pallone.

EXAMINING FEDERAL ADVANCED MANUFACTURING PROGRAMS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Examining Federal Advanced Manufacturing Programs''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MARITIME TRANSPORTATION REGULATIONS: IMPACTS ON SAFETY, SECURITY, JOBS AND THE ENVIRONMENT, PART 1

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled ''Maritime Transportation Regulations: Impacts on Safety, Security, Jobs and the Environment, Part 1''. Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Joseph Servidio, Assistant Commandant for Prevention Policy, United States Coast Guard; Mario Cordero, Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission; Paul ''Chip'' Jaenichen, Acting Administrator, Maritime Administration; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

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, 10:30 a.m., SD–138.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance, to hold hearings to examine assessing the investment climate and improving market access in financial services in India, 2 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the Department of Homeland Security at 10 years, focusing on examining challenges and achievements and addressing emerging threats, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert Leon Wilkins, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Timothy L. Brooks, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, James Donato, and Beth Labson Freeman, both to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, 10 a.m., SD–226.

House

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, hearing entitled ''Keeping College Within Reach: Supporting Higher Education Opportunities for America's Servicemembers and Veterans'', 12 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Technology, hearing entitled ''Innovation Versus Regulation in the Video Marketplace'', 2 p.m. 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled ''The Fed Turns 100: Lessons Learned over a Century of Central Banking'', 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, hearing entitled ''The Threat to Americans' Personal Information: A Look into the Security and Reliability of the Health Exchange Data Hub'', 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2655, the ''Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2013''; H.R. 2871, to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the composition of the southern judicial district of Mississippi to improve judicial efficiency, and for other purposes; H.R. 2922, to extend the authority of the Supreme Court Police to protect court officials away from the Supreme Court grounds; and a vote to close to the public the classified Full Committee hearing on September 18 entitled ''Oversight of the Administration's use of FISA Authorities'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing on the Reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and the Census, hearing entitled ''Ensuring an Accurate and Affordable 2020 Census'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the SIGTARP Report on Treasury's Role in the Delphi Pension Bailout'', 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing entitled ''Implementation Update: Fully Developed Claims'', 3 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Human Resources, hearing on preventing the payment of unemployment benefits to incarcerated individuals and other ways to improve the integrity of the Unemployment Insurance program, 1:15 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, September 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: At approximately 10 a.m., Senate will observe a moment of silence to pay tribute to the thousands of Americans whose lives were taken on September 11, 2001.

At 11 a.m., there will be a bipartisan, bicameral remembrance ceremony of the 12th anniversary of the September 11th attacks. Members will gather in the rotunda at 10:45 a.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, September 11

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 2775—To condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barber, Ron, Ariz., E1275
Boehner, John A., Ohio, E1271
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E1271
Brooks, Mo, Ala., E1272
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1271, E1277
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E1271
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1274, E1276
Collins, Doug, Ga., E1273
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1275
Cook, Paul, Calif., E1271, E1277
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E1274
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1273
Fincher, Stephen Lee, Tenn., E1276
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E1274, E1278
Kline, John, Minn., E1275
Loebsack, David, Iowa, E1276
McCarthy, Kevin, Calif., E1272
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E1272
McNerney, Jerry, Calif., E1275
Meng, Grace, N.Y., E1275
Miller, George, Calif., E1274
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1276
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E1278, E1278
Schwartz, Allyson Y., Pa., E1274, E1278
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1277
Valadao, David G., Calif., E1276
Walberg, Tim, Mich., E1277
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E1273

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.