United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2013 No. 123

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 18, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG LAMALFA 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.

ALZHEIMER'S MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to discuss the sixth-leading cause of death in the United States of America and the fifth-leading cause of death for those aged 65 years and older. It's a disease more than 5 million Americans are living with and is the only cause of death among the top 10 in the United States without a way to cure it or to slow its progression. It's a type of dementia that encompasses various diseases and conditions that damage brain cells—Alzheimer's disease.

September is Alzheimer's Month, a time spent by Alzheimer's advocates in promoting and educating on this life-changing disease.

According to the Alzheimer's Association, deaths from Alzheimer's increased close to 70 percent between 2000 and 2010. During that same time period, deaths from other major diseases, such as heart disease, decreased. In my home State of Pennsylvania, in 2010, more than 3,500 individuals died from Alzheimer's. My mom, Mary Thompson, suffered with Alzheimer's for 10 years as the disease slowly stole her memories, her dignity and, eventually, her life.

In 2010, Congress passed legislation to create a national plan to combat Alzheimer's disease. It established a National Alzheimer's Project within the Department of Health and Human Services in order to coordinate the country's approach to research and caregiving. This effort supports the amazing work being done through medical research and awareness to improve the lives of those who are living with Alzheimer's.

While awareness of Alzheimer's has grown over the last decade, America and the world have a long way to go to educate and combat this disease. Alzheimer's is a condition that most Americans have encountered through a parent, a loved one, a friend or someone close they care about. However, together, through continued advocacy, research and the dedicated work of health professionals, care providers and scientific researchers, we can and will make a difference.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, week after week, I've stood on this floor and talked about hunger in America. Week after week, I've talked about the devastating impacts of hunger in our country—how it affects kids and seniors and how our country is worse off because of hunger. I've talked about ways we can end hunger, and have expressed my commitment to the effort to end hunger now.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the Republican leadership not only willfully ignores the plight of the hungry in America, but they are actually moving legislation that will make hunger in America worse.

Just a few weeks ago, USDA released the newest data on hunger in America. Hunger rates have essentially stayed flat over the past few years. That means that, statistically, hunger hasn't gotten worse since the end of the Great Recession, but it hasn't gotten any better either.

The United States has a strong anti-hunger safety net. Even though we have 49 million people who don't know where their next meals will come from, we know that nearly 48 million of them are enrolled in SNAP, formerly known as ''food stamps.'' SNAP is a lifeline. It provides low-income families with access to food, access they wouldn't otherwise have if they were not enrolled in SNAP. Now let me address a common piece of misinformation, a fabrication, that opponents of SNAP continue to use again and again.

SNAP is among the most effective and efficient, if not the most effective and efficient, Federal program in America. SNAP error rates—overpayments, underpayments and fraud rates—are not only at all-time lows for the program, but they are among the lowest rates of any Federal program. This notion that fraud, waste and abuse are rampant in SNAP is a fallacy. It's a make-believe talking point designed to take away food from hungry people. Yet the Republicans are

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

bringing a bill to the floor tomorrow that, if passed, will undoubtedly make hunger worse in this country. Their bill will make hunger worse for working mothers and fathers, for kids, for senior citizens, and even for our veterans.

CBO reports that the bill would cut 3.8 million low-income people from SNAP in 2014—and just so there is no misunderstanding, ''low-income'' means ''poor.'' On top of that, an average of nearly 3 million people will be cut from SNAP each and every year over the coming decade. These are some of the Nation's most destitute adults as well as many low-income children, seniors and families that work for low wages. That's right. People who work but who don't make enough to feed their families will be cut from this program.

The biggest cut affects at least 1.7 million unemployed, childless adults in 2014 who live in areas of high unemployment. These are poor people. Many don't have the skills or education they need to find a job. This is a group whose average income is about $2,500 a year for a single individual—$2,500 a year—and for most, SNAP is the only government assistance they receive.

This bill also cuts an additional 2.1 million people from SNAP in 2014, mostly low-income working families and low-income seniors. These are people who have gross incomes or assets modestly above the Federal SNAP limits but whose disposable incomes—the income that a family actually has available to spend on food and other needs—are below the poverty line, in most cases often because of high rent or child care costs.

If that weren't bad enough, 210,000 children in those families would also lose their free school meals, and 170,000 unemployed veterans will lose their SNAP benefits. To top it all off, other poor, unemployed parents who want to work but who cannot find a job or an opening in a training program, along with their children other than infants, will be cut from the program.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when combating hunger was a bipartisan issue—when Bob Dole worked with George McGovern and when Bill Emerson worked with Tony Hall. It didn't matter whether you were a liberal or a conservative—ending hunger was a priority. The current Republican leadership has blown all that up.

We should not do this. There are no hearings on this bill, no markup, no semblance of regular order. And for what—to stick it to the working poor yet again? We should be doing everything we can to end hunger now. The Republican bill just makes hunger worse, and it should be soundly defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge and I plead with both Democrats and Republicans to stand together, to come together in a bipartisan way, and to demand to end hunger now.

Please, please, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, reject this Republican leadership bill that is coming to the floor tomorrow. It is cruel. It is immoral. We are much better than this. Reject the leadership bill.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, although this hall is empty, there are a lot of people watching it, and I wonder how many of them have ever actually gone hungry. How many of the people watching this have had to go without a meal so their kids could eat? How many have had to wonder how they'll get through a summer without subsidized school lunches? It's easy to talk about pulling yourself up by your bootstraps when you've had designer shoes on your whole life.

Tomorrow, we will be voting on whether or not to cut $40 billion from SNAP. That's a nutrition program for people who do not have access to adequate nutrition. It's a program that helps one out of seven Americans to put food on the table. If this seems familiar, it's because it is familiar. Republicans tried just exactly this before the August recess, a couple of months ago, and not surprisingly, for the most unproductive Congress in decades, this bill had to be pulled at the last minute because of a lack of support. Even some of the Republicans saw it was too much.

Anyone who has been paying attention knows that symbolic votes to nowhere are the bread and butter for this Congress, but the Republicans couldn't even get their own support on the bill—$20 billion of cuts that primarily help children and the elderly wasn't enough for them. They had to hurt people more, so here we are again with a new, improved plan that doubles the cuts to $40 billion. On top of making 2 million people ineligible for benefits, they are also going to take away our States' ability to provide temporary benefits in times of high unemployment. As a result, the CBO predicts that this will add an additional 1.8 million hungry Americans to the ''ineligible'' list.

Why are we attempting to inflict another needless wound on the working poor?

Republicans will tell you that the program has grown too much over the last few years, as though the need for food stamps were unrelated to a dragging economy. They see no connection between the economy and the fact that people don't have food. That's exactly what the program was designed to do—quickly help people who are in need. When unemployment is high and people can't pay their bills, that's exactly the time they need the SNAP program. Caseloads rose dramatically when the recession hit. We laid off 700,000 people a month in 2007, but that growth has also slowed as the economy has recovered slowly. The CBO projects that, in just a few years, SNAP spending will be back down to 1995 levels as a share of the GDP, and since it's shrinking on its own, it isn't adding to the long-term deficit problems.

The rhetoric is simply empty and stupid. Conservatives can try and push this tired welfare abuse narrative. It's a talking point. Every time they come out here, ''Welfare abuse. Welfare abuse. People are getting money for food. That's welfare abuse,'' but as usual, the reality is not in their corner. Studies show that food assistance has some of the lowest rates of fraud of any benefit program. If you go to one of those food banks and talk to the people who are there, you'll find some surprising people there, people who thought they would never have to go there, but they are short on money and can't feed their kids, so they're getting some money.

So I ask you again: Why are we doing this—wasting time to satisfy the furthest right-wing of the Republican Party?

We are again catering to a fringe agenda thought up by partisans who are obsessed with the deficit bogeyman. That bogeyman has been roaming around here for 4 years. ''We're going to have a terrible collapse. We're going to have inflation. We're going to have terrible things.'' It has never happened. The President has done a miraculous job in keeping us on an upward track in spite of the resistance of the other side. What it does is it makes it harder for 4 million people to put food on the table.

So be it. That's their attitude. I'm in. At least they won't risk facing a primary in the next election. They are all worried about somebody further on the right. We've already got one Member over here, Mr. Speaker, who is worried about somebody coming from the right, and he's about the furthest right I can imagine on the floor.

Senate Democrats and Republicans appointed conferees to negotiate a farm bill back at the beginning of August. Quit worrying about scoring points with the Heritage Foundation, and let's focus on the American family and vote this bill down.

□ 1015

SNAP

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I think each one of us 435 has to ask ourselves, Is this really what we were sent here to do, to take food out of the mouths of hungry people, nearly half of them children? That's what's at stake this week when we are asked to vote on legislation that would cut $39 billion from one of our Nation's most successful and important programs, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP. It used to be called food stamps.

As a Jew, we just came through the Jewish holidays, and we talked about what it means to be a human being in this world, in this country. Every major religion in this world and represented in this House teaches that you feed the hungry. Not as charity, but as a mandate, because that's what it is to be a human being in our world. All the religions have written letters and implored us not to do this.

I participated three times in the congressional food stamp challenge in which we eat on $31.50 for an entire week. I'm not complaining about it because I knew it was just a week and it would end, but that's the average SNAP benefit. You know what? You can get the calories. That's pretty easy if you're lucky enough to live near a grocery store and not in a food desert. The reality for 48 million people is that you can get the calories, but it's really hard to get the nutrition. By the time you get to the fruits and vegetables, which are quite expensive, it's hard to do it. It's not comfortable to rely on SNAP benefits, and many people line up at the end of the month at food pantries that are everywhere in this country, including some of the richest districts. But the SNAP program, which has a bipartisan history, is the last line of defense between 48 million Americans and chronic hunger.

The House already voted down a farm bill that included $20 billion in SNAP cuts, and it would have taken benefits away from up to a million children and would have prevented 200,000 hungry children from getting the school lunches that they rely on so much. Now this bill is back but on steroids. In addition to all of the devastating cuts that have been proposed, those that were rejected earlier, the new bill would prevent any able-bodied adult from getting more than 3 months of SNAP benefits during a 3-year period, even if they're unable to find work. Up to 170,000 of those who are veterans who served our country would be denied. This is at a time when unemployment among low-income Americans is over 20 percent and the average time of unemployment is about 9 months. Those numbers don't add up. It means that passage of this bill could nearly starve those looking for work, and no one can deny that fact.

I know how SNAP benefits my constituents, and I know what would happen if those benefits were lost. I've attended several events at food pantries and community centers, and each time I've heard resounding support for SNAP. In just one day, I received 242 postcards from my constituents urging me to oppose these dangerous cuts to the SNAP program. They have my vote, and I'm imploring my colleagues that it should have the vote of every Member of this body to reject those cuts.

A constituent who previously wrote to my office summed up her thoughts about the importance of funding the SNAP program this way. Here's what she said:

> Hungry thoughts every waking day are my constant companion here in the supposedly wealthiest country on Earth. Please have compassion for your low-income and fixed-income constituents who are loyal, patriotic Americans and who are in dire need of nutritious and affordable food.

A former SNAP beneficiary, a woman named Dresden Shumaker, described the program as a trampoline rather than a safety net. Because of SNAP, she was able to make ends meet for her young family during a period of time of great need. Her story is similar to most SNAP beneficiaries who no longer need food assistance within one year of receiving benefits.

I'm begging my colleagues, please, don't support these cuts. Let's be the value-driven country that we are and vote ''no'' to the $40 billion cut to SNAP.

SNAP

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the ongoing Republican war on the poor—and that's what this is—and their attempt to gut our Nation's critical safety net against hunger one more time.

This past June, the Republican leadership failed millions of farmers and millions of struggling families when they could not pass a farm bill. They allowed the extremist Tea Party fringe of their party to poison the farm bill with amendments and so-called reforms that, in fact, would only increase hardship and hunger in America.

Yet instead of working across the aisle to find a better solution that would create jobs and protect families, the Republican leadership has chosen to bring an even more hurtful, toxic, and heartless nutrition bill to the floor. This new bill includes all of the extremist amendments that killed the first farm bill. It also piles on even more restrictions and so-called reforms that only serve to increase hardship for hungry families, children, seniors, and veterans.

These false reforms will dramatically reduce access to vital nutrition assistance all across America—rural and urban—in every single one of our congressional districts.

This bill would also end critical flexibilities for our States and would cripple smart and targeted programs that allow States to efficiently deliver nutrition assistance to the neediest. For example, the Republican nutrition-only bill would end categorical eligibility for all of our States.

We created this to streamline the delivery of social services so that we can lower administrative costs and put more of these dollars directly into the hands of needy families. This Republican bill would end those efficiencies, raise costs for our States, and make it harder for families to get the help they need.

This bill also claims to create work requirements for able-bodied adults. Let me remind my colleagues that the SNAP program already has very restrictive work requirements. The current SNAP program cuts off able-bodied adults after just 3 months of benefits right now. We only allow States to adopt waivers for when unemployment in their States rises high enough that this restriction is clearly unreasonable. The new so-called ''reforms'' would cut everybody off, no matter what the unemployment rate is in their State. This is just heartless. These cuts would come at a time when the Republicans have blocked every single effort to pass a real jobs bill in the House and cut job-training and job-placement assistance. Let me tell you, as a former food stamp recipient myself, I know that people don't want to be on food stamps. They want to work. If we're going to put work requirements on people, why in the world don't we pass a jobs bill so they can work?

At a time when our Nation should be creating opportunities for all, the House Republican leadership proposed to cut SNAP by $40 billion. This will surely create a bleaker future for our children, our seniors, and our overall economy. If this bill ever becomes law—and I hope it doesn't—at least 4 million to 6 million low-income children, seniors, and families will be cut from this economic lifeline and pushed into poverty.

Similar to about 29 of my colleagues, I have taken the food stamp challenge about three times and ate off of $4.50 a day. It was unhealthy and very difficult; yet I knew it would only last a week for me. Yet millions of Americans see no end in sight. And now, mind you, they have to worry that this meager benefit, this pittance, is going to be cut even more.

Instead of gutting SNAP, we need to strengthen it. Not only does SNAP help put food on the table for struggling families; it also helps stimulate economic growth. For every $1 in SNAP benefits, we generate $1.70 in economic activity. So Congressman CONYERS and I have introduced new legislation that would extend the SNAP benefits that were increased as a part of the stimulus package. Otherwise—and many don't know this—on November 1, every single family or individual who receives SNAP benefits now will see an automatic cut of about $29 per month for a family of three. This will happen regardless of this $40 billion nutrition cut.

In 2011, SNAP lifted 4.7 million Americans out of poverty. Without SNAP, millions more would fall into poverty, millions more of Americans would suffer hunger, and our economy would create even fewer jobs and be worse off.

I just have to say, our values as Americans and who we are as a country recognize that these despicable cuts are immoral and un-American. We need to provide opportunities to help lift families out of poverty, grow the economy, and create economic stability for

all. Let's restore a unified farm bill, and let's put an end to these draconian cuts to SNAP.

SNAP

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, there's a cruel war being waged on the poor and hungry in America. I stand today as a voice for more than 1.6 million Texas households who depend on SNAP. Cuts to SNAP, our Nation's first line of defense against hunger, are immoral. I will not stand by as my Republican colleagues continue to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans.

House Republicans unveiled on Monday a plan to cut over $40 billion in SNAP over the next 10 years. This proposed package would eliminate basic food assistance for over 4 million Americans, including poor jobless adults in areas of high unemployment, working-poor families, children, seniors, and even struggling veterans.

Some might say that the proposal is an attempt to reduce fraud or waste in the program. Some say benefits are going to adults who don't want to work. I have news for people who say that: you try earning minimum wage, working hard every day, and you will still, after working 40 hours a week at the end of the year, only make around $15,000.

All of these claims are misleading to the public. SNAP fraud has been reduced to about 1 cent per dollar spent on the program, according to one of the most recent USDA statistics. In fact, the cuts will come from benefits that many Americans need to survive. These cuts will take food out of our seniors' refrigerators and food out of the mouths of our babies. This new legislation unfairly targets millions of unemployed adults who want to find work; but due to a bad economy and a sluggish recovery, they cannot find a job.

□ 1030

This includes Republicans, too. I worked at a grocery store in Texas when I was in high school. And I saw Republicans come in from Republican strongholds, like Weatherford, Texas, Azle, Lake Worth, and they were on SNAP.

People need to stop stereotyping the program. Proponents claim that these cuts represent ''work requirements,'' but that is willfully misleading, Mr. Speaker. The provisions would callously terminate food aid to people who are willing to work but just can't find a job.

Just a few short weeks ago, the Republican leadership of this House tried to eliminate the SNAP benefits entirely when they stripped the nutrition program from the farm bill. This is a cruel assault against the most vulnerable and neediest Americans. Those affected by the bill's harshest provisions even include low-income veterans, putting food assistance at risk for an estimated 170,000 of the approximately 900,000 veterans who receive SNAP benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I also participated in the SNAP challenge this year and lived on a budget of $4.50 a day and can attest that it was not easy. I had to make tough decisions and realized firsthand how difficult it is to follow a healthy diet on such a limited budget. I made difficult choices, as families do every day, between purchasing nutritious options and what's on sale. As a father of a 7-year-old son, I cannot imagine the decisions many Texans have to make every day, including skipping a meal to provide nutrition for their kids.

When drafting this legislation, did anyone take the time to think about how these SNAP cuts would hurt our kids? Nearly half of all SNAP participants are kids. This represents close to one in three children in the United States. Without access to nutritious meals, our children are put at risk of developmental delays, poorer physical health, and many other ailments.

Mr. Speaker, we need to do everything that we can to keep the SNAP program going. The conditions that I have talked about are very serious when you think about it affecting a child's ability to learn and perform well in school. These long-range implications have dire consequences for our entire economy.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle who support these cuts, these kids that I just talked about, what did these kids do to deserve these cuts?

This past year, some 49 million Americans lacked access to adequate food because they didn't have enough money or other resources to meet their basic food needs. Many of these hungry Americans skipped meals or took other steps to reduce what they ate to make ends meet.

I represent a constituent in my district who is elderly, disabled, and lives on a fixed income. She received $93 a month in SNAP benefits, but recently, those were cut to only $52 a month. That's only $1.73 a day. And if this bill is passed, she will be cut off from the program entirely. I ask the proponents of this program, where is she to find assistance for her nutrition needs? I refuse to stand silent as some propose we take food out of the mouths of the hungry.

SNAP is also a very powerful antipoverty program that has helped make our economy stronger. In 2011, SNAP kept 4.7 million people out of poverty, including 2.1 million children.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS AND HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it's time for Congress to work together on a commonsense solution to address the impacts of climate change.

As we begin Hispanic Heritage Month, it's important for us to recognize the impact climate change is disproportionately having upon minority communities across the country. Whether it's farmers and ranchers in my home State of New Mexico struggling through devastating drought conditions or communities that are being impacted by recent flooding as a result of more severe weather, millions of Americans have been impacted by the effects of climate change.

Released earlier this year, a survey conducted by Public Policy Polling found 74 percent of Latinos believe climate change is a serious or a very serious problem, a higher level than the 65 percent among all American adults; 68 percent of Latinos support the President using his authority to reduce greenhouse gas pollution, including 60 percent of all American adults; 69 percent of Latinos agree with the President's statement that ''for the sake of our children'' and our future, we must do more to combat climate change, compared to 62 percent of all American adults.

Combating climate change and preserving our land, water, and air is a top priority for many Americans, especially those in minority communities. For years, a coalition of stakeholders, including Hispanic farmers and ranchers, tribal communities, conservation groups, hunting and fishing organizations, and local governments came together to lay the foundation that led to President Obama establishing the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument earlier this year. This is an example of the type of leadership and advocacy that can make a real difference in addressing climate change and preserving our precious resources. By establishing the Rio Grande del Norte, we have created economic certainty for farmers and ranchers, increased recreation and tourism opportunities, and, most importantly, protected our land, water, and air for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I have also come to the floor today to express my concern for the House Republicans' plan to slash funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. This program is vital to many in New Mexico, especially our children. Sadly, New Mexico ranks near the bottom when it comes to childhood well-being and ranked worst in childhood hunger.

The Republican plan to cut $40 billion from the SNAP program caters to the most extreme views. Earlier this year, they tried to cut $20 billion, only to have the Tea Party revolt. So the new plan goes even further at a time when many communities are still struggling from a slow economy, even including a provision that prevents high unemployment areas from receiving additional assistance.

Today we have 47 million Americans living in poverty. And while we should

be doing more to address the root causes, we should not turn our backs on those struggling to make ends meet by cutting benefits that help put food on the table for working families.

I believe we all share the goal of seeing a stronger economy that creates jobs and reduces the need for this kind of assistance. But until that time, let's not make the most vulnerable among us pay the steepest price.

SNAP BENEFITS FOR VETERANS

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, during the 35 years I spent in the military, it was my privilege to lead the outstanding men and women in our Armed Forces. Many are still serving today. They served with honor and distinction, yet here we are talking about treating the lowest paid of them like second-class citizens, unworthy of basic assistance in these difficult times.

I was elected to Congress to represent everyone in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois. I represent the poorest county in the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 100,000 people in my district, most of them children or seniors, live below the poverty line. My district has a higher proportion of veterans than any other district in this State.

I answer to Active Duty military and veterans who rely on SNAP benefits to make ends meet. They exist in my district and in every district represented in this House. Mr. Speaker, does anyone in this Chamber wish to tell them that in this hour of need, their country is turning its back on them? Who among us wants to decide which of these veterans deserve assistance and which do not? I know I don't.

According to the Census Bureau, about 7 percent of people who report prior military service also report receiving SNAP benefits. Census data indicates that some 1.5 million households with a veteran are receiving SNAP benefits.

The base pay of most recent enlistees, from corporals on down, is at or below the $23,050 poverty rate for a family of four. At military commissaries nationwide, nearly $88 million in SNAP benefits were redeemed. Stars and Stripes reported that in 2011, food stamp purchases at military commissaries tripled during the preceding 4 years.

Just last month, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities reported that approximately 900,000 veterans currently receive food aid and that proposed cuts would impact around 170,000.

According to The Hill newspaper, more than $98 million in SNAP benefits were redeemed by veterans in 2012. The Huffington Post reports that in 2011, ''both Active Duty members and retirees, together, used more than $100 million in Federal food aid in the past year.''

Sixteen percent of SNAP recipients are disabled, many of them are veterans. SNAP benefits are already scheduled to go down. On November 1, families of three will lose $29 a month. Now, that doesn't sound like very much, but the daily per person per meal benefit will be less than $1.40.

Recently, one Illinois veteran was quoted, saying, ''I relocated, and the job I was supposed to get fell through. I lived off my savings but found myself needing to apply for emergency assistance to sustain until I found a job. I, like many others, was only receiving assistance for a time (5 months) but don't know what I would have done without it.''

They served us with honor and distinction, Mr. Speaker. Some are still serving. Now it is time for us to serve them with a measure of honor and distinction of our own. I urge my colleagues to reject these shameful proposals which would cut this basic level of assistance to deserving recipients who need it now more than ever.

A SAD DAY IN AMERICA

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I probably don't need 5 minutes to say what I would like to say.

This is a very sad moment for the most powerful Nation in the history of this planet. We are on the verge of a government shutdown over ideology. I can remember in 1995, I was the mayor of Kansas City when the government shut down and the impact was Herculean, not just here in Washington, but around the country and around the world. And if we are proud to be Americans, it means that we pay our bills.

We are the only nation that still allows a vote by a legislature on paying our bills. Most countries won't do that because they don't need any disruption in paying their debts. We are close to declaring to the whole world that we don't pay our bills.

The other part that's troublesome is this whole issue of SNAP, or food stamps. And there are so many myths that roll around that it just turns my stomach.

I lived in a house with no running water or electricity until I was 7 years old. We moved into public housing. My father worked three jobs. He eventually was able to buy a home.

I know what it's like to be poor. I know what it's like to struggle. My father was able to send my mother to college when I was in the eighth grade, and then all four of his children graduated from college, too, with postgraduate degrees. So I am always insulted when I hear all of these irreverent and nasty comments about poor people. And we spread this stuff around the country to the point of absurdity.

We spread lies. ''Well, people go into stores and they buy alcohol with food stamps.'' Well, we don't have food stamps anymore. We have cards, Economic Benefit Transfer cards. And in spite of the lies that people tell, you can't buy alcohol with cards. You cannot buy lottery tickets. I heard Members of Congress—this Congress—tell people that they know that people in prison are getting food stamps, and they've seen people buy alcohol with food stamp cards. It doesn't work. And it divides and damages this Nation.

The other lie, over 70 percent of the people receiving SNAP benefits are the elderly, the disabled, and children. And we are against helping them? Another 25 percent are people who work every day, it's just that they can't make enough to survive.

I remember growing up and my mother would say, Eat everything on your plate; there are starving kids in Africa. Well, I'm not sure how eating everything on my plate helped them—I'm still struggling with that—but there are starving people not far from here, and the government of the United States is saying we'd rather shut down than to have a program that deals with the people who are in trouble.

I just heard a few moments ago about a 101-year-old person whose daily Meals on Wheels had been reduced. 101 years old, and people are celebrating that, Mr. Speaker? This is a sad, sad day. And by the end of next week, when we are shut down, it's going to be much sadder.

UNITED STATES FINANCIAL CRISIS: 5 YEARS LATER

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the meltdown of Lehman Brothers, and the 5-year anniversary of the greatest financial crisis in a generation that struck our country. This economic disaster nearly caused the destruction of our country's entire financial infrastructure and led to what we now call the Great Recession.

However, Wall Street, during the last 5 years, has actually profited greatly from this crisis and, in the process, has caused continuing financial failures of millions of Americans. JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, Citigroup, Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs, and Morgan Stanley have all reported record profits during the recession.

□ 1045

Wall Street, in the last 5 years, has regained all of its pre-crisis wealth with interest. Wouldn't the American people like to be in that position?

Meanwhile, Main Street has yet to see a real robust recovery.

The roots of the recession began in the late 1990s, when a majority in this Congress first overturned something called the Glass-Steagall Act, which separated speculative banking from prudent banking and then, in 2000, refused to regulate the trading of derivatives.

By hamstringing the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities Exchange Commission, Wall Street turned once stable investments into the toxic assets that brought down our economy.

American taxpayers were then asked to bail out these same banks responsible for trashing our economy and facilitating the single greatest redistribution of wealth from the poor and middle class to the rich in American history. Our middle class has shrunk.

And guess what?

The ranks of the poor shot up. It's no wonder people can't afford to pay for food. American citizens continue to struggle to recuperate their lost wealth from a clever banking system that stole their equity.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas recently reported that the cost of the collapse to the United States economy was up to $14 trillion. Is it any wonder we have rising debt levels?

It could be more when you factor in potential permanent losses in earning power by Americans who aren't paying taxes anymore because they're not working yet.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, from 2000 to 2011, the median income for working-age households fell from approximately $64,000 a year to $55,000. This is a decline of nearly 13 percent.

The U.S. Census Bureau paints a similar bleak picture of the precipitous decline in American household income. It shows that the overall median income of households has continued to fall since the start of recession, and now, people are earning—guess what—similar to what their median income was in 1988. That's right. They've lost decades of income growth.

Income inequality has only widened during the crisis, where only the top 5 percent of income earners in our country saw an increase in their earnings between 2010 and 2011. The top is doing fine. Everybody else is not.

In addition, a GAO report earlier this year estimated the total loss in household equity from the crisis to be $9 trillion. Those are some of your neighbors and mine. Indeed, what a property-taking that is.

Losses on this level prevent Americans from owning their own homes, opening their own businesses, or going to college and, ultimately, creating their own American Dream.

Meanwhile, on Wall Street, we see the enormous accumulation of banking assets and vast financial power in a handful of institutions. JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, Goldman Sachs, all of them are making enormous profits, in fact, the highest profits in the nation, along with the oil companies.

Fifteen years ago, the assets of the six-largest banks were approximately 17 percent of gross domestic product. Today, estimates for the assets of those same banks are equivalent to over half of our gross domestic product. So six institutions, JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, Citigroup, Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley control an enormous percentage of our banking system and, in turn, your future and our nation's future. That is too much power in the hands of the big six.

America is currently in the midst of the slowest recovery from a recession since World War II, and it's important that this Congress not sit idly by. In the 5 years since the recession, our economy has only managed to put more money in the pockets of the top 1 percent, ignoring the difficulties of the bottom 99 percent.

One way to begin rectifying this situation is to reinstitute the Glass-Steagall Act. I ask my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 129, the Return to Prudent Banking Act to restore the distinction between prudent banking and speculation. In addition, the executive branch should prosecute the predatory practices of those financial institutions that have led to this harm to the American people.

There should be no statute of limitation on the justice that is owed to the American people.

THE REPUBLICAN SNAP PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the deep cuts to nutrition programs that are being proposed this week by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program provides critical food and nutrition support for hardworking families in cities and towns all across my home State in Rhode Island. The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that more than 180,000 Rhode Islanders rely on this important program every day.

Once again, House Republicans have decided, rather than working to come to a bipartisan agreement on the farm bill, that they will instead pander to the far right of their party and, in doing so, impose real hardships on America's working families and put many children at risk of going hungry all across our country.

While protecting generous subsidies for agricultural corporations, my Republican colleagues are threatening the food security of our most vulnerable neighbors. So let's review this package of cuts to the nutrition program and consider its impact on children, seniors, veterans and families.

First, the Congressional Budget Office estimates this proposal would cut SNAP funding by at least $40 billion. Some of these cuts would be particularly devastating for seniors and low-income families.

For example, this bill would eliminate categorical eligibility, putting working families at greater risk of going hungry and eliminating the incentive to find work.

Currently, a working mother who makes a little more than $24,000 a year qualifies for SNAP if her disposable income falls under 130 percent of the poverty line due to the rising cost of child care or rent. This bill would eliminate this provision and deny some working mothers and children in 40 States from receiving necessary nutrition assistance.

Make no mistake: this places a cruel burden on working families who can least afford it.

But it gets worse. Another provision would require the mother of any child a year of age to work or participate in a training program or risk losing their nutrition assistance. At a time of high unemployment and dwindling resources for job training, this bill means that a 2-year-old could go hungry if the child's mother can't participate in job training or find work.

Of course these provisions don't only impact working families. Even a veteran receiving disability compensation could lose their exemption and have their nutrition assistance terminated if they can't find a job under this bill.

These cuts imposed on the backs of disabled veterans, children younger than 6, and working moms are bad enough. But to compound these cuts, the Republican farm bill makes it more likely additional beneficiaries will be hurt as well.

This legislation would actually encourage individual States to kick people off nutrition assistance by promising them 50 percent of the savings.

Of course, some of this is old news. We're here debating this issue again. Shockingly, the immoral, outrageous cuts I've already outlined weren't enough for the conservative fringe. They weren't satisfied with cutting funding for SNAP. They demanded even deeper cuts that would force more children and more unemployed workers to go hungry. They've insisted that more seniors and veterans, the people who helped build this country, should be turned away at their local market.

The House Republican leadership was happy to comply, and they decided to make a bad bill worse. They doubled the cuts imposed on the SNAP program and chose to slash nutrition assistance by a total of $40 billion. These newer cuts target jobless adults without children who live in areas with high rates of unemployment.

The National Association of Evangelicals said they were ''especially concerned'' about this proposal.

Let's not mischaracterize this as a new work requirement. The changes proposed in this bill tell people who are struggling to find work in a difficult economy that if their job search goes on longer than 3 months, they should go hungry too. But the bill does not provide additional workforce training resources, and it doesn't invest in job creation to help individuals find work.

This sends a clear message. If you're struggling to find a job in an area hard-hit by the recession, get ready, because in a few months you're also going to struggle to eat.

Let's not forget the context in which this particular bill is drafted. It comes after House Republicans stripped out the nutrition title and passed the rest of the farm bill.

In other words, they were happy to provide agricultural companies with extremely generous subsidies to purchase crop insurance. They were happy to spend $40 billion on commodity programs. But nutrition assistance for children and the underemployed was apparently a bridge too far.

Dozens of religious groups and other leaders have strongly opposed this bill. Earlier this week, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops reminded us that ''how the House chooses to address our Nation's hunger and nutrition programs will have a profound human and moral consequence.''

The Jewish Federation argued that this bill ''would constitute untenable trauma to millions of Americans and their families.''

Former Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole, a Republican, warned ''this is no time to play politics with hunger.''

They've sent a clear message. This bill is wrong, it's immoral, and does not reflect our values as a country. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this proposal.

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 55 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 Dale Ribble, Oak Lake Church, Lincoln, Nebraska, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, You have been our dwelling place from the foundation of our country. We ask for wisdom from You, the all-wise God, for these leaders as they seek to lead our country.

Your word tells us that ''wisdom from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, open to reason, full of mercy and good fruits, impartial, and sincere.''

You have said that a harvest of righteousness is sown in peace by those who make peace. May these men and women be united in wisdom that leads to peace.

O Lord, may we, as a Nation who has known the greatness of Your mercy and grace, not stray from seeking You and Your righteous ways, for You have said, ''Blessed is the Nation whose God is the Lord.'' Keep us in the shelter of your wings and turn our hearts to You.

In Jesus' name, 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 Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WALBERG 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND DALE RIBBLE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am the youngest son of six sons, all children of an ordained Baptist minister. I have five older brothers, four who are still alive today. Three of them have responded to the call of ministry and are pastors. One of my own sons, Clint, is also a pastor. It's impossible to separate my faith heritage from my daily life. My brother, Dale Ribble, who is our guest chaplain today, is exactly the same.

From my earliest childhood memories, Dale was destined for ministry. As a child, I observed him countless times reaching out to people around him, both young and old, with a spirit of compassion and concern. He has a gift given to him by God for this purpose. The work that churches do in our communities change and affect lives for the positive. They reach out to the poor, the sick, and the hungry, improving the lives of whom they touch and enriching our communities. I've watched Dale do these things his entire life. I'm proud of his work and thank him for being with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IF YOU CAN'T HELP EVERY CHILD, YOU CAN'T HELP ANY CHILD?

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the Southern Poverty Law Center was a laudable civil rights organization, boldly combating bigotry and extremism. Such noble pursuits have been cast aside for partisan politics, and today the SPLC is better known for their attacks on Judeo-Christian groups.

Recently, the SPLC has targeted the Alabama Accountability Act, a school choice law passed earlier this year. Under this act, Alabama provides tax credit scholarships for students at failing schools so that they can attend better-performing schools—private, religious, and nonfailing public schools.

Rather than allow students a chance at a good education, the SPLC has filed a lawsuit that would trap students in schools the State's own accountability system has graded D or F. In other words, if you can't help every child, you can't help any child? How absurd.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for this intolerance to end, and it's time that Congress and the American people embrace policies that allow parents and students the opportunity to choose the type of education that fosters success.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, 9 months after the tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut, our country is once again facing the terrible reality of another horrific mass shooting. In this case, 12 innocent men and women were murdered at the Washington Navy Yard just 2 days ago. I know that all of us are keeping the victims and their loved ones in our thoughts and prayers today.

All of us in this Chamber should ask ourselves whether there is anything that we could have done to prevent this tragedy. According to the Associated Press, the person who carried out this cowardly attack had previously complained about serious mental health issues, including paranoia, sleep disorder, and hearing voices in his head. And despite all of this, he legally purchased a shotgun from a firearms dealer in Virginia just last week.

Mr. Speaker, there is something seriously wrong in this country when someone with such serious mental illness is able to purchase a firearm without even the slightest bit of scrutiny.

We owe it to the victims of the Navy Yard and their families to finally close loopholes that allow criminals and the seriously mentally ill to purchase firearms. How many tragedies should we witness before we finally enact commonsense gun violence prevention?

OBAMACARE IS A THREAT TO SECURITY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this morning South Carolina Attorney General Alan Wilson testified before a joint committee on Capitol Hill warning that the health care takeover legislation is a threat to the security and safety of citizens.

The attorney general cited:

> Despite the President saying last month, ''We're well on our way to fully implementing the Affordable Care Act,'' important deadlines are being routinely missed. In order for the ACA to adequately determine the eligibility . . . it must create a data hub that connects databases from seven different agencies. However, the hub has not been beta tested, independently verified, or properly audited. When it goes live on October 1, it will be a con-man's all-you-can-eat buffet overflowing with a gold mine of sensitive information from the agency databases.

Attorney General Wilson summarized as follows:

> Until HHS rectifies safeguarding Americans' personal information, Congress must suspend implementation of ACA.

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

MONTH OF THE HISPANIC CHILD

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate not only Hispanic Heritage Month, but to celebrate the next generation of Hispanic leaders.

I applaud the national PTA for naming September the Month of the Hispanic Child.

With the Hispanic population totaling 53 million people in the U.S., Hispanic children and youth are the fastest growing population in America. By 2060, it is projected that Hispanics will be about 128 million people in the United States.

In order to produce the next generation of leaders that are capable and equipped to work and to tackle our future challenges, we must invest in every Hispanic child. Education and equal opportunity are what will ensure that these students fulfill the American promise.

I will continue to advocate for programs like Head Start and fight to make college more affordable for all children.

As we celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month, let us keep in mind that the younger generation will be our leaders of the future.

RENEWING THE CLINTON-GINGRICH PARTNERSHIP

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to see the President begin the sixth year of our Nation's economic malaise by renewing his partisan name-calling and finger-pointing on Monday.

Fortunately, we have a model for bipartisan economic cooperation. In 1995, when President Clinton realized that his policies weren't working, he reached across the aisle to work with the Republican House; and despite their political differences, they did some amazing things:

They reduced Federal spending by a miraculous 40 percent of GDP;

They produced the largest capital gains tax cut in American history;

They reformed entitlement spending by abolishing the open-ended welfare system we had at the time;

They delivered 4 years of budget surpluses.

These bipartisan policies produced a period of prolonged economic expansion and unprecedented prosperity for America's middle and working classes.

Republicans have been eager to repeat these successful bipartisan policies of the Clinton years. Why isn't the President?

THE REPUBLICAN NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition of H.R. 3102, the Republican Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

America should be uncomfortable because this bill would cut $40 billion in critical nutrition assistance programs, denying SNAP benefits to at least 4 million low-income Americans, affecting children, seniors, the disabled, and veterans.

America should be uncomfortable because this Republican deal affects unemployed adults with an average income of just $2,500 per year who would immediately lose their SNAP benefits.

America should be uncomfortable because this bill hurts Americans living in rural, urban, and suburban areas. For many, SNAP benefits are the only thing that keeps them from living with hunger and malnutrition and sickness.

America should be uncomfortable. We should not cut these funds. These are extreme cuts of one of the most effective programs we have combating hunger.

SNAP

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

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

Contrary to the rhetoric of my Republican colleagues, the overwhelming majority of SNAP recipients who can work do so. Among SNAP households with an able-bodied adult, more than 50 percent work while receiving SNAP benefits. They just do not earn enough money to provide food for their families. In my district in Los Angeles, nearly 77 percent of families receiving SNAP benefits are working families.

The Republican attack on SNAP is a sad example of not understanding the struggles faced by so many Americans, including many of their own constituents. SNAP benefits help low-wage working families make ends meet as they try to get back on their feet. Millions of families rely on SNAP as they struggle with unemployment and low wages in the wake of the recession. The House Republican proposal would recklessly cut assistance for at least 4 million to 6 million people who need help, and we cannot let this happen.

NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS MONTH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, September is National Preparedness Month, and preparedness includes making sure that the public has access to timely information in cases of emergency. For many Americans, public broadcasting is a vital source of important emergency announcements.

Over 98 percent of the American population has access to public radio or a television signal. In times of emergency, public broadcasting is a go-to source of information for emergency management officials and first responders. We have a responsibility to ensure that stations that are damaged in a disaster are repaired and operational as quickly as possible.

That's why I've introduced the Emergency Information Improvement Act. My bill clarifies that local public radio and television stations are eligible for assistance to rebuild their facilities when they are damaged in a federally designated disaster such as a storm or terrorist attack.

This legislation will help ensure that this important informational resource will be available to Americans in times of need.

I invite my colleagues to support this legislation.

SNAP

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the SNAP program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

SNAP is a critically important program. It helps struggling families put food on the table while they work to get back on their feet. It helps our Nation's most vulnerable, as nearly two-thirds of recipients are children, elderly, and disabled. And according to new

census data just released yesterday, the SNAP program helped lift 4 million people out of poverty in 2012. Additionally, this is a multiplier of 2½ times in our economy.

Unfortunately, it is my understanding that the House of Representatives may soon consider legislation that cuts $40 billion in funding from SNAP. This is the wrong approach. At a time when many families and communities are still struggling to get back on their feet from the Great Recession, we should be working to strengthen, not undermine, the SNAP program.

□ 1215

CUTTING $40 BILLION FROM THE NUTRITION PROGRAM

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart because this body will soon consider a bill that will cut 4 million children from their nutrition benefits. Americans will go hungry. In my district and across this country, these are our friends, our neighbors, our fellow parishioners. They are children and veterans and seniors.

One of my constituents wrote to me recently about how Federal nutrition assistance is essential to feeding her family. She is 28 years old, disabled, and an orphan, so she has no family to fall back upon. And she is the mother of a toddler. On top of all that, she's in college, working to get her undergraduate degree, and has a double major, no less. But right now, she depends on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program to feed her toddler, and that assistance doesn't even go far enough. She still has to rely on our local food bank and other community assistance.

This is who we are talking about when we debate cutting $40 billion from the nutrition program. We can and should do better.

SNAP AND THE FARM BILL

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

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the seriousness of the proposed $40 billion cut to the nutrition bill. As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I am gravely concerned with this bill, as it circumvented proper deliberation before the Agriculture Committee. This bill lacks the transparency required by the American people and is outside the custom and practice of all past farm bills this House has passed.

I am ready to vote for a farm bill, but we are no closer to finding a compromise than we were 6 months ago. This issue is about Americans' ability to eat, as our country struggles to come out of the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression.

SNAP is a vital tool in empowering Americans in a challenging economy and should not be the sole factor in solving the Nation's long-term fiscal problems. Costs for the program will shrink as the economy improves and people are able to do exactly what Americans want to do: put food on the table.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we wonder why people need nutrition assistance in the first place. Well, it's because our minimum wage is inadequate, and it's because the government has given up on creating jobs. A parent working full-time at minimum wage will simply not earn enough income to cover basic needs.

SNAP recipients are not lazy. It's this Congress that is lazy.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to cut $40 billion in nutrition funding, I have a two-part plan for you. Raise the minimum wage so workers can feed themselves, and pass the American Jobs Act so Americans can find work in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the working poor, seniors, and children are suffering now, and you plan to cut nutrition assistance? Not only will they suffer, but some may die.

It's time for this Congress to address the real issues: raise the minimum wage, and jobs, jobs, jobs.

OPPOSITION TO THE REPUBLICAN NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PLAN

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I'm not one to go on and on about a lot of statistics, but as we debate the nutrition bill, there is one that struck a chord with me. One in four, yes, one in four children go to bed hungry every night. And I'm not talking about in Africa, China, or India. I'm talking about one in four children who live right here in the United States going to sleep without adequate nutrition.

For me and the 1 million New Jerseyans on SNAP, this is a complete and total outrage. We live in the greatest country on Earth, yet 17 million children in this country do not get the nutrition they need.

Last year alone, SNAP lifted 4 million people out of poverty. The bill on the floor this week, which would cut SNAP by nearly $40 billion, will only ensure that these people are pushed right back into poverty.

That's why I strongly oppose the nutrition assistance bill; and I urge my colleagues to examine their conscience and remember that, when they cast their vote, they are casting their vote for or against one in four children who still go to bed at night hungry.

THE ATTACK ON POOR, DISADVANTAGED, AND HUNGRY PEOPLE ACT

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong opposition to H.R. 3102, what I call the Attack on Poor, Disadvantaged, and Hungry People Act. This bill will cut food stamps by $40 billion; and, as a result of that, at least 4 million low-income individuals will no longer be eligible to receive nutrition assistance.

I say shame on whoever concocted this draconian idea, whoever put this proposal together, and certainly shame on us if we vote for it.

WEIGH OUR OPTIONS BEFORE CUTTING SNAP

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 3102, calling for a $40 billion cut in critically needed funding for nutrition assistance programs.

You know, Mr. Speaker, struggling to encourage my Republican colleagues to take a walk in the shoes of those who suffer from food insecurity has become uncomfortably common in this Chamber. In this House, we have moved beyond poor economic doctrine and immoral social policy, and we're now dealing with the very dangerous mindset that the weakest in our society are to blame for their condition.

Instead of taking away food stamps, we should be encouraging jobs. That we should be encouraging smaller assistance for those who are in need is not, I think, the way that this policy should go. We should be incentivizing companies to provide a living wage. And I think it's hypocritical for us to value the sanctity of life while neglecting policies that ensure all Americans have a better quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, 54 percent of the households in my district receive SNAP. I think that it's really important that we remember the people that we're sent here to represent.

PANCREATIC CANCER RESEARCH

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have recently met with some constituents from New Mexico whose lives have been impacted by pancreatic cancer,

the deadliest of all major forms of cancer. It's not easy to hear a woman talk about losing her husband, a sister talk about losing her brother, or even a father talk about losing his daughter.

It's not easy to listen to their stories, but it's important, and here's why: pancreatic cancer is the fourth leading cause of cancer deaths in this country; the 5-year survival rate is just 6 percent; and there are still no early detection tools or lifesaving treatments.

Last year, Democrats and Republicans came together to pass the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act, which requires the National Cancer Institute to develop a scientific framework for combating both pancreatic cancer and lung cancer. Unfortunately, the much-needed progress we stand to make is in serious jeopardy. Largely because of sequestration, the National Cancer Institute's budget has been drastically cut.

This is simply unacceptable, and it's yet another reason why I continue to call for a permanent fix to sequestration. The country deserves it; those constituents I met with deserve it; and everyone who has lost a loved one to pancreatic cancer deserves it.

The SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we use words like ''SNAP,'' and people don't know what it means. SNAP means Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. It's supplemental to what people receive. Nutrition, that's its main purpose, and it just gives assistance.

What we are proposing to vote on is a bill that would cut $40 billion from SNAP. What it means—and this is something that's very important for us to recognize—is it means children will lose access to things like free school lunches. For some children, that's the best meal of the day that they have. We know hundreds of thousands will lose that.

Mr. Speaker, 1.7 million people, 850,000 households will be reduced by $90 a month. Think about your own budgets and think about what $90 will mean for a family that needs assistance. And in addition, this bill will ask disabled people to work 20 hours a week before they can even qualify for supplemental nutrition assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this is a mean-spirited measure, and Congress should not be defined by that.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 761, NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 347 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 347

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days in which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act. It provides one hour of general debate, equally divided between both sides. It provides for five amendments, four of which are Democrat amendments and one is a Republican amendment. So this rule is fair to a fault and it is totally generous, and it will provide a balanced and open debate as long as we, as Members, structure our remarks to the merits of this particular bill and don't go off on tangents.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to stand before the House and support this rule. It's a good rule.

I also support the underlying bill, H.R. 761, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), as sponsor of this particular piece of legislation, as well as the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), for his leadership in this particular effort.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is blessed with an abundance of resources, which has made us a leading world economy and industrial power, and we have only scratched the surface, literally, of what we can potentially develop.

We have energy potential such as coal, oil shale, and natural gas deposits, as well as various critical minerals that we, as a Nation, need and should be developing.

But unfortunately, much of this development of our domestic mineral resources has actually been stymied by a combination of special interest politics, as well as bureaucratic red tape, particularly under this administration. It is a pain we have all seen coming.

Twenty-five years ago, 20 percent of all money that was spent for development and production of critical minerals was spent here in the United States. Today that's down to only 8 percent, as other nations have replaced our efforts, unfortunately.

This has meant an increase in our trade imbalance, dollars going overseas, escalating prices here at home for both energy and commodities. It means job losses here in the United States. And ironically, these jobs that we are losing are some of the highest-paying middle class jobs that are available. Bureaucratic delays are causing this, and they are causing us to see a change, both for manufacturing and defense.

Twenty-five years ago, there were 30 minerals that we actually had to import to this Nation that were considered critical minerals. Today that number has gone from 30 to 61.

Twenty-five years ago, there were 16 minerals that we imported a great majority of. Today that number that has gone to 24.

It affects manufacturing, such as electronics and metal alloys, ceramics, glass, magnets, catalysts, everything. It affects our defense as well, as our Defense Logistics Agency tries to

stockpile these minerals so the demands are there when we actually need them.

Unfortunately, as we've illustrated, more and more of these are being purchased from overseas. They are critical to our weapons development system, including such things as night vision equipment, advanced lasers, avionics, fighter jet components, missile guidance systems, and it goes on and on.

Look, the Constitution tells us that our first responsibility is to provide for a common defense. This bill steps us into the right direction so we actually can provide for a common defense and do it intelligently and avoid unnecessary and frivolous delays.

There are some that will criticize us for the kinds of minerals that we are placing in this restriction area. There was a study in 2009 that was done called the Great California ShakeOut, which was a mock of what could happen if the big earthquake actually hit that area, and it found out that, in an effort to try and rebuild the infrastructure that would be necessary, there's a whole list of things we normally don't consider as critical that would, in that situation, be critical, including sand and gravel, that we simply would have a frightful deficiency of if we were trying to rebuild under those types of critical situations.

This bill anticipates that, and makes sure that we will not be found lacking, either in defense, or in manufacturing, or in critical civilian needs in case of disaster.

This bill doesn't predetermine anything. It simply says, make a decision, yes or no, on whether this project should go forward; simply make a decision, and do it in a timely fashion.

We still, today, average between 7 and 10 years in which those decisions are made. This bill says that that is unrealistic, and it simply says, you've got 30 months—2½ years—to make a decision, yes or no. If you have to have an extension, it provides for that on common agreement, which is only rational to do. But for heaven's sakes, finally make a decision.

It is based on not only what we are talking about here, but it's based on what we are doing in our transportation area. It's based on a Presidential concept; when the President established an Executive Order No. 13604, which talked about the importance of trying to streamline reform and reference our process.

This is the basis of what we are attempting to do in this particular bill as well. This implies that whenever there are agencies, multiple agencies involved in a project, that there must be a lead agency which must take the responsibility of actually getting the job done, so that any kind of environmental statement should be being done currently, not sequentially, that we can make sure that any kind of lawsuit does not stop the process of making a decision.

Once again, this is one of those things that simply is logical. Just make a decision. You have plenty of time to do it. Make a decision. There is no reason we cannot make a decision on whether to go forward on a project in 2½ years, none, none whatsoever.

The fact that we are dragging our feet is simply done from bureaucratic excess that is illogical and irrational. We have done this in other areas. This is the time to do this in this area as well.

If, indeed, we could do this process, it would be very clear that this Nation would prosper. We could have good-paying jobs, and we could make the desert blossom.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Utah, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I deem necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the House faces a number of pressing issues that everybody in America knows that we should be addressing. Instead, we are here today on H. Res. 347, a structured rule, and the underlying bill, H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013.

I get it that my friends from areas that have these minerals in public spaces would like for us to proceed apace to extract them. I understand their feelings. I come from yet another of the critical areas of our country that we have to protect much of the space of, and that would be the Everglades.

I don't understand why Congress is trying to provide even more breaks to the United States mining operations when we do have these urgent domestic issues that we are confronted with and, somehow or another, that we were unable to undertake.

We haven't done all of our appropriations. We are having difficulty getting a continuing resolution. We will soon be faced with lifting the debt ceiling. And somehow or another, we are dealing with something that, I might add, we have voted on before, that came out of the House of Representatives, that did not pass the Senate, and H.R. 761 is not going to pass the Senate either.

So H.R. 761 guts important environmental protections offered through the National Environmental Policy Act, referred to as NEPA. It fails to require adequate financial assurance, and I will have an amendment on the floor that will address that subject, and offers other benefits to mining companies.

Mining operations in the United States benefit already from multiple Federal tax breaks, exemptions to regulation under existing environmental laws, and no royalty payments to the United States for mining operations, even on U.S. land.

Mining companies limit their liability for environmental restoration and cleanup by operating with U.S. subsidiaries to foreign parent companies. This relationship shields the parent company from liability and has allowed parent companies to draw profits from United States mining operations.

So what happens when companies do not pay for environmental damage caused by their operations?

The people of the United States pay. They pay through a contaminated environment. They pay through sickness, including cancer. They pay through taxes, because taxpayer dollars are ultimately needed to clean up these sites.

It would seem that we should have learned from our mistakes with the 1872 General Mining Law. Mining companies should be held accountable so that their operations will not impose additional burdens on the American people.

H.R. 761 not only takes away valued natural resources for hiking, fishing, canoeing and other recreational activities, it shifts the burdens of mining cleanup and restoration to the American taxpayer.

Furthermore, H.R. 761 classifies domestic mining operations for strategic and critical minerals on Federal lands as infrastructure projects. Using a broad definition that encompasses virtually every type of mine, this legislation allows mines to take advantage of a Presidential order from 2012 which requires Federal agencies to streamline the permitting process for infrastructure projects.

However, building a mine is not the same as building roads and highways that are much needed in this country, or replacing rotted sewerage that is much needed in this country, which is, in fact, the country's infrastructure.

Bills like this are why, in my opinion, the American people are so frustrated with us here in the United States Congress. We have a number of issues that we could—no, not that we could, that we should be working on—and, yet, we are rehashing a bill that went nowhere last Congress, ain't gonna go nowhere this Congress and, most importantly, is bad for the Nation.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I just want to make a couple of comments before we go on with the discussion of this particular rule, which, once again, is a fair rule and is a good rule.

This bill is one of those bills that has no significant cost to the budget. At no time does this stop any of the NEPA requirements. All it says is, do your job and do it on time. Nothing big about that, simply what those regulations are.

And it is obviously one of those things that takes place that we desperately need, both for the manufacturing sector, as well as for defense.

Look, I'm old. I still use legal pads. I trust those. They never crash on me. But if you have an iPhone or an iPad or any of that other kind of new stuff that my kids like to have, you're going to

have these critical minerals. And if we are not proposing and developing them here in the United States, we are paying more to develop them out of country, and we're putting ourselves, manufacturing-wise, in a significant deficit situation. And obviously, with the defense, what is happening is even more critical.

This is simply taking the executive order and saying, yeah, it's good for infrastructure; it's also good for our critical mineral development system, and saying, do the job. Do it well, do it quickly, get it done in a reasonable period of time, and don't drag this stuff out by sequencing the issues and the actions one after the other. You have a period of time. Do your job.

It's an amazing concept of asking the bureaucracy of this Nation to actually do their job, but it's important.

Yes, it was passed in the last session by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. It's a bipartisan bill. The fact that the Senate did not take it up is another indictment to Senate leadership, admittedly, an oxymoron, but it's another indictment for the Senate leadership for ignoring the significant issues that we have to face in this Nation. It's another indictment that they should actually do their job.

Just because the Senate leadership decides to sit on these type of issues does not mean we have to sit on them as well. This is something we have to have, and it needs to go over to the Senate. If it has to go over every week to the Senate until the Senate finally decides to actually do something, then that is our responsibility, and we should do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper characterizations of leadership of the other body.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Oregon, (Mr. DEFAZIO), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Great name. We're really good at messaging around here, particularly on the Republican side. It's got a great name: National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013.

Now we've heard just earlier that this is about things that are in critical short supply, vital for our national security and for emergencies.

□ 1245

None of those things are true. They could be a miniscule part of this.

But what this bill does is say that any mining project anywhere on any public lands in the United States of America does not constitute a significant Federal action. No matter how large, no matter how sensitive the area, no matter how proximate to the Grand Canyon and national treasures or how proximate to Yellowstone or how proximate to some critical watershed, that's not a major Federal action. So it's exempt from NEPA. That's one very big problem with this legislation. I think there's a lot of members of the public even living in very conservative areas of the country who would find that a little bit of overreach.

And then, again, these critical minerals are not critical. Sand and gravel are now critical. Anything is critical that you can find on public land. Any dirt of any sort, you are going to get an expedited process. That's a little bit of overreach.

We're going to have a great amendment by Mr. LOWENTHAL, who will use an actual definition from the National Research Council for strategic and critical minerals. So if this is on the up-and-up, the other side will accept that amendment and we will have these expedited processes, which still cause us some anxiety; but they will only be for truly strategic and critical materials, not everything and anything on any public land.

Secondly, most Americans would be appalled—those who don't already know—to learn that we give away all of the minerals on our public lands: gold, uranium, platinum. No matter what it is, we give it away. We do not charge. Unlike many western States, unlike Native American tribal lands, unlike private lands, unlike most foreign countries, we don't charge a royalty for extracting minerals from our lands, no matter how valuable, no matter how many billions of dollars that that load might be worth of platinum or gold or uranium. No charge. Give it away.

Twice this body has passed, on a bipartisan basis, historically, a modest royalty on the extraction of depletable valuable minerals from Federal lands. I've been very involved in that in the past. In the summer, I went to the Rules Committee when this bill was first going to come up.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. They admit there are no parliamentary issues, no scoring issues. In fact, with my amendment, an 8 percent royalty would raise hundreds of millions of dollars. And those hundreds of millions of dollars would be used to remediate hundreds of thousands of mines in the West that are polluting the environment, polluting our rivers.

I have a foreign company in my district that, yeah, they put up their million-dollar bond. Unfortunately, they left the country, and it's a $14 million cleanup. The public is going to get stuck with that. It's polluting the river, killing fish, and the taxpayers are going to have to pay for it.

My amendment would have raised the resources necessary to deal with hundreds of thousands of abandoned mines in the western United States that need remediation and mitigation, but the Republicans were afraid to vote on that amendment.

Some in the West know it's a problem. They didn't want to vote against fixing the problem. Others just say you should run the government like a business, except when it comes to valuable minerals. We want to give them away. We don't really care about the deficit.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. If we defeat the previous question, I'm going to offer an amendment to this rule that will allow the House to hold a vote on the Bring Jobs Home Act. This bill will help to boost the economy by encouraging businesses to bring more jobs to America and discourage companies from shipping jobs overseas.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), my good friend.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. HASTINGS.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill before us today, H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013. I just think it goes too far.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and take up this legislation, which we've worked on for a full year now, the Bring Jobs Home Act, a bill which, for the first time, makes sure we promote insourcing of jobs and stop the corporate welfare business for outsourcing jobs.

The underlying legislation would set a dangerous precedent by waiving mining projects from environmental reviews and eliminating public access to the justice system itself. Pushing mining projects through the permitting process is sure to continue to degrade our environment and create workplace situations which are definitely unsafe. But it won't solve the employment problem.

Since that's been injected into the discussion, the legislation will simply allow our Nation's resources to be used to pad the pockets of the same international corporations who ship jobs overseas; and, by the way, that process of shipping jobs overseas is subsidized by the Federal Government. We have for years helped corporations send jobs overseas. What we should be doing is helping them get jobs back to America, particularly since we see an upgrading of the past 16 months in the manufacturing sector of our economy.

With this bill we're going to end the tax breaks that encourage companies to ship their jobs overseas and use that to pay for tax credits for patriotic companies that want to bring jobs back home. Do you want to have real job improvement? This is the way to do it.

Over the last decade we've lost 5.5 million manufacturing jobs—more than during the entire Great Depression. Our trade deficit increased by $300 billion. During the recession, the manufacturing workforce plummeted to a near 60-year low.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. More troubling, Mr. Speaker, is that recent studies estimate that one-quarter of American jobs are at risk of being outsourced in the coming years. We're not talking about chump change here. This is a lot of jobs.

So let's defeat this motion so we can actually debate a bill that will end corporate welfare that allows companies to continue to engage in outsourcing and then get a tax cut for doing so. Instead, let's provide incentives that will grow good-paying manufacturing jobs in the USA.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend if he's prepared to close. I have no further speakers at this time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Obviously, I am prepared to close. It depends on how long your closing goes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I can make it go as long as you want it to go.

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

Picking up where Mr. PASCRELL left off, which I wasn't intending to do until my good friend from Utah mentioned the timeframe. Tomorrow, we are going to vote on whether or not to cut $40 billion from the supplemental nutrition program for people this country. One of the measures included in that is going to be that people can only qualify for 3 months during a specified period of time if they are able-bodied people.

Well, if you vote for the previous question that Mr. PASCRELL offered, there may be some jobs for those people. Otherwise, what we're getting ready to do is put more people in a position of needing the food stamps. And we continue to talk about jobs, but we haven't done anything on the infrastructure.

I predict even if this measure before us today were to become law, which it is not, but if it did by chance become law, we would be lucky if in the course of time we had the kind of jobs and the number of jobs that are desperately needed in this country.

What is wrong with this institution? Don't we understand that we have college kids that are graduating and they can't find a job? We hire kids up here at lower than the minimum wage because they can't find jobs in the private sector. This is crazy.

We can't continue doing nothing when in fact the people are suffering in this great country of ours. We have not only the natural resources that my friends would have us extract from even public lands without paying royalties, but we have the resources as a people to do the things creatively to assist us in bringing jobs here rather than sending them all over the world and causing a diminution of jobs here at home.

Again, for the life of me I don't understand why we are considering this bill today. We're considering virtually every mine on public land, including uranium and coal mines, to operate without adherence to Federal environmental laws, which protect public safety. Our priorities are truly in the wrong place.

As I asked before, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying legislation, and I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the opportunity we have of presenting this particular rule to the body. I've always appreciated the opportunity of sharing this time with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who is a good friend and a very colorful orator. And I always like to hear his orations here on the floor.

You'll forgive me if I want to try and refocus on the matter that it is hand, for, indeed, I recognize the statements that have been made by the last two speakers that deal with the significance of jobs. What we simply have to have is a policy in this country that promotes private sector jobs, not just government sector jobs.

By promoting private sector jobs, we actually expand the economy and build upon that concept. That is one of the reasons why this particular bill is here. But all of a sudden you go from 30 minerals that we had to import from other areas to 61 minerals that we now have to import from abroad. That means there are a bunch of minerals that we used to be producing in good, high-paying jobs that no longer are there.

So this is one of the areas that we can move our country in the proper direction and not just simply say, Okay, let's create some kind of make-work program that actually adds particular jobs. It needs to be the right kind of jobs to move our country forward.

One person once told me the people sitting here is the entire universe with which we talk. We will not make ourselves rich by paying each other to take vacations. At some time, someone has to add real wealth into the equation. That's what this bill is trying to do. We have critical mineral wealth in this country. It needs to be added to the equation so that we can create those good-paying mining jobs that will spin off into good-paying manufacturing jobs in the private sector. That's everything we are attempting to do.

I would like to take one issue and try to put it to rest as to the idea that these companies who would be receiving benefit from this are somehow getting off and not paying taxes or royalties. They are not paying Federal taxes, but sometimes we forget that we're not the only equation out there. Every one of these pays significant royalties and severance taxes to State and local governments.

□ 1300

The Federal tax that is proposed by some of the amendments to this bill would be on top of that. It would be a form of double taxation. Its goal would be to raise money, which is a nice goal, but simply because you found a potential effort for the Federal Government to try and raise more money doesn't mean you need to rush into that, especially when it has a negative aspect somewhere else. It would have a negative aspect on State and local governments. It would also have a negative aspect on those companies that some people don't want to have any empathy for the situation they're in.

If you actually put an additional Federal royalty on top of the State and local royalty which they are paying and the severance tax that you are paying, in a traditional company you could pass that tax burden on to the consumer. In a world market, you cannot. That just doesn't happen. It has to come out from the company itself.

The companies who are involved in here have clearly said that they are not opposed if we could put some kind of net proceeds up. But these kinds of proposals that we will be hearing in the debate today are not net proceeds tax; they are an unparalleled, unprecedented gross tax. Nothing has ever gone to that level in which the amendments would try to put on this program.

So once again, what we're trying to ask you to do is look at this in the overall view of what we are trying to do to develop real and good private sector jobs.

The underlying element still goes back to the fact that, look, what we need is to go through the permitting process but to do it in a way that is legitimate. It should not have to wait 7 to 10 years to actually permit something. That is just unrealistic.

I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I am an old schoolteacher. As a schoolteacher, we had 9 months to do something. If you couldn't get it done in 9 months, you didn't get it done. There was no idea of just postponing it to a future date. If a principal came to me and said we're going to have to have our testing done on Tuesday for the standardized test, I couldn't say no, I can't do that; let's wait for 2 weeks and maybe—maybe—I will be ready to help you with the testing data. In any education system, when the time is up, the time is up. You have to do the work, and you back-schedule to make sure that you actually do the work. That happens in

almost every element of society except for here in government.

When I was in the State legislature, we had a constitutional end of that State legislative date. We had 45 days to make a decision. Often those decisions are not easy and you make the better of the bad choices that you have, but we had to make a decision.

I contrast that with what is happening here in the United States Government in which the Forest Service was asked to do a study on a potential bridge that we could transfer from Federal ownership over to State ownership. They said yes, in about 4 years we would be able to do that study. Four years to do a simple study? We give ourselves these unreasonable and inexcusable time references, and we do it all the time.

I had a bill that we passed a couple of years ago and which mandated that a certain agency of government had to give a piece of property over to the local entity of government. Congress passed it. They mandated it. Now here, 2½ years later, the agency still has not transferred that land. They are going through their surveys. They are taking their time. Even the local government had to pay for all these time-consuming surveys. What Congress mandated, 2 years later, still has not happened. That is unrealistic. In the private sector, no one would tolerate that. In our State government, no one would actually tolerate that. In the education community, no one would tolerate that. Yet we look at that as the norm, 7 to 10 years, as an average, to actually permit these things?

That is why what this bill is trying to do is say, look, go through the process, use the NEPA process, but do it in a fair and rational way and make a decision. You don't drag things out just for the fun of dragging things out. If the decision is yes, fine; if the decision is no, fine; but for heaven's sake, make a decision.

Some elements of government, whom I will not make caricatures about even if it's true, some elements seem to like to drag out decisions. This is an area that should not be. So this simply says, if you're going to deal with this area, you've got 30 months to make a decision. You can do that in 2½ years. There is no reason why it cannot be.

We are doing this in other areas of the government. The President, in his executive order, said this has to be the way we move forward. This bill moves us forward.

This bill does a good thing. It was right that it passed in the last session by a huge bipartisan vote because it's the right thing to do. It's the right message. It's the right program. It moves us forward. It's the right thing to do this year. And we will continue to push this until at some point we have succeeded in making sure that we are moving forward with hard deadlines so that decisions are made and we're not just piddling and piddling and waiting and delaying time after time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill. It was a good bill last time we passed it. It's still a good bill. We need to pass this bill again. It's also a very good rule. It's a fair rule. It's a rule for which we can be proud.

I would urge my colleagues to make sure that we vote for this rule so we can move forward on a bill that should have been passed by both bodies a long time ago. But we need to, once again, start this process and continue going forward because it is the right thing to do. It will provide us with resources; it will provide us with jobs; it will provide us, more importantly, with decisions. Finally, we can actually have an agency that makes a decision in a timely manner.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 347 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 851) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 851 as specified in section 2 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 347, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 301.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 192, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

YEAS—229

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

NAYS—192

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

NOT VOTING—11

Courtney
Diaz-Balart
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Nadler
Perlmutter
Polis
Rangel
Rush
Waters

□ 1338

Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BARBER, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. VEASEY, CUELLAR, and Ms. LOFGREN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 190, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

AYES—231

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

NOES—190

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee

Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Cárdenas
Cassidy
Diaz-Balart
Herrera Beutler
Himes
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Perlmutter
Polis
Rush
Waters

□ 1345

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL ENVOY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 301) to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, 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 California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 22, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—402

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)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
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 (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
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
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
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)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
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
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
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—22

Amash
Broun (GA)
Collins (GA)
Graves (GA)
Hudson
Jones
King (IA)
Lummis
Massie
McClintock
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Neugebauer
O'Rourke
Posey
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Sanford
Stutzman
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yoho

NOT VOTING—8

Cassidy
Diaz-Balart
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Perlmutter
Polis
Rush

□ 1353

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.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 761.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 347 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 761.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1355

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, with Mr. FORTENBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

Not a day goes by when Americans don't use a product that is made from critical minerals. In fact, life as we know it in the 21st century would not be possible without these minerals. There would be no computers, no Blackberrys or iPhones. There would be no MRI, CAT scan, or X-ray machines. There would be no wind turbines or solar panels. Mr. Chairman, the list is exhaustive of these things that depend on critical minerals that make modern life possible.

Rare-earth elements, a special subset of strategic and critical minerals, are core components of these products in the 21st century. Yet despite the tremendous need for rare-earth elements, the United States has allowed itself to become almost entirely dependent on China and other foreign nations for these resources.

America has a plentiful supply of rare-earth elements, but roadblocks to the development of these crucial materials have resulted in China producing 97 percent of the world's supply. Our current policies are handing China a monopoly on these elements, creating a dependence that has serious implications on American jobs, on our economy, and on our national security.

Burdensome red tape, duplicative reviews, frivolous lawsuits, and onerous regulations can hold up new mining projects here in the U.S. for more than 10 years. These unnecessary delays cost American jobs as we become more and more dependent on foreign countries for these raw ingredients. The lack of America-produced strategic and critical produced minerals are prime examples of how America has regulated itself into a 100 percent dependence on at least 19 unique minerals. It has also earned the United States the unfortunate distinction of being ranked dead last when it comes to permitting mining projects. In 2012, the U.S. was ranked last, along with Papua New Guinea, out of 25 major mining countries on the pace of permitting. Mr. Chairman, I can't speak for Papua New Guinea, but the reason the U.S. Government is so slow to issue new mining permits is very simple: government bureaucracy.

H.R. 761, introduced by our colleague from Nevada, Mr. AMODEI, will help us to end the foreign dependence by streamlining government red tape that blocks America's strategic and critical mineral production. Instead of waiting for over a decade for mining permits to be approved, this bill sets a goal of total review process for permitting at 30 months.

□ 1400

Now this isn't a hard deadline, Mr. Chairman. It can be extended. But it is a goal to push the bureaucrats into action on these important infrastructure projects. It shouldn't take a decade to get a project built for minerals that we need in our everyday life and for our national security.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, above all, this is a jobs bill. The positive economic impact of this bill will extend beyond just the mining industry. For every metal mining job created, an estimated 2.3 additional jobs are generated. And for every nonmetal mining job created, another 1.6 jobs are created.

This legislation gives the opportunity for American manufacturers, small businesses, technology companies, and construction firms to use American resources to help make the products that are essential to our everyday lives.

As China continues to tighten global supplies of rare-earth elements, we should respond with an American mineral mining renaissance that will bring mining and manufacturing jobs back to America. The National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act is important to our jobs and to our economy. We must act now to cut the government red tape that is stopping American mineral production and furthering our dependence on foreign minerals.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today we are considering H.R. 761, the so-called National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013. Now, despite the bill's title, it has almost nothing to do with national strategic and critical minerals production. In fact, under the guise of promoting the development of minerals critical to the United States' national security, this legislation would reshape mining decisions on public lands for almost all minerals.

Mr. Chairman, the bill's classification of ''critical minerals'' is so broad that even sand and gravel and other such things can fall under its definition. Critical and strategic minerals? The Democratic amendments we will consider today will attempt to tailor this legislation to cover only minerals that are truly critical and strategic and will address the egregious provisions that would truncate important environmental review.

Make no mistake, this bill is a giveaway. It is free mining, no royalties, no protection of public interest, exemption from royalty payments, near exemption from environmental regulations, near exemption from legal enforcement of the protections. And it's unnecessary.

There is a real debate that we could be having about the mining laws in this country. It should start with reforming the mining law of 1872, which is as archaic as its name suggests—the mining law of 1872. We should be discussing abandoned mine reclamation. We should be discussing ensuring taxpayers a fair return on industrial development of our public lands.

Mr. Chairman, in the Natural Resources Committee markup on May 15 of this year where H.R. 761 was reported out on a nearly party line vote, the committee also reported two other bills on a bipartisan basis, two other bills that would lay the groundwork for developing critical and strategic mineral production. Those bills, H.R. 1063, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Policy Act of 2013, and H.R. 981, the RARE Act, were unanimously reported out of the Natural Resources Committee and legitimately would be worth debating here in the House as part of any serious effort to improve our understanding of critical strategic mineral deposits and to aid in their development.

We reported out bills on a bipartisan basis that would do what this legislation purports to do. We could be discussing those bills. Instead, we're taking up legislation which is a giveaway. The legislation we could be dealing with would actually deal with strategic and critical minerals. Now, if the majority were to bring it to the floor, I'm sure it would pass in an overwhelming, bipartisan way and would likely be passed by the other body and signed into law. In fact, in the last Congress, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Policy Act—not to be confused with the Production Act that we are considering today—was supported by the National Mining Association.

The president and CEO of the National Mining Association issued a statement when that bill passed out of committee last Congress, and he said: ''The House Natural Resources Committee took important bipartisan action today to ensure U.S. manufacturers, technology innovators, and our military have a more stable supply of minerals vital to the products they produce and use.'' He went on to say that legislation, ''will provide a valuable assessment of our current and future mineral demands and our ability to meet more of our needs through domestic minerals production.''

We could be considering legislation like that.

We should be able to work in a bipartisan fashion when it comes to improving our supply of rare-earth minerals and other strategic minerals and ensuring that we are not dependent on China and other nations for their supply. But the majority seems to be not interested in that. Evidently, they don't want to work in a bipartisan fashion to produce legislation that all sides out there in the country, in industry, people who look after public lands and the environment could agree on. Instead, they're

moving this bill, H.R. 761, which has almost nothing to do with strategic minerals, is really about giveaways to the mining industry.

This bill would be a Trojan horse if it were to become law; however, it has no chance of becoming law. Maybe the American people should be grateful we won't pass this giveaway, that the American people—I say, those American people who don't stand to get rich by this mining giveaway.

But can the American people really feel good that we're wasting time and actually not looking after the critical and strategic minerals that American products, American defense depends on? Why are we playing these games? Why, I should say, are they playing these games with our legitimate needs to develop strategic minerals? We should be working in the kind of fashion that led to last year's bill.

The majority should shelf this giveaway to the mining industry and bring to the floor serious proposals that we could honestly debate as part of a legitimate bipartisan discussion regarding rare-earth policy and supply.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), the author of this legislation.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, having a real debate on this issue is something that I wholeheartedly support.

We probably ought to start with the facts. First of all, you've heard much about the overly broad definition. H.R. 761 deliberately contains a broad definition of strategic and critical minerals. Here are some of the reasons why:

In 2006, prior to the worldwide economic downturn, there was great concern over the future availability of platinum, group metals, and copper. At the time, projections in demand for copper indicated that by 2016, 30 large-scale copper deposits would have to come online to meet worldwide demand. At the time, there were not enough copper deposits in the permitting pipeline to make up for the projected downward curve.

And you have heard much about sand and gravel. Even sand and gravel and other construction mineral materials can be in short supply or not available, as the USGS discovered in 2009 during the great California shakeout. What they discovered during that was that, in its assessment of scope and damage and materials needed for construction in the event of a large-scale earthquake, USGS discovered there were not enough sand, gravel, and other construction materials available in the region to meet the affected area's reconstruction needs.

So when you talk about the ability to foretell the future and you say, well, we should just limit things to the i-u-m ending minerals, I say you probably ought to think about what it takes to get a bill through Congress to respond to those things because it's less timely than the Federal permitting process.

Much has been made about getting rid of NEPA review. You know, when all else fails, read the bill. Take a look at page 7. And when you look at lines 4 through 9 there, these are not the words that you would be using if you were trying to get rid of the NEPA process. Starting up at page 6, line 24, it says, ''The lead agency with responsibility for'' permitting. Then you go down to page 7, line 5, it says, ''if the procedural and substantive safeguards of the permitting process alone,'' they must find that those are there. Look at line 5, ''if the procedural'' are found. That is unlimited discretion in an executive branch agency.

So don't tell me that we're getting rid of NEPA, because the bill would have been written differently if we were trying to get rid of NEPA.

I want to also point your attention to the base of this is an infrastructure executive order from the current administration that talks about avoiding duplication of efforts. I also want to point out some words in there. It says, ''infrastructure projects in sectors, including surface transportation''—oh, by the way, I think that has something to do with sand and gravel—''aviation''—runways I think have some of those elements that people don't think are critical—''ports, waterways, water resource projects, renewable energy generation, electricity transmission, broadband, pipelines''—hello, Keystone. See how good it's done them.

If this is an attempt to skirt environmental regulations, somebody probably should have written it differently. We didn't. It is simply not the truth.

And I want to talk about fair return on all this taxation stuff. In my State, which is 85 percent owned by the Federal Government, the Federal Government gives $22 million a year to the rural counties in Nevada for PILT. And I know some of my colleagues from east of the Mississippi don't understand what that acronym means. It's payment in lieu of taxes, $22 million. What this bill is really about is about jobs.

The final piece is this. This does not require anybody in the Federal permitting agencies to say, Yes, you can have your permit in 30 months. It requires an answer in 30 months. Nobody seeks to apply this to get a nice, crisp ''no'' in 30 months, which is why the language is in there, Mr. Chairman, that says, by the way, if both sides agree, you can have longer to process it.

Now, when you bounce that off the claims of 3½ and 5 years, under existing administration permitting timelines, asking them to set a 30-month timeline is not something which undoes environmental responsibility, rapes the landscape, and outdoes the taxpayers out of their normal revenues that are there.

Mr. HOLT. May I inquire of the time remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 23½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Chair, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, I will repeat. This bill is a giveaway. It is free mining, no royalties. I referred to the archaic legislation that goes by the archaic name of the Mining Act of 1872 which excuses miners from royalty payments. That would apply here.

And as for excusing the miners from environmental regulations, the legislation says that the lead agency shall determine that a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of human environment has not occurred or is not occurring. In other words, the mining activities are excluded from, excused from, the triggering language of the Environmental Policy Act. No significant environmental policy review would be undertaken under the National Environmental Policy Act if the agency can say, Well, the State is doing something; the State is doing something, whatever that may be, however adequate that may turn out to be.

So I call that a relaxation, if not an exemption, of environmental protection. And I repeat, these mining activities do not allow for a fair return to the taxpayer, the owners of this land, for the use of this land.

□ 1415

And under this, we could call anything at all strategic and critical. Yeah, sometimes the military might need to build a runway or extend a runway, but to say that the sand and gravel that's necessary to do that becomes strategic is a real perversion of the idea of strategic and critical.

So let's deal with those things that we need for aircraft engines and powerful magnets, lanthanum and neodymium and gadolinium and dysprosium and these other so-called rare-earth elements, some of which are actually not so rare, but they're dispersed and, therefore, hard to mine and hard to get adequate quantities of them and some of which are truly rare.

Let's deal with the legislation that makes those available for manufacturing needs, for national security needs, rather than having a catch-all mining definition that excuses any kind of mining from royalties and from environmental regulation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), a new member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Congressman for recognizing the need to correct a major supply chain vulnerability in the United States, that of critical and strategic minerals.

Many of us in Congress only heard of the concept of strategic minerals after

we became lawmakers. Most of the time, we hear about exotic elements at the bottom of the periodic table like neodymium and europium, but the fact is that we are facing down potentially devastating supply disruptions for a much more familiar material, lead.

In my district, we know a lot about lead because my district produces more lead than any other district in the Nation. We rely on lead for everything from bullets, missiles, ships and tanks, to batteries for vehicles and energy storage, to TV and computer screens, to storing nuclear waste. Almost every one of us drives a car powered by a lead-acid battery.

It may be hard to believe that lead could be a strategic vulnerability for the United States because we have used it in so many products for over a century. Over the past generation, we have taken lead out of things like gasoline and paint to help protect human health.

But the fact is lead is still crucial as a critical material that we use safely in a vast number of American-manufactured technologies. There is only one primary lead producer remaining in the United States today, and that facility is scheduled to close at the end of 2013. And environmental regulations are making it more and more difficult for lead producers to extract and process economically.

Today, China produces three times the lead that the United States produces, and our global market share is shrinking. At the same time, global demand for lead is expected to grow by 5 to 6 percent a year, increasing prices and competition for our domestic resources.

American innovators are working hard to improve the efficiency of lead production and make sure as many lead-acid batteries as possible are recycled so their contents can be repurposed. But the U.S. simply cannot meet its national security needs and commercialize important new technologies without a more robust, secure supply.

I hope that H.R. 761 will open doors for lead production in the United States, and that any future legislative efforts on critical minerals will also account for lead supplies.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This legislation is fundamentally a solution in search of a problem. Now, according to analysis of data provided by the Bureau of Land Management for hardrock mines on public lands, for which there is complete data, the average time it takes to approve a plan of operation for a mine has actually decreased under the Obama administration. We do not need a relaxation of regulations in order to speed things up.

According to the BLM data, plans of operation for hardrock mines are being approved roughly 17 percent more quickly under the Obama administration than under the previous administration. Thank you, President Obama.

And despite the majority's claims, 82 percent of plans of operation for hardrock mines are approved within 3 years under the Obama administration.

Now, the mining company will say, oh, 3 years, that's so long. Well, according to the BLM ''it takes, on average, 4 years to approve a mining plan of operation for a large mine, more than 1,000 acres on public lands.''

Now, my colleagues on the other side have asked repeatedly what the problem is with their legislation that would truncate and eviscerate proper review of all mines on public lands if the majority of plans are approved within 3 years.

Well, it's because a little more than 15 percent of hardrock mines take more than 4 years to approve. For these mines, where mining companies may not have submitted a complete application, or may not have posted sufficient bond to ensure that the mine is cleaned up after the work, or where additional environmental review is required because the mine is large or potentially damaging to our environment and to public health, this bill would prevent proper review.

We're already approving hardrock mines more quickly under the current administration than under the previous administration. We should not be eviscerating proper review of virtually all mining operations on public lands, including sand and gravel, I repeat, as this Republican bill would do. We should certainly not be doing it under the pretense of developing critical and strategic minerals.

Now, the other side likes to cherry-pick. They cherry-pick one statistic out of a report, without having, apparently, read the rest of the report.

If you look at the full report by the international consulting firm Behre Dolbear, it states that ''permitting delays are a global issue'' and that ''the business environment will likely favor firms that aggressively take a proactive stance concerning societal and environmental issues.''

Plans under the current administration, under the current BLM, plans of operation for hardrock mines are being approved roughly 17 percent more quickly than previously.

They say that the United States is last, ranked last, in mining. No. What they fail to note is this very report says that the United States is one of the most attractive countries in the world for mining, sixth, to be precise, sixth most attractive. We are number six in the world when you take all factors into consideration and all countries into consideration.

Yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to cherry-pick and say that the United States is so unfair to the mining interests that we have to give them a break, that we have to give away all of these mining resources on the public's lands, with no royalties and very few questions asked.

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

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Missouri) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI).

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, only in Washington would we be having a debate about whether 4 years is okay or 2½ years is okay when we're talking about a jobs bill. And only in Washington would we talk about cherry-picking when we're talking about the vast majority of the production that is sought for permitting, and the vast number of jobs that is created is not—I want to make this very clear so the record is clear—is not handled within 3 years.

Now, it may be true that it's less than the Bush administration, which is fine. Let's assume that it is.

But when you're talking about primarily issues that deal with Western lands whose States are at or near a majority of Federal ownership, and you want to talk about the middle class, and you want to talk about generating jobs, and you want to say, hey, by the way, you can take as long as you want; we don't know if you're going to have a job in that industry or not because there are no rules.

Only in Washington would we be defending no time limits whatsoever. To say 30 months is a bad idea, with language that says, if both sides agree, you can take longer, is not an unreasonable environmental or administrative stance.

Nobody wants a nice, crisp denial in 30 months; and by the way, if the application should be denied, then I presume that it will be denied.

But what we're seeing now, and you can find no legislative history for this anywhere in any of the applicable environmental regulations and statutes, of which all still apply, there is nothing that says, by the way, if nothing else works, just see if you can drag it out as long as possible and hope that that capital goes away. Because when you talk about permitting attractiveness, it's not what these folks are those folks say, it's where the capital goes. And the capital isn't going here.

And the strategic interest of having to go to China for your rare-earths or having to go to other countries to produce those is not apparent.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

My friend on the other side of the aisle says that, evidently, the agencies that are reviewing these massive projects, projects that can permanently degrade the environment, permanently degrade the environment, hurt public health, affect communities, they're doing it just to be mean to the mining interests.

No, I don't think so. They are charged with protecting the lands that belong to Americans, the health of Americans, and the long-term welfare of the communities.

Now, as for China, let's talk about China. We should be talking about China. We should be concerned about what happens to the rare-earth minerals around the world and in this country being locked up by China.

Talk to any business searching the venture capital community for start-up funding, and one of the first things that they will be asked is, what is your China plan, because if you don't have a China plan, you won't be very successful.

The bill that we're considering today, once again, shows that Republicans, in their eagerness to have giveaways for the mining industry, are wandering in total darkness when it comes to developing a strategy for dealing with China.

In the Findings section of the bill before us it says:

> The industrialization of China and India has driven demand for nonfuel mineral commodities, sparking a period of resource nationalism exemplified by China's reduction in exports of rare-earth elements.

True. And these are the rare-earth elements that are necessary for telecommunications and military technologies and health care technologies and conventional energy and renewable energy technologies.

So what would this bill do about China's export restrictions?

What would this bill do to ensure that China not restrict exports of rare-earths to us, or that we keep the rare-earth elements in this country to be used as strategic input to these strategic industries?

Nothing.

I have news for my colleagues. We do, in the United States, produce rare-earth. We mine and concentrate rare-earth elements. The Molycorp facility in California mines one of the richest rare-earth deposits in the world. They're ramping up to 40,000 tons of production by next year. That will be a quarter of the global production.

□ 1430

But guess what? Guess where they are sending much of that production? Yes, China. That's right. Our rare-earths will go to China to be refined into alloys and metals. And there they will stay, if the Chinese Government so determines, for Chinese high-tech manufacturers. What are we doing about that in this legislation? Nothing.

So why are we doing this legislation first when the bigger problem is how are we going to have a reliable supply of these strategic minerals.

The Republican solution is, China, we waived our environmental laws. We're going to turn these out faster and faster from these public lands that belong to the American people. We'll send them to you, China, so you can refine them. And please send them back to us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my friend from New Jersey if he has any further speakers. I'm prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. HOLT. I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the remaining time.

In closing, let me just repeat what we've heard over and over. This is unnecessary. It's not dealing with the real problems first. It is a giveaway to the mining industry to exempt them from regulations, to exempt them from paying a reasonable royalty to the American people for use of the American people's lands. It would alter nearly all mining operations on public lands in the United States by reducing or even eliminating review under the National Environmental Policy Act. It would change these mining operations not just for these rare-earth elements but for copper, uranium, sand, and gravel.

The Interior Department testified this legislation would remove many of the environmental safeguards for almost all types of hardrock mines on public lands, bypass evaluation of potential impacts under the National Environmental Policy Act, and limit public involvement in agency decision-making.

Can that be a good idea—to eliminate all those things and not actually deal with the production and supply and availability of strategic minerals?

The authors of the bill say it's needed ''because it could take a developer years to get all government permits in place.'' Well, that's up to the developer to get those in. And it's up to the government agencies to make sure they do it in a way that protects the public health, protects the public lands, protects the future of communities that would be affected by this.

This bill is not about fixing delays, but really about preventing proper environmental review and safety and public health reviews.

We should be updating the Mining Act of 1872. We are a century or a century-and-a-half late in updating that mining law. Maybe there was a time in the 19th century where we wanted to send people out to develop the great expanses of the western United States and give them carte blanche. We've come a long way since then.

We should get up to date here in the House of Representatives. We should be dealing with the hundred thousand known abandoned mines that are a danger to people and to the environment. Promoting the development of minerals that are critical to core national priorities and that are genuinely susceptible to disruptions should be an area where both sides, Republicans and Democrats, can work together. Instead, we're dealing with special interests, giving them free rein in a handout.

I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, before I make my closing remarks, I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE of the Judiciary Committee for his cooperation in helping schedule this bill for consideration. We have an exchange of letters to that effect.

Mr. Chairman, much has been debated here on the floor about what is strategic and what is not strategic. Let me posit a suggestion here on the fact that there are two ways that you could define this. You could define it by making a definition so narrow that in effect the legislation picks winners and losers. Or you could write statutory law that says that certain conditions that require certain elements will be the driver of what is strategic. That means the marketplace is the one, then, that decides what is strategic. I think that's a much better approach because when I talk about this, I recall hearing that in the late 1890s the U.S. Patent Office issued a statement—and I could be off a little bit—saying that we ought to close down the U.S. Patent Office because everything that has been invented, has been invented. This is in the 1890s. This is before we were flying airplanes. This is before the car became commercially available. This means all the minerals that go into those things weren't even thought of at the time.

So what we do then in this bill is just very straightforward. We say that the strategic minerals will meet these criteria. By the way, you can find this on page 5, section 3, ''Definitions'':

> (A) For national defense and national security.

That is so self-evident, it hardly needs to be debated.

Second:

> For the Nation's energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining.

That's from an energy standpoint. That certainly should not be debated because we have to have a good energy source if we're going to have a growing economy.

And:

> (C) To support domestic manufacturing.

Of course, that includes agriculture and housing. In other words, to support our economy. Doesn't that make good sense to have a source of strategic minerals for that?

Finally:

> (D) for the Nation's economic security and balance of trade.

That makes eminently good sense because we are seriously out of balance

now with China, as has been brought up.

So this approach is more of a long-term solution because I dare say that 25 years from now there will be a mineral that somebody will find that will be used for new technology. But if we have defined it so narrowly that we don't know what that technology is, we have in fact been picking winners and losers. That's the wrong approach. The right approach is what's embodied in this bill to say that these conditions will be the ones that will define strategic minerals.

Finally, let me close on this: everybody likes to make fun of sand and gravel as being strategic. I guarantee you that after the earthquakes in northern and southern California, when the freeways collapsed, I can tell you very, very strategically that cement and sand and gravel fit that category.

So under the conditions, I think this fits what we are attempting to do in the long term.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS, I am writing with respect to H.R. 761, the ''National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013,'' which the Committee on Natural Resources reported favorably. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 761 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 761 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 761, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 761.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 3, 2013.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, as amended, on May 15, 2013. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on the Judiciary will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 761 at this time, the Committee on the Judiciary does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on the Judiciary represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTING,
Chairman.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, while I strongly support efforts to enhance our domestic security by reducing our reliance on foreign sources of strategic and critical minerals, but aside from its short title, the pending legislation has nothing to do with that goal.

In fact, this legislation provides relief to any and all types of minerals on public lands—minerals such as gold, silver and copper produced under the Mining Law of 1872.

These are minerals that are mined for free, with no royalty charged in return for their removal from lands owned by all Americans.

Yet, the pending legislation would provide multi-national conglomerates with even more relief in their pursuit of mining free gold from federal lands.

It is not limited in scope to, for instance, rare earth minerals used in fuel cells and solar panels among other applications. Rare earths are certainly strategic and critical.

Instead, the bill provides relief to any "mineral exploration or mine permit" with plans of operations issued by the BLM under its 3809 regulation and the Forest Service under it counterpart regulations.

Read the bill. Look up those regulations.

The BLM 3809 regulations are clear, they apply to "all operations authorized by the mining laws on public lands where the mineral interest is reserved to the United States."

The Forest Service regulations referenced in the bill state they apply to "the surface of National Forest System lands in connections with operations authorized by the United States mining laws . . ."

So I say to my colleagues, understand what you will be voting on. Understand that this bill provides additional relief to mostly foreign owned companies who are extracting gold, silver and other hardrock minerals from our lands, our public lands, without paying a royalty in return.

Mine coal on federal lands, you pay a royalty. Drill for oil and natural gas on public lands, you pay a royalty. But not gold, not silver, and not copper.

I oppose this legislation.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 761

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 Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The industrialization of China and India has driven demand for nonfuel mineral commodities, sparking a period of resource nationalism exemplified by China's reduction in exports of rare-earth elements necessary for telecommunications, military technologies, healthcare technologies, and conventional and renewable energy technologies.

(2) The availability of minerals and mineral materials are essential for economic growth, national security, technological innovation, and the manufacturing and agricultural supply chain.

(3) The exploration, production, processing, use, and recycling of minerals contribute significantly to the economic well-being, security and general welfare of the Nation.

(4) The United States has vast mineral resources, but is becoming increasingly dependent upon foreign sources of these mineral materials, as demonstrated by the following:

(A) Twenty-five years ago the United States was dependent on foreign sources for 30 nonfuel mineral materials, 6 of which the United States imported 100 percent of the Nation's requirements, and for another 16 commodities the United States imported more than 60 percent of the Nation's needs.

(B) By 2011 the United States import dependence for nonfuel mineral materials had more than doubled from 30 to 67 commodities, 19 of which the United States imported 100 percent of the Nation's requirements, and for another 24 commodities, imported more than 50 percent of the Nation's needs.

(C) The United States share of worldwide mineral exploration dollars was 8 percent in 2011, down from 19 percent in the early 1990s.

(D) In the 2012 Ranking of Countries for Mining Investment, out of 25 major mining countries, the United States ranked last with Papua New Guinea in permitting delays, and towards the bottom regarding government take and social issues affecting mining.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.—The term ''strategic and critical minerals'' means minerals that are necessary—

(A) for national defense and national security requirements;

(B) for the Nation's energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation and transmission, and renewable energy production;

(C) to support domestic manufacturing, agriculture, housing, telecommunications, healthcare, and transportation infrastructure; or

(D) for the Nation's economic security and balance of trade.

(2) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' means any agency, department, or other unit of Federal, State, local, or tribal government, or Alaska Native Corporation.

(3) MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.—The term ''mineral exploration or mine permit'' includes plans of operation issued by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service pursuant to 43 C.F.R. 3809 and 36 C.F.R. 228A or the authorities listed in 43 C.F.R. 3503.13, respectively.

TITLE I—DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC SOURCES OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS

SEC. 101. IMPROVING DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.

Domestic mines that will provide strategic and critical minerals shall be considered an ''infrastructure project'' as described in Presidential Order ''Improving Performance of Federal Permitting and Review of Infrastructure Projects'' dated March 22, 2012.

SEC. 102. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE LEAD AGENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall appoint a project lead who shall coordinate and consult with cooperating agencies and any other agency involved in the permitting process, project proponents and contractors to ensure that agencies minimize delays, set and adhere to timelines and schedules for completion of the permitting process, set clear permitting goals and track progress against those goals.

(b) DETERMINATION UNDER NEPA.—To the extent that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to any mineral exploration or mine permit, the lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall determine that the action to approve the exploration or mine permit does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 if the procedural and substantive safeguards of the permitting process alone, any applicable State permitting process alone, or a combination of the two processes together provide an adequate mechanism to ensure that environmental factors are taken into account.

(c) COORDINATION ON PERMITTING PROCESS.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall enhance government coordination for the permitting process by avoiding duplicative reviews, minimizing paperwork and engaging other agencies and stakeholders early in the process. The lead agency shall consider the following best practices:

(1) Deferring to and relying upon baseline data, analyses and reviews performed by State agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed project.

(2) Conducting any consultations or reviews concurrently rather than sequentially to the extent practicable and when such concurrent review will expedite rather than delay a decision.

(d) SCHEDULE FOR PERMITTING PROCESS.—At the request of a project proponent, the lead agency, cooperating agencies and any other agencies involved with the mineral exploration or mine permitting process shall enter into an agreement with the project proponent that sets time limits for each part of the permitting process including the following:

(1) The decision on whether to prepare a document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(2) A determination of the scope of any document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(3) The scope of and schedule for the baseline studies required to prepare a document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(4) Preparation of any draft document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(5) Preparation of a final document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(6) Consultations required under applicable laws.

(7) Submission and review of any comments required under applicable law.

(8) Publication of any public notices required under applicable law.

(9) A final or any interim decisions.

(e) TIME LIMIT FOR PERMITTING PROCESS.—In no case should the total review process described in subsection (d) exceed 30 months unless agreed to by the signatories of the agreement.

(f) LIMITATION ON ADDRESSING PUBLIC COMMENTS.—The lead agency is not required to address agency or public comments that were not submitted during any public comment periods or consultation periods provided during the permitting process or as otherwise required by law.

(g) FINANCIAL ASSURANCE.—The lead agency will determine the amount of financial assurance for reclamation of a mineral exploration or mining site, which must cover the estimated cost if the lead agency were to contract with a third party to reclaim the operations according to the reclamation plan, including construction and maintenance costs for any treatment facilities necessary to meet Federal, State or tribal environmental standards.

(h) APPLICATION TO EXISTING PERMIT APPLICATIONS.—This section shall apply with respect to a mineral exploration or mine permit for which an application was submitted before the date of the enactment of this Act if the applicant for the permit submits a written request to the lead agency for the permit. The lead agency shall begin implementing this section with respect to such application within 30 days after receiving such written request.

(i) STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS WITHIN NATIONAL FORESTS.—With respect to strategic and critical minerals within a federally administered unit of the National Forest System, the lead agency shall—

(1) exempt all areas of identified mineral resources in Land Use Designations, other than Non-Development Land Use Designations, in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act from the procedures detailed at and all rules promulgated under part 294 of title 36, Code for Federal Regulations;

(2) apply such exemption to all additional routes and areas that the lead agency finds necessary to facilitate the construction, operation, maintenance, and restoration of the areas of identified mineral resources described in paragraph (1); and

(3) continue to apply such exemptions after approval of the Minerals Plan of Operations for the unit of the National Forest System.

SEC. 103. CONSERVATION OF THE RESOURCE.

In evaluating and issuing any mineral exploration or mine permit, the priority of the lead agency shall be to maximize the development of the mineral resource, while mitigating environmental impacts, so that more of the mineral resource can be brought to the market place.

SEC. 104. FEDERAL REGISTER PROCESS FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINING PROJECTS.

(a) PREPARATION OF FEDERAL NOTICES FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—The preparation of Federal Register notices required by law associated with the issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall be delegated to the organization level within the agency responsible for issuing the mineral exploration or mine permit. All Federal Register notices regarding official document availability, announcements of meetings, or notices of intent to undertake an action shall be originated and transmitted to the Federal Register from the office where documents are held, meetings are held, or the activity is initiated.

(b) DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINING PROJECTS.—Absent any extraordinary circumstance or except as otherwise required by any Act of Congress, each Federal Register notice described in subsection (a) shall undergo any required reviews within the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture and be published in its final form in the Federal Register no later than 30 days after its initial preparation.

TITLE II—JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTIONS RELATING TO EXPLORATION AND MINE PERMITS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS FOR TITLE.

In this title the term ''covered civil action'' means a civil action against the Federal Government containing a claim under section 702 of title 5, United States Code, regarding agency action affecting a mineral exploration or mine permit.

SEC. 202. TIMELY FILINGS.

A covered civil action is barred unless filed no later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the final Federal agency action to which it relates.

SEC. 203. RIGHT TO INTERVENE.

The holder of any mineral exploration or mine permit may intervene as of right in any covered civil action by a person affecting rights or obligations of the permit holder under the permit.

SEC. 204. EXPEDITION IN HEARING AND DETERMINING THE ACTION.

The court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as possible.

SEC. 205. LIMITATION ON PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.

In a covered civil action, the court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that such relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of a legal requirement, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct that violation.

SEC. 206. LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES.

Sections 504 of title 5, United States Code, and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (together commonly called the Equal Access to Justice Act) do not apply to a covered civil action, nor shall any party in such a covered civil action receive payment from the Federal Government for their attorneys' fees, expenses, and other court costs.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–214. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–214.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, strike lines 3 through 16 and insert the following:

(1) STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.—The term ''strategic and critical minerals''—

(A) means—

(i) minerals and mineral groups identified as critical by the National Research Council in the report entitled ''Minerals, Critical Minerals, and the U.S. Economy'', dated 2008; and

(ii) additional minerals identified by the Secretary of the Interior based on the National Research Council criteria in such report; and

(B) shall not include sand, gravel, or clay.

Page 5, strike lines 21 through 26 and insert the following:

(3) MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.—The term ''mineral exploration or mine permit''—

(A) means a mineral exploration or mine permit for strategic and critical minerals; and

(B) includes any plan of operation for strategic and critical minerals that is issued by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I was puzzled when I read the bill title, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, and then went on to read the bill text. Surely there must have been a mistake when drafting this bill. Strategic and critical minerals were certainly not meant to include sand, gravel, and clay.

But right now, section 3 of this bill is written so broadly that it would include very common nonstrategic and noncritical minerals—even going so far, as I mentioned, to encompass materials such as sand, gravel, and clay.

The Interior Department recently testified before my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee and confirmed that this is, in fact, exactly the case. The bill that we are now considering is written expansively beyond critical minerals.

The Interior Department testified:

This legislation would remove many of the environmental safeguards for almost all kinds of hardrock mines on public lands, bypassing evaluation of potential impacts under NEPA, and limit public involvement in agency decisionmaking.

That's why I introduce an amendment that would simply narrow the bill's definition of purported strategic and critical minerals to actual strategic and critical minerals, as defined by the National Research Council.

Why is my amendment critical? It is because instead of ostensibly fast-tracking only strategic and critical minerals, which this bill I think does poorly, this legislation appears to be a guise for mining interests to loosen public review, judicial review, and environmental protections not just for strategic and critical minerals, but for all hardrock mining.

We could have a debate about how to ensure America's supply of strategic and critical minerals, but first we have to get the definition right.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment really picks up on what my arguments were at the end of the general debate because the effect of this amendment would be to pick winners and losers by narrowly defining a use. And as I stated in my closing remarks, we have four categories that I think are very broad and change over a period of time.

So what this amendment does is try to restrict what may be decided as a critical mineral. Of course, that will change over time. If this amendment is adopted—and I, obviously, urge rejection of this amendment—but if it were to be adopted, I can make a prediction that I know would come back, and that is we'll be back here in the future saying there's another set of critical minerals that we need to define. And we keep doing that over and over and over. Isn't it much better to define the categories and then apply those minerals to those categories? Because they will change.

I find it kind of interesting, too, Mr. Chairman, because I closed my general debate remarks by talking about sand and gravel. My good friend from southern California, I guess, alluded to the fact that sand and gravel don't fit into that category. I'm not going to ask him to answer me, but I'll just ask the question rhetorically, I wonder if he felt that way after the earthquake collapsed freeways in southern California. Would he have liked to wait maybe 4 years for the permitting process to get sand and gravel in order to build those freeways that are so important to southern California?

I asked that question rhetorically, of course, Mr. Chairman.

□ 1445

But I just want to say that this amendment would do exactly opposite of what the intent of this bill is about, and that is that it picks winners and losers. I urge its rejection, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I welcome those comments, but let's be real clear what I'm talking about. I am talking about eliminating a giveaway of almost all hard rock mining, to really defining what is strategic and critical as defined by the robust methodology in the National Research Council's report.

Now, what do I mean by a robust methodology? It says if we look at all the mining that we have, if we look at what we have to define as strategic, we have to look along two dimensions in a scientific way. We have to know: What is the impact of this mineral or this mining if there was a supply restriction? What would be the impact if there was a supply restriction? Would it impact defense? Would it impact national security? If it does have an impact, then it has a high rating on that.

Also, what about the supply risk? We need to measure, if we do not develop this mine at this place, are there other places that we can? If, in fact, a mineral has high supply risk, high impact, not only are those minerals defined now, but the Secretary of the Interior, using this methodology, will define. This clearly defines what is needed in terms of strategic and critical, and not just everything.

I remind you that right now we are loosening in the bill the environmental protections, public participation, judicial review for everything. We're doing it, as was pointed out, for national defense, he said, anything that meets national security requirements, for energy infrastructure, pipelines, refining capacity, power generation, domestic manufacturing—which includes everything, whether it's important or not—health care, telecommunications, transportation. What we're doing is we're gutting protections for everything, not those that are just needed.

I present a methodology which will allow a real clear definition, not just of what's in the bill now, but include a methodology that the Secretary of the Interior can include if the material is really needed to be mined.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. China is not trying to lock up the world's sand and gravel. We do have to worry about the supply of yttrium and gadolinium and these other things that are necessary for jet engines and magnets and hard drives in laptops and so forth.

Let me just address the point that has to do with this definition that my friend from Washington talks about, winners and losers. Yes, this bill has winners and losers. The winners would be the mining companies. The losers would be local communities, the environment, water quality, wildlife, and the American taxpayers.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Again, I introduced this amendment that would narrow the bill's definition to not what is purported to be strategic but actually what is strategic, that if we're going to give benefits, they must be strategic, and my amendment provides for an actual way of measuring that.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I think the gentleman from New Jersey did say this picks winners and losers—at least he didn't deny it—and then he tried to turn it around and say that we pick winners and losers. I will acknowledge that from this standpoint:

the winners will be those States that have huge, huge swaths of Federal land. The winners will be the communities in those States that have large swaths of Federal land that want to create jobs, because jobs are created because of the natural resources in those States. So from that sense, yes, we are picking winners and losers, and, frankly, I am proud of that.

But I have to say this, Mr. Chairman. In listening to my friend's argument on this, keep in mind what this bill does. This bill tries to provide certainty for those that would want to get into the mining business by saying that you have to have a decision made in 30 months. Now, the decision doesn't have to be affirmative, but there has to be a decision.

What this gentleman is saying, what the effect of this amendment is, as I hear his argument, is there is one more layer we have to go through before it is strategic, and that's the Secretary of the Interior. Does that not suggest that that might be a political problem, then, rather than a problem based on what is needed? No. The four broad categories is a much, much better way to do it.

I think the gentleman's amendment is misplaced. I urge its rejection, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. VEASEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–214.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 26, insert the following:

SEC. 4. PUBLICATION OF CRITICAL MINERALS.

The Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register—

(1) by not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a list of the minerals that are strategic and critical minerals for purposes of this Act; and

(2) every 5 years thereafter, an updated list of such minerals.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer this amendment because, Mr. Chairman, mineral exploration and mining have a deep history in our country. We have vast resources in America that we have been able to use for our own security, innovation, and economic benefit. This is why we must continue to explore these resources in a smart, environmentally sensitive manner.

It is dangerous for America to depend on countries like China for rare-earth elements and rare metals. These elements are necessary for telecommunications, military technologies, health care technologies, as well as conventional and renewable energy technologies. But the underlying bill goes far beyond these specific minerals in defining what constitutes ''strategic and critical.''

While the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act gives four characteristics for what should be a strategic and critical mineral, it leaves the exact minerals open to interpretation. The majority has stated that their purpose in leaving the definition so broad is to allow for flexibility over time. This bill would cover virtually all hard rock mining on Federal lands.

I think most Americans will agree that sand and gravel are important to our economy, but how many would be willing to go on Federal lands, places such as the Grand Canyon, in order to mine these two elements?

That is why I have proposed my amendment to H.R. 761. My amendment would give the Secretary of the Interior the authority to specifically list what are strategic and critical minerals and make this information available to the public. After a given number of years looking at the global and national landscape for mineral exploration, the Secretary would have the authority to change this list as factors dictate. This allows for flexibility in responding to global mineral markets while protecting our public resources.

Mr. Chairman, I know both Democrats and Republicans strongly support the development of rare-earth elements and other critical minerals necessary for our national security and national competitiveness, but we must refrain from allowing the mining industry to define what is critical solely in accordance with their economic needs. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on my amendment to define what minerals are of national public interest and to protect the prestige of our public lands.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Clearly, with the last amendment and this amendment, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are really disturbed about what strategic is. I guess I can understand that. I obviously disagree with that.

This is very similar to the last amendment, except it specifically gives the Secretary of the Interior that power to decide what is critical or not.

Now, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I don't think from a policy standpoint we should give that much power to anybody to say what is critical and not as far as minerals concerned that support our economy. Let me just give you a case in point of how we run into problems with this.

Less than 10 years ago, people were concerned about platinum group metals used in computers and electronics and the pending shortfall of copper. So because we hadn't defined these broad categories—see, if we had this bill in place 10 years ago, this category would have taken care of itself because the market would have suggested we need new minerals in order to support a certain sector of the economy. But no, when you pick winners and losers, then you have to go through the whole process and the hand-wringing and the high prices and all of those things that slow down the economy.

So, once again, in deference to my good friend that offered this amendment, in a bill that is trying to add certainty to the regulatory process, this adds another layer of uncertainty by giving it to the Secretary of the Interior. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that is good policy.

This goes along again with the last amendment. By voice vote, that was rejected. This should be rejected in a like manner. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington, in this bill, who would decide what is a strategic and critical mineral?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would be more than happy to tell you. And I made this. If you look on page five, under Definitions: Strategic and Critical Minerals. The term ''strategic and critical minerals'' means minerals that are necessary—and there's four categories—for national defense and national security requirements. I can't predict in 25 years which mineral will support our weapons, for example, but that is a category in which that would be a critical mineral.

B, for the Nation's energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation and transmission, and renewable energy production. Now, I have no idea what, in the future, critical minerals we will need to support those activities, but I know before wind and solar took hold, nobody was worrying about those minerals. But this category, if you had it by category, you would not have to go through the hand-wringing to find out where that source is.

C, to support domestic manufacturing, agriculture, housing, telecommunications, health care, and transportation infrastructure.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, again, I want to ask the gentleman: Who would decide what is strategic and a critical mineral? I mean, I listened to the gentleman in his explanation, and I never heard exactly who would decide in his explanation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VEASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Well, just let me finish then because there's only one more, and I do want to say that.

For the Nation's economic security and balance of trade. So once that category is defined and somebody wants to refine some element—I don't know, pick a name; there are all these new names; I can't pronounce them anyway—and they find out that there's a new industry that wants a certain element, if an entrepreneur wants to mine for that, they make the permit and it's decided by the Federal agency. Very simple. And if it fits this category, he gets the permit. That's the beauty of it.

Mr. VEASEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the answer to that would be the Secretary of the Interior.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I just want to say that we have somewhat exhausted this; but the difference between this gentleman's amendment and the broad categories I say is that he—he—or I should say the Secretary of the Interior—picks that. The Secretary picks it.

Under the underlying bill, yes, the Secretary picks it; but if it meets these broad categories, then, of course, he has to pick that mineral. That makes perfectly good sense because it responds to the marketplace.

Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–214.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning at page 6, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 7, line 9, and insert the following:

(b) DETERMINATION UNDER NEPA.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall determine any such action would constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.).

Beginning at page 7, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 9, line 7.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here we go again. Another week, another attempt by the House majority to gut critical environmental protections that we know save lives and communities. Right before we left for the August recess, a break I urged the Republican leadership to forego, the House passed a reckless offshore oil drilling bill that risks our shoreline communities along the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts. And for what? To continue our dependence on fossil fuels.

H.R. 761 is not unknown to Congress. In fact, we had passed a rule and were set to consider it only a few weeks ago before the House majority abruptly pulled it from the floor and rammed through a partisan farm bill instead—a bill that protected farm subsidies, crop insurance guarantees, and handouts for Big Agribusiness, including some Members of this very body, at the expense of the neediest among us, including more than 210,000 children.

Yet here we are today. Once again, the House majority is attempting to not only remove environmental safeguards provided under the National Environmental Policy Act, but to set arbitrary deadlines for its approval process.

I am pleased to once again offer this commonsense amendment that will preserve NEPA protections and ensure that a thorough safety review is conducted.

In 1969, Congress passed the National Environmental Policy Act, a bipartisan act with strong Republican support, including President Richard Nixon, who understood then that environmental impacts on large projects must be explored, understood, and eventually mitigated.

Under NEPA, any infrastructure project that could have a significant impact is now subject to an environmental impact statement, which outlines the purpose of the project, possible alternatives, the affected environment, and the consequences of completing the project. The findings are then considered prior to final project approval.

Projects with less environmental impact may be subjected to a less detailed environmental assessment instead. Some projects, like the construction of a foot trail, may be deemed to have no significant environmental impact and can receive a categorical exclusion.

Make no mistake, the bill before us today has no foot path. We are talking about major mining projects that could devastate entire communities. There are many aspects of mineral exploration policy for which statutory changes should be considered, such as closing Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act loopholes. Unfortunately, that's not what we're doing here.

As I've noted before, considering that all other major projects, even transit projects with clear environmental benefits, must still go through an environmental impact statement, it is absurd to turn around and exclude from such analysis activities or put an arbitrary time limit on it that has such potential to actually destroy ecosystems and regional economies.

My commonsense amendment, Mr. Chairman, would simply restore that process so that there can be peace and comfort of mind to affected communities, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, if you like the current 7- to 10-year timeframe to do mining permits in this country, then you will love this amendment; but this bill is all about making it possible to do mining in this country and use our natural resources in a reasonable, commonsense way.

Other countries, like Australia and Canada, have a 2-year time cycle from beginning to end to get your application and permit done so you can begin mining. In this country, it's 7 to 10 years. That's why we have declining activity of the well-paying jobs that mining produces, the resources that are available from mining so we don't have to rely on countries like China.

This amendment would eviscerate, this amendment would gut, what this bill is trying to do. It's unnecessary because NEPA already applies. NEPA remains in force. This just allows needless and endless bureaucratic delays by allowing NEPA to do an environmental impact statement at almost every step in the whole process.

It is important to have a certainty of when the process is over so you know whether or not you can invest in a long-term project like this. Seven to 10 years is beyond any of our economic cycles. It is not feasible from a business standpoint to wait that long in a commodity market like minerals and metals to make these investment decisions. You to have certainty, you have to have closure, you have to have a time certain that you're done.

So the 30-month timeframe is critical. We respect and uphold NEPA. It remains in effect, but we get rid of the ability to do it at every step in the process.

This amendment would be a backward step and back to the current status quo which makes it harder to have

mining projects in this country with the jobs that they create, with the benefit to our economy that these minerals allow for.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a strong ''no'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire how much time is left on this side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I certainly respect my friend and his point of view about the mining industry. I wish it were true that the other side of the aisle respects the NEPA process; but, frankly, we've had bill after bill and amendment after amendment in excess of 100 that actually attack everything from the Clean Water Act to the Clean Air Act that have resisted regulation even when it comes to public health and particulate matter, for example. They have assaulted the NEPA process every step of the way.

In this bill, there's a huge carve-out for one industry—the mining industry. It is not true that the average is 7 to 10 years. It may be true that some have had that. But it is also true that a NEPA process protects communities. It answers questions. It answers the very uncertainty my friend talked about. But sometimes it answers that uncertainty in a way that the industry and its supporters don't like.

I think our job here is not so much to protect wealthy advocates of a particular industry who may also positively influence the financing of campaigns. I think our first duty is to protect public health and safety, those communities that have found themselves devastated because proper environmental analysis, in fact, had not been done. We have seen that all across America from Appalachia to southern Illinois to in the West.

I, too, want to make sure we unlock strategic minerals and that the United States has them available when it needs it. But I don't believe that the tradeoff has to be at the expense of every community that could potentially be the site of a mine.

Mr. Chairman, I actually strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' for this commonsense amendment to restore an environmental analysis process that, in fact, has worked.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to remind my colleague from Virginia that this administration has streamlined NEPA for several uses during its time in office for renewable energy projects, for highways, for the so-called ''stimulus'' that we had in 2007. So this administration at times, anyway, sees the need to balance the creation of jobs with protecting the environment, but not allowing environmental regulations to be used to endlessly delay projects.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I'm afraid, would endlessly delay the production of the projects that we need to produce critical and strategic minerals. For that reason I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have left.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague and friend from New Mexico, Representative PEARCE.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would make a comment to my friend from Virginia that we in the West are being protected from ourselves, we are being protected from jobs. The devastation is in our jobs.

I have one county—I have 18 counties—one county is 7,000 square miles. That is three times the size of Delaware. It is six times the size of Rhode Island. It has a population of 3,725 people. The jobs have gone away. There used to be 11 rare-earth mineral mines in the southern district of New Mexico. Today there are none. All of those jobs have gone to China.

This is just a commonsense bill that says we are going to go through the process. We have economies that are being devastated, but it's not an environmental devastation. It is from the environmentalist who will sue to stop every single job in the West. We've lost our mining jobs; we've lost our timber jobs. These are areas that are not sitting out here making life unlivable and unhealthy; these are areas that are looking for jobs.

I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment with respect to my friend.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time and say that if you think it's a good situation for the United States to be lumped in with Papua, New Guinea, dead last among mining countries in this world, as shown by a recent study, in that it takes 7 to 10 years to get mining projects off the ground, then you would like this amendment. But if you don't, if you think we can protect the environment at the same time as creating jobs and strike that balance, which this bill does, then you will vote ''no'' on this amendment and ''yes'' on H.R. 761.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–214.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 14, before ''The lead agency'' insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—

Page 9, line 21, before the period insert '', the cost of cleanup in the event of any release occurring at such site, and the costs incurred by the United States to implement this subsection''.

Page 9, after line 21, insert the following:

(2) FORM.—Such financial assurance shall be in the form of a surety bond, letter of credit, or other instrument that would routinely be accepted in commerce.

(3) AMOUNT BASED ON TYPE OF OPERATION.—The amount of such financial assurance shall be based on the type of mining operation to be conducted.

(4) INSPECTIONS.—The lead agency shall conduct annual inspections and reviews of financial insurance required under this subsection.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me read the amendment. It's very short:

The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit may not issue such permit until the applicant for the permit has fully reimbursed the United States, each State, and each Native American tribe for all costs incurred by the United States and such State and such tribe respectively for issuance of the permit. Such reimbursement shall include costs of all Federal, State and tribal reviews and approvals required for the permit, contracting costs and salaries, including benefits for State and Federal employees and the conduct of reviews by State, a State that under authority delegated to the State under Federal law.

□ 1515

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer today to H.R. 761 would reimburse the costs of permitting in order that the National Environmental Policy Act requirements be met. Those who complain about the National Environmental Policy Act permitting—and it has been said here repeatedly on the floor, and when I was managing the rule earlier today, it was said—often cite timing as a concern. With budget cuts, furloughs, and other competing work, it is not possible to meet all the demands. The reimbursement of any and all costs will help to resolve this issue and provide for meaningful public participation in the decisionmaking process for the use of Federal lands.

Mr. Chairman, I would ultimately ask that my amendment be made in order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the intention behind this amendment, and I thank the gentleman for offering it. I do want to reassure him, though, that the bill and current law already satisfy what he is after, so I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Let me read specifically from the language of the bill. This is on page 9. I'm going to read a paragraph, and, hopefully, this will alleviate your concerns:

(g) Financial Assurance. The lead agency will determine the amount of financial assurance for reclamation of a mineral exploration or mining site, which must cover the estimated cost if the lead agency were to contract with a third party to reclaim the operations according to the reclamation plan, including construction and maintenance costs for any treatment facilities necessary to meet Federal, State or tribal environmental standards.

So, in case the company goes bankrupt—in the worst case scenario—it has to post a bond, and I believe it's equal to 140 percent of what the reclamation cost would be.

We already have comprehensive regulations in addition to the bill language from the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service. These regulations have been revised during both the Clinton and Bush administrations so that, today, both BLM and Forest Service regulations require that exploration and mining activities have the resources necessary to ensure reclamation after it's over even if the company goes bankrupt.

I appreciate the intention behind this amendment, but I believe it is completely unnecessary. So, for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I need to make a correction.

I had two amendments in the Rules Committee last night. The one that I just read into the RECORD and that my friend and colleague just responded to was the one that was not made in order, but I will be very brief because the one that was made in order, amendment No. 4, which we are addressing, requires financial assurance in the form of a surety bond, a letter of credit, or other instrument that would routinely be accepted in commerce.

In the interest of time, I would only offer, Mr. Chairman, that my full statement on amendment No. 4 be placed in the RECORD. I am sure my colleague has time to respond to amendment No. 4. If he does not, I would be prepared to yield to him whatever time I have in order for him to respond.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer today to H.R. 761, would reimburse the cost of permitting and order that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements be met. Those who complain about NEPA permitting, often cite timing as a concern. With budget cuts, furloughs, and other competing work, it is not possible to meet all demands.

Reimbursement of any and all costs will help to resolve this issue, and provide for meaningful public participation in the decision-making process for the use of Federal lands.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I urge the Committee to make my amendment in order.

At the end of title I (page 12, after line 2) add the following:

SEC. __01. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ISSUANCE OF MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.

(a) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit may not issue such permit until the applicant for the permit has fully reimbursed the United States, each State, and each Indian tribe for all costs incurred by the United States, such State, and such tribe, respectively, for issuance of the permit.

(2) COSTS INCLUDED.—Such reimbursement shall include—

(A) costs of all Federal, State, and tribal reviews and approvals required for the permit; and

(B) contracting costs and salaries (including benefits) for State and Federal employees.

(b) CONDUCT OF REVIEWS BY STATES.—A State that, under authority delegated to the State under Federal law, performs any function required for the issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall perform such function in accordance with all requirements that would apply under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to performance of such function by a Federal agency.

(c) EXTENSION OF TIME LIMITS.—Any period of time established by Federal law for the issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall be extended by the period of any delay in such issuance that is attributable to a failure of the permit applicant to timely complete any action required for such issuance, including any failure to timely submit any request or payment.

Mr. LAMBORN. May I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, let me just summarize by saying that we already have it in current law and that it's already addressed in this bill that there must be adequate financial assurances given, including the posting of bonds to ensure that the reclamation can take place by contract for third parties if the company goes bankrupt or, for whatever reason, can't follow through. All of our western public land States also have comprehensive regulatory and bonding programs covering hard rock mining. That's in addition to the Federal laws and regulations. In many of these States, the Federal and State agencies work together to jointly manage the reclamation and bonding projects.

As of June of 2013, BLM, in conjunction with its State partners, currently holds more than $2.2 billion in financial assurances to reclaim potential mining sites around the U.S. So you can see this is an active and well-funded program that is in place. Under regulation, these holdings are reviewed and adjusted annually to make sure that costs won't spiral out of control if we have inflation or unforeseen contingencies. In some instances, mining companies are required to establish trust funds and to build them over the course of the mine life to ensure adequate funding for any long-term treatment facilities that might be necessary to meet Federal, State, or tribal environmental standards.

So I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there are already in place appropriate and adequate protections and regulations and that the bill respects that also. I respect the gentleman for his intentions on this amendment, but I believe that it is unnecessary, and for that reason, I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would just say to my colleague that there are deficiencies and inadequacies of funding in the measures that you cited, and they do not cover the cost of cleanup and accidents. That's why we are addressing it.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask and urge my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113–214.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SECRETARIAL ORDER NOT AFFECTED.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as to affect any aspect of Secretarial Order 3324, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 3, 2012, with respect to potash and oil and gas operators.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment today to H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

My amendment is very simple. It only serves to clarify the scope of the bill by stating that it does not impact the rules put in place by Secretarial Order No. 3324, issued by the Secretary of the Interior late last year. That order sets in place buffer zones between potash mines and oil and gas drilling, among other requirements. The Permian Basin's potash reserves are some

of the purist in the world, and our oil and gas drilling plays a key role in the current energy boom that the country is experiencing.

There is a very long history between potash and drilling operators in the region, and the secretarial order helped to clarify some of those issues. I've spent the better part of my career in Congress working to facilitate an agreement between these two industries to ensure both are able to thrive simultaneously. While some have criticisms of the secretarial order, it is an important step in the process of assuring the safe extraction of mineral resources.

My amendment simply clarifies that the text of the bill cannot be used by the Bureau of Land Management to show favoritism for either potash or oil and gas leases within the area laid out in the secretarial order. It does not affect the underlying bill, and it does not cost the American taxpayers a single dime. It brings economic stability to the Permian Basin and ensures that these two mineral resources can be safely and properly developed side by side.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time that is allotted to the opposition to this amendment, although I do not intend to oppose it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this amendment because it makes a point very well that I was making earlier today.

We have criticized this bill because, while it is being sold as necessary for critical and strategic minerals, the definition is so broad that it would cover virtually all mining on public lands. Mr. PEARCE shares our concern. The gentleman is worried that, if H.R. 761 is enacted, the definition is broad enough that it would cover even potash.

Now, potash is important as fertilizer for crops and for other purposes, but let's be clear—it is not used very much in high-tech manufacturing; it is not used in manufacturing items that are important for our national defense; and it is not scarce. It is one of a long list of minerals that produces money for miners, but it should not be covered under this very broad definition in the underlying bill.

I agree with Mr. PEARCE that potash could be covered under this legislation, and we agree that elevating mining for potash on public lands under this bill could impact other uses of those lands, including the development of oil and gas, so I am happy to support this amendment to clarify this overly broad definition.

I would like to note that we had an amendment a few moments ago, offered by our colleague Mr. LOWENTHAL, which would fix the definition in this bill by limiting the bill to truly strategic and critical minerals determined to be, as the gentleman Mr. LOWENTHAL described, a really thorough and, let's say, academic definition of those minerals. It would address not only Mr. PEARCE's concerns, but it would solve one of the overall problems of this bill.

I am happy to support the amendment, and I thank the gentleman for making our case for us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to differ with the gentleman from New Jersey, my friend.

He said that potash is not very high-tech. When you use a scoop shovel to follow the cows around and use the by-product from the cattle to fertilize with, potash is extremely high-tech.

So, with that one exception, I yield 30 seconds to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, nothing in this bill impacts the important multiple use mission of our Nation's public lands. One of the great stories of America is that our Nation recognizes the importance of balancing our land use for many different needs, including mineral and oil and gas development, renewable energy projects, grazing, timber harvests, hunting, fishing, recreation, and other important activities that bring economic vitality to our public lands.

This legislation doesn't change that. It simply addresses the long bureaucratic and burdensome permitting timelines required for mineral exploration and mine development by building on executive orders requiring coordination by regulatory agencies to process permits for infrastructure projects in a timely manner and without compromising environmental safeguards.

Mr. HOLT. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no other comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1530

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA) having assumed the chair, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1631

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio) at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 347 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 761.

Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) kindly take the chair.

□ 1631

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113–214 offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–214 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. VEASEY of Texas.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 241, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

AYES—187

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

NOES—241

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

NOT VOTING—4

Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Polis
Rush

□ 1659

Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, POE of Texas, ROKITA, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, BILIRAKIS, BARR, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. McINTYRE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. TIERNEY, GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. VEASEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 237, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

AYES—189

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

NOES—237

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)

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

NOT VOTING—6

Herrera Beutler
Johnson (GA)
Lamborn
McCarthy (NY)
Polis
Rush

□ 1706

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 240, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 468]

AYES—186

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

NOES—240

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

NOT VOTING—6

Bachus
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Rush

□ 1712

Ms. ESHOO changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 235, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 469]

AYES—191

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

NOES—235

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

NOT VOTING—6

Hahn
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Meng
Polis
Rush

□ 1717

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDING, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, and, pursuant to House Resolution 347, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CICILLINE. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cicilline moves to recommit the bill H.R. 761 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title I (page 12, after line 2), add the following new sections:

SEC. 105. PROHIBITIONS REGARDING CHINA AND IRAN.

(a) PROHIBITION ON EXPORT.—Each Federal mineral exploration or mine permit issued pursuant to this Act shall include provisions that prohibit export to China or Iran of strategic and critical minerals produced under the permit.

(b) PROHIBITION ON ISSUANCE OF PERMITS.—No Federal mineral exploration or mine permit may be issued pursuant to this Act to any company in which China or Iran has an ownership interest.

(c) PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER OF PROHIBITIONS WITH RESPECT TO CHINA.—The President may waive the prohibitions under subsections (a) and (b) with respect to China upon certification that the Government of China has removed its export restraints on strategic and critical minerals.

SEC. 106. PROHIBITION ON ISSUANCE OF PERMITS TO PERSONS, CORPORATIONS, AND SUBSIDIARIES CONVICTED OF VIOLATING SANCTIONS LAWS.

No Federal mineral exploration or mine permit shall be issued pursuant to this Act to a person, corporation, partnership, trust, or other form of business organization that has been convicted of violating the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.), or the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

Mr. AMODEI (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the reading of the motion.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which

will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Much of the debate today has properly focused on the importance of rare-earth elements to our national security and our economic competitiveness.

Globally, the demand for mineral materials continues to grow. These resources are critical for a wide range of products that help ensure the long-term viability of our manufacturing sector, public health, and our defense capabilities.

New technologies and emerging American industries rely on rare minerals. For example, a diverse set of less abundant heavy rare-earth elements are essential to the production of cell phone and laptop screens. Hybrid engines and advanced vehicle technologies similarly rely on these rare minerals. In addition, patients and health care professionals regularly use medical devices and equipment that require rare-earth elements during production.

Finally, our defense capabilities for manufacturers of jet fighter engines to satellite and antimissile systems rely on a consistent supply of rare-earth minerals.

This is an important subject for many business leaders and manufacturers in my home State of Rhode Island and all across our country. In order to plan for the future and to hire additional workers, businesses need to be certain that the supply chain for essential minerals remains consistent and predictable.

So it should be clear that we all understand the strategic and economic importance of these minerals. Some of us disagree on how we should manage the extraction of these elements.

I believe that thoughtful management of these natural resources, instead of undermining important environmental protections, would actually help ensure a supply chain that is sustainable in the long term.

But this amendment addresses a different concern. Today, China has a near-monopoly in the global rare-earth element production market. According to recent estimates from the U.S. Geological Survey, China possesses 97.3 percent of the world's mine production and 55 percent of the world's rare-earth elements reserves.

At the same time, in an attempt to manipulate the world market for minerals and raise prices, the Chinese Ministry of Commerce has established strict export quotas and tariffs. Obviously, this has a real impact on the mineral supply chain for American manufacturers and businesses.

China is not acting alone. Iran is also one of the largest mineral-producing countries in the world. The director of the Persian Gulf Mining and Metal Industries Special Zone in southern Iran has said that China is their largest commercial partner. Recently, according to international reports, senior Chinese officials have engaged with Iran on various geological research projects as they look to expand this relationship. In other words, China is already stockpiling various minerals upon which American manufacturers and our defense capabilities rely, and they may even be working with Iran to gain a larger market share. This is a real threat to our national security; but it's also a real concern for local businesses and manufacturers, technology companies, and defense contractors who rely on rare-earth elements every day.

Despite these concerns, the underlying bill fails to protect these strategic and critical minerals from exposure to foreign influence or control. That's why I rise today offering an amendment to ensure that minerals produced under this act do not become available to China, Iran, or any entity that has violated existing sanctions laws. Specifically, the amendment would ensure mine permits issued pursuant to this act include provisions prohibiting the export of the strategic and critical materials produced under the permit to China or Iran.

The amendment also prohibits issuance of permits to any company in which China or Iran has an ownership interest.

Finally, the amendment prohibits issuance of permits to any entity that has been convicted of violating the Iran Sanctions Act and related laws.

In the end, the amendment accomplishes three important goals. First, it guarantees that our own domestic resources aren't used to promote or increase Iranian or Chinese business interests at the expense of the American taxpayer. Second, it makes sure we continue pressuring Iran with economic sanctions in a sector critical to their local economy. This is a vital bipartisan national security interest. And, third, it provides more certainty for domestic manufacturers by ensuring that American minerals stay here and help make our domestic supply chain more predictable.

I urge my colleagues to support this simple amendment and to protect our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Rhode Island for the eloquent description of what the underlying bill does. I tend to agree with his description on how critical this legislation is.

I am surprised at the tone, though, when we already have multiple rules, regulations, statutes on the books that talk about import and export.

I am surprised at the tone when we talk about the danger of producing these materials in this country when right now we're not producing many of them, and we are entirely reliant upon those with whom we compete globally and militarily to attain these.

I would suggest to you that while well-intentioned, that this matter is, in fact, already taken care of under existing law; but let's not forget the underlying purpose of the bill. It's about jobs.

You want to talk about the middle class? You want to talk about the economy? You want to talk about the western half of this country where over 40 percent of many of those States are owned by the Federal Government, where people who are elected by nobody within the State are making decisions about permitting? You want to talk about permitting times and how long it takes to do that? By the way, did you hear that if it isn't grown, it has to be mined?

The purpose of this bill is to put people to work and put us back in control of supplying those minerals for the building industries, the communications industries, the manufacturing industries, all of that. By the way, not that anybody wants to trade with any of the folks mentioned in here specifically and you have the whole executive branch to take care of that, but there is that thing called ''balance of trade,'' which is something we could use some help with.

Mr. Speaker, I urge your vote against the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for an electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 229, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 470]

AYES—197

Andrews	Capps	Cooper
Barber	Capuano	Costa
Barrow (GA)	Cárdenas	Courtney
Bass	Carney	Crowley
Beatty	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Becerra	Cartwright	Cummings
Bera (CA)	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Bishop (NY)	Chu	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Cicilline	DeGette
Bonamici	Clarke	Delaney
Brady (PA)	Clay	DeLauro
Braley (IA)	Cleaver	DelBene
Brown (FL)	Clyburn	Deutch
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	Dingell
Bustos	Connolly	Doggett
Butterfield	Conyers	Doyle

Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—229

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

NOT VOTING—6

Brady (TX)
Herrera Beutler
Jeffries
McCarthy (NY)
Polis
Rush

□ 1735

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 178, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]

AYES—246

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

NOES—178

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes

Schakowsky	Slaughter	Veasey
Schiff	Smith (WA)	Velázquez
Schneider	Speier	Visclosky
Schrader	Swalwell (CA)	Walz
Schwartz	Takano	Wasserman Schultz
Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Waters
Scott, David	Thompson (MS)	Watt
Serrano	Tierney	Waxman
Shea-Porter	Tonko	Welch
Sherman	Tsongas	Wilson (FL)
Sinema	Van Hollen	Yarmuth
Sires	Vargas	

NOT VOTING—8

Blumenauer	Jeffries	Polis
Carney	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Herrera Beutler	Meeks	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1742

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1507

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1507, a bill originally introduced by Representative MARKEY of Massachusetts, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 349

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—Mr. Yarmuth.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1745

WATER FOR THE WORLD

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in developing countries, access to clean water isn't as easy as walking over to the kitchen faucet.

Communities suffer and die from diseases they contract from bad water. And in their search for life's basic need, they put themselves in harm's way.

In Third World countries, women walk miles to wells to find clean water; but some wells are controlled by criminals who brutally assault these innocent women right in front of their own kids. And then they must then buy the water.

We have the ability to help these countries that don't have access to clean water. We can help them dig wells, for example. That's why Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER and I have introduced the Water for the World Act. This bill uses existing taxpayer money more effectively by making water available and a priority in Third World countries.

I'd like to thank Congressman BLUMENAUER for his relentless efforts, and the groups who advocate for Water for the World.

No one on Earth should be assaulted just to obtain clean water on a daily basis.

And that's just the way it is.

CUTS TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to point out the near-universal condemnation that the majority's wrong-headed plan to cut $40 billion from food stamps has received from advocates, researchers, and American families.

The Center for Budget and Policy Priorities has noted how 170,000 veterans could lose access to food aid because of this act.

The National Education Association said this plan will ''result in more than 210,000 children losing access to nutritious meals, which help children be more attentive in class.''

AARP condemns this bill saying ''hungry children, seniors and families cannot and should not have to wait on the economic and political sidelines for access to an effective nutrition safety net.''

Homeless organizations have said this act will ''worsen the lives of up to 4 million Americans who are either homeless already or whose risk of homelessness would become even more severe.''

The Catholic Bishops have said this bill will ''harm hungry children, poor families, vulnerable citizens, seniors and workers who are underemployed and unable to find employment.''

The list of opposition to tomorrow's bill goes on, even from Republican leaders like Senator Bob Dole.

I urge all members of conscience in the majority to join with us tomorrow to vote down this cruel legislation.

WE MUST REFORM ENTITLEMENT PROGRAMS TO SAVE THEM

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office informed us again yesterday what we already know about our job here in Congress, which is that we must reform entitlement programs in order to save them.

We must save them so we can save ourselves from this unsustainable debt and deficit which faces us; and further, that if we are to do it by raising taxes, it will erode the economic recovery that we're already just beginning to have.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Senate Democrats to adopt the House Republican budget which will balance in 10 years, which will address our unsustainable debt and deficit, and put us on the road to recovery.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, because of the proposed sequestration cuts, the Air Force is considering the complete retirement of entire fleets of aircraft, including the A–10 Warthog. The A–10 is unsurpassed in its ability to provide close-air combat support for our troops on the ground.

In Iraq and Afghanistan, the A–10 performed one-third of the combat sorties. One Army commander told me that whenever he heard the Warthogs overhead, he knew that their day was going to get better.

The A–10 is a multi-role plane that assists in combat search-and-rescue operations, escorting helicopters through the toughest combat zones. Its wings and electronics package have been completely refitted so that its mission can continue for at least another 15 years.

Sequestration is a disgrace. I never supported it, and I implore my colleagues to work with me to end it. Our national security and the protection of our servicemembers in combat areas must be paramount as we fund the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop the irresponsible sequestration cuts and keep the A–10 flying.

BENGHAZI ATTACK INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, Under Secretary Kennedy made this statement at the House Foreign Affairs Committee meeting today:

The Department has demonstrated an unprecedented degree of cooperation and engagement with the Congress on these issues,

especially following the attack in Benghazi. To date, the Department has provided to the Congress the classified ARB report and more than 25,000 pages of documents.

Secretary Kerry, testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in April, also pledged coordination with the Benghazi investigation when he stated:

I'm determined that this will be as accountable and open State Department as it has been in the past and we will continue to provide answers.

So the question I have for each of them is this: Why do I have to hold in my hands a handwritten transcript of an email?

Why is it that congressional investigators must hand-copy them under supervision from the other side, so to speak?

Why can't we get the documents and copy themselves?

Why must we subpoena everything?

And why are they not in compliance with any of the subpoenas?

PROPOSED SNAP CUTS

(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, more than 30,000 families in New York's capital region rely on SNAP benefits to put dinner on the table every night. Nationally, about 87 percent of families on food stamps include a child, a senior citizen, or a disabled person. These members of the American family are hungry. They are not criminals.

Yet House Republicans are trying to cut $40 billion from this critical program, 10 times the amount the Senate has proposed, without first looking at closing tax loopholes for major corporations or cutting subsidies to profit rich oil companies.

These benefits are not luxuries, Mr. Speaker. These are basic, sustainable meals that will keep our unemployed and underemployed nourished until they find a job that lets them support themselves and their families on their own.

If House Republicans truly want to reduce food stamp rolls and decrease how much our Nation spends on the SNAP program, then they need to join the Democrats and get serious about creating quality, well-paying jobs instead of trying to balance the budget on the backs of our country's most vulnerable.

HONORING THE LIVING CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to be here today. It is an honor for me, as a new Member of Congress, to sit here on the floor of the House with my colleagues to actually honor all of our living Congressional Medal of Honor recipients.

I'm proud to work with my colleague, TULSI GABBARD, from the great State of Hawaii, in a bipartisan way to make sure that these heroes that protected our freedoms, that have protected our ability to stand here and debate the issues that we debate every single day, are honored by their heroism and by their fight for this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we're going to begin this process through the 1-minutes, but we're also going to have an hour and a half of a Special Order that's going to be a bipartisan, unprecedented Special Order to honor these American heroes. And I stand here today to say thank you to each and every one of them.

RECOGNITION OF IMMIGRATION REFORM, CONSTITUTION DAY, CITIZENSHIP DAY, AND CONSTITUTION WEEK

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my colleague, Congressman CÁRDENAS, for bringing everyone together to support immigration reform and in recognition of Constitution Day, Citizenship Day, and Constitution Week.

From Angel Island to Ellis Island, from our northern to southern borders, from the fertile earth of Steinbeck country, to innovation's epicenter of Silicon Valley, immigration issues and immigrants have touched every corner and facet of our Nation.

As the Representative of California's 17th District, I have witnessed how this immigrant spirit is the entrepreneur's spirit. In fact, 40 percent of the largest U.S. companies have been founded by immigrants or their children.

In Silicon Valley, between 1995 and 2005, more than half of all the major technology and engineering firms were founded by an immigrant.

People come to our shores with different dreams, aspirations, and needs. We must support stronger provisions for those guest workers who toil the earth and harvest food for our dinner tables. We must support students who come to this country seeking top education and then allow them to kindle their entrepreneurial spark into our economy.

We must support high-skilled immigrants, as well as their families, who will strengthen our talented workforce. We must never turn our backs on our married children and siblings just because they are above a certain age.

HONORING COLONEL WESLEY LEE FOX

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I join with my colleagues to honor those recipients of the Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Wesley Lee Fox of the United States Marine Corps. Colonel Fox currently resides in Blacksburg, Virginia.

Colonel Fox was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty in the Republic of Vietnam.

Colonel Fox's company came under intense fire from a large, well-concealed enemy force. Colonel Fox was wounded, along with the other members of the command group. Colonel Fox personally neutralized one enemy position and calmly ordered an assault against the hostile emplacements.

Colonel Fox refused medical attention so he could establish a defensive posture and supervise the preparation of casualties for medical evacuation. His indomitable courage, inspiring initiative, and unwavering devotion to duty in the face of grave personal danger inspired his marines to such aggressive action that they overcame all enemy resistance and destroyed a large bunker complex.

It is for his outstanding heroism and leadership that I am proud and honored to remember the actions of Colonel Wesley L. Fox.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT ALLAN JAY KELLOGG, JR.

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I'm so proud to stand here today to join Congressman RODNEY DAVIS from Illinois and the rest of my colleagues as we honor the 79 living Medal of Honor recipients, which include U.S. Marine Corps Staff Sergeant Allan Jay Kellogg, who's lived in Hawaii for more than 25 years, and who calls my hometown of Kailua his home as well.

Under the leadership of Sergeant Kellogg, a small unit from Company G was evacuating a fallen comrade when the unit came under enemy fire from the surrounding jungle. What he did is the stuff of legend.

After an enemy soldier hurled a hand grenade at the marines, Sergeant Kellogg quickly forced the grenade into the mud, threw himself over the grenade, and absorbed the full effects of its detonation with his body, saving his unit. Although suffering multiple injuries to his chest and his right shoulder, Sergeant Kellogg continued to direct his men until all reached safety.

It's for his unwavering devotion to duty and his continued service to our country that I'm so proud to honor and remember the actions of Staff Sergeant Allan Jay Kellogg, Jr. here today.

□ 1800

HONORING COLONEL OLA LEE MIZE

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic actions of Congressional Medal of Honor recipient Ola Lee Mize of Gadsden, Alabama, who resides in the Fourth Congressional District, which I'm honored to represent.

Colonel Mize was with the 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for outstanding courage in action on June 10 and 11, 1953, in Korea. His company was responsible for the defense of a vital position that was attacked by a well-organized enemy force. Colonel Mize charged through an intense barrage of fire to rescue a friend who had fallen. Following the successful rescue, Colonel Mize returned to his post and dug in. Although under duress, Colonel Mize held the line, fighting to keep his men safe. Colonel Mize protected his fellow soldiers, called in artillery support, and led a successful counterattack.

It is for his unflinching courage and valor that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Ola Lee Mize. The Fourth District of Alabama, the State of Alabama, and the United States Congress is very honored to recognize the work that he did in Korea.

HONORING COLONEL ROBERT JOSEPH MODRZEJEWSKI AND COLONEL JAY VARGAS

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to honor the heroic efforts in Vietnam of two veterans of the United States Marine Corps who today call San Diego their home: Colonel Robert Joseph Modrzejewski and Colonel Jay Vargas.

Colonel Modrzejewski was the commanding officer of Company K and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action in Vietnam. Though wounded, he refused to allow his men to be overrun during an attack on a well-fortified enemy in a superior position. Though they sustained many casualties, Colonel Modrzejewski and his men were successful in repelling the enemy.

Colonel Vargas served as commanding officer of Company G and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his extraordinary heroism in action. Although wounded, Colonel Vargas led his men in an emboldened attack on heavily defended enemy forces. On the second day, Colonel Vargas saw his battalion commander go down and, after advancing to his position, carried him to safety.

For their unparalleled heroism and gallantry in action, exemplifying the spirit of the Marine Corps, I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Modrzejewski and Colonel Vargas.

HONORING SERGEANT DAKOTA L. MEYER

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Marine Sergeant Dakota L. Meyer.

Sergeant Meyer was a scout sniper with the 3rd Marines and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on September 8, 2009, in Afghanistan. While maintaining security at a patrol rally point, an element of Sergeant Meyer's team was moving on foot through a village. When they were ambushed, Sergeant Meyer and a fellow marine raced to provide additional support for the ambushed squad.

Despite concentrated enemy assaults, Meyer made two trips into the ambush area to evacuate two-dozen Afghan soldiers. He was then wounded by gunfire. After that, he made additional trips into the ambush area to recover additional wounded soldiers, and provided fire to help the remaining U.S. and Afghan soldiers fight their way out of the ambush. For his heroic efforts, Dakota L. Meyer was awarded the Medal of Honor on September 8, 2009.

When Douglas MacArthur gave his farewell speech to West Point, it was entitled, ''Duty, Honor, Country.'' I think those three words reflect the efforts of Dakota L. Meyer and his entire team.

Today, I pay tribute to Dakota L. Meyer of the First Congressional District of Kentucky.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT TY MICHAEL CARTER

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, four of the 79 living Congressional Medal of Honor recipients live in the congressional district that I have the great honor to represent. I will speak on three tonight.

I rise first to honor the incredible courage and outstanding heroism of Staff Sergeant Ty Michael Carter of the United States Army—America's newest Congressional Medal of Honor recipient.

Staff Sergeant Carter was a cavalry scout with Bravo Troop and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme bravery in action on October 3, 2009, in Afghanistan. On the morning of October 3, Sergeant Carter's outpost came under heavy and intense fire from all sides. Staff Sergeant Carter charged to an exposed forward position and provided deadly suppressive fire into the oncoming enemy attack, stalling their advance. When a fellow soldier was critically wounded, Staff Sergeant Carter, though wounded as well, courageously charged again through the enemy onslaught to provide aid to his comrade. Sergeant Carter's heroic actions and tactical skill were central to beating back the enemy offensive and saving numerous lives.

It is for his incomprehensible courage that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Staff Sergeant Ty Michael Carter, a resident of Yelm, Washington.

HONORING COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR ROBERT MARTIN PATTERSON

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Command Sergeant Major Robert Martin Patterson of the United States Army.

Command Sergeant Major Patterson was a fire team leader of the 3rd Platoon, 17th Cavalry Regiment, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on May 6, 1968, in Vietnam. When the 3rd Platoon became pinned down by interlocking enemy fire and rocket-propelled grenades, Command Sergeant Major Patterson led two men in quickly silencing an enemy bunker with rifle and grenade assaults.

When Command Sergeant Major Patterson noticed the enemy engaging his men from hidden spider holes, he entered the complex and single-handedly conducted an assault on their position. In so doing, the sergeant major successfully destroyed five enemy bunkers, killing eight and capturing seven enemy weapons.

It is for his dauntless courage and heroism that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Command Sergeant Major Robert Martin Patterson.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ALFRED VELAZQUEZ RASCON

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Colonel Alfred Velazquez Rascon of the United States Army.

Lieutenant Rascon was a medic with the 173rd Airborne and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extraordinary courage in action on March 16, 1966, in Vietnam. The following is directly from his commendation:

> Disregarding heavy enemy fire, Lieutenant Colonel Rascon rushed to the aid of wounded machine gunners and placed himself as a shield between himself and the enemy. After saving two men, he entered the line of enemy fire to retrieve an abandoned machine-gun, allowing for suppressing fire while he treated the wounded. When the sergeant of the platoon went down with injuries, Lieutenant Colonel Rascon once again placed himself as a shield between the wounded man and the enemy. Although sustaining multiple wounds himself, Lieutenant Colonel Rascon refused to leave the field until the last had been treated.

Lieutenant Colonel Rascon came out of retirement and joined the United States Army Reserves and served this Nation in both Iraq and Afghanistan in our recent conflicts.

It is for his amazing valor and heroism that I am proud and humbled to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Colonel Alfred Velazquez Rascon.

HONORING SERGEANT ROBERT EMMETT O'MALLEY

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Marine Corps Sergeant Robert Emmett O'Malley of Goldthwaite, Texas.

Sergeant O'Malley was a squad leader with Company I, 3rd Marines, during the Vietnam War, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action on August 18, 1965.

Sergeant O'Malley's unit came under heavy enemy fire while conducting an amphibious assault on an enemy position during Operation Starlite. Disregarding his own safety, Sergeant O'Malley charged forward and killed eight enemy soldiers. Then he directed his men to fire on the enemy, with deadly effect. He also rallied his squad to help an adjacent Marine unit suffering heavy casualties.

Although he was wounded, Sergeant O'Malley refused to allow medics to treat him, insisting instead on helping evacuate wounded marines. After being wounded a third time, Sergeant O'Malley refused to yield the engagement until all of his men were accounted for.

It is for his valor, leadership, and courageous efforts on behalf of fellow marines that I am proud to represent Sergeant Robert Emmett O'Malley of the 11th Congressional District of Texas.

HONORING CAPTAIN PAUL WILLIAM BUCHA

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I'm thrilled tonight to join my colleagues in honoring these extraordinary men and women who have been awarded the Medal of Honor.

I rise today to honor the manifest bravery and courage of my constituent, Captain Paul William Bucha of the United States Army, Ridgefield, Connecticut.

Captain Bucha was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action during March 16–19, 1968, in Vietnam. For 3 days, on a mission to seek and destroy enemy positions, Captain Bucha led his 89-man unit through intense combat. On March 18, a North Vietnamese battalion with numerical superiority pinned down the forward units of his company. When Captain Bucha discovered the origins of the heaviest fire, he maneuvered into position and single-handedly eliminated the enemy position. Due to his exceptional leadership and guidance during the 3-day engagement, Captain Bucha's men held their position, refused to yield, and inflicted considerable casualties upon the superior enemy force.

It is for his extraordinary heroism and exemplary leadership that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Captain Paul William Bucha.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES MICHAEL SPRAYBERRY

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant Colonel James Michael Sprayberry of the United States Army.

Raised in Sylacauga, Alabama, he joined the Army in Montgomery, Alabama, in 1967. Lieutenant Sprayberry was just 21 years old and serving with the 1st Cavalry Division in Vietnam when, on April 25, 1968, he engaged in extraordinary acts of heroism for which he was awarded the Medal of Honor.

On that day, his company commander and many of his fellow soldiers were wounded and separated from the unit. When a daytime rescue attempt was deterred by entrenched enemy machine-gun fire, Lieutenant Colonel Sprayberry organized and led a nighttime patrol to eliminate the enemy fire and rescue his fellow surrounded soldiers.

When the patrol came under intense enemy machine-gun fire, he single-handedly conducted multiple attacks against multiple enemy machine-gun bunkers and eliminated them one by one with hand grenades. After destroying bunkers, he was able to direct the isolated men to safety. The operation was a resounding success and resulted in the safe return of many fellow soldiers.

It is for his conspicuous gallantry and indomitable spirit that I am proud to honor the actions of Lieutenant Colonel James Michael Sprayberry.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT HIROSHI H. MIYAMURA

(Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Staff Sergeant Hiroshi H. Miyamura of the United States Army, who called Gallup, New Mexico, home.

Sergeant Miyamura was with the 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme bravery in action from April 24–25, 1951, near Taejon-ni, Korea. Staff Sergeant Miyamura's company was holding a defensive position when a strong enemy force launched a surprise attack to overrun them. Understanding the severity of the situation, Staff Sergeant Miyamura hustled to the line and plunged into the oncoming enemy forces with his bayonet, killing 10 of the attackers.

During the second assault, he used his machine-gun, taking out the enemy. He insisted that his men pull back while he covered their withdrawal. While unloading on the enemy's advances, Staff Sergeant Miyamura killed at least 50 and provided a safe withdrawal of his unit.

It is for his heroism and distinguished service that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Staff Sergeant Hiroshi H. Miyamura.

HONORING CORPORAL RODOLFO PEREZ ''RUDY'' HERNANDEZ

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

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Corporal Rodolfo Perez ''Rudy'' Hernandez of the United States Army.

Corporal Hernandez was with Company G, 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for visible gallantry in action on May 31, 1951 in Korea. His platoon was in a defensive position on Hill 420 when it came under heavy attack by enemy forces. Although his comrades were forced to withdraw, Corporal Hernandez stood his ground. When his machine-gun jammed, he valiantly charged with rifle and bayonet straight into the attacking force and he was seriously injured by a grenade blast. Due to Corporal Hernandez's heroic charge, the enemy advance was stalled long enough for his unit to mount a counteroffensive and retake the hill.

It is for this extraordinary courage in action that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Corporal Rodolfo Perez Hernandez.

□ 1815

HONORING MAJOR FREDERICK EDGAR FERGUSON

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

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Major Frederick Edgar Ferguson of the United States Army. Major Ferguson served in the 1st Cavalry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme gallantry in action on January 31, 1968, in the Republic of Vietnam. Today he lives in Chandler, Arizona, in the district I have the honor of representing.

Major Ferguson was the commander of a helicopter monitoring an emergency call from wounded passengers of a downed helicopter under heavy attack. Without hesitation, Major Ferguson volunteered to respond to the call despite warnings to stay clear of the area.

Major Ferguson displayed superior flying skill by landing his aircraft under heavy fire. And although the helicopter sustained severe damage as the wounded men boarded, Major Ferguson flew his crippled aircraft to safety. That day, Major Ferguson saved the lives of five fellow servicemen with his brave and selfless act.

It is for his outstanding display of bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Major Frederick Edgar Ferguson.

Thank you, Major Ferguson.

HONORING SPECIALIST FOURTH CLASS FRANK A. HERDA

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

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Specialist Fourth Class Frank A. Herda of the United States Army.

Specialist Herda was with Company A, 506th Infantry Regiment of the 101st Airborne Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme bravery in action on January 29, 1968, in Vietnam.

When five enemy soldiers charged the position held by Specialist Herda and two fellow soldiers, one of the attacker's grenades landed amongst the men. Without hesitating, Specialist Herda threw himself on it, shielding the blast with his body. Specialist Herda's valiant and selfless actions saved the lives of his two comrades.

For his extraordinary bravery and commitment, I am proud today to honor and remember the actions of Specialist Frank A. Herda.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT SALVATORE AUGUSTINE GIUNTA

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Staff Sergeant Salvatore Augustine Giunta of the United States Army. Staff Sergeant Giunta was with the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on October 25, 2007, in Afghanistan.

Staff Sergeant Giunta and his team were ambushed by heavy enemy fire. After sprinting for cover and returning fire, Staff Sergeant Giunta raced to his wounded squad leader to assist him. While disregarding the withering enemy fire, Staff Sergeant Giunta continued to assist the wounded and link up with men separated from his unit.

When he observed two insurgents carrying away one of his men, this staff sergeant charged their position, killing one enemy and wounding the other. He then carried his comrade away from the exposed position and began to administer first aid before his squad caught up to provide security.

It is for his extreme heroism and valor that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Staff Sergeant Salvatore A. Giunta.

HONORING TECHNICAL SERGEANT CHARLES HENRY COOLIDGE

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Signal Mountain, Tennessee, resident Technical Sergeant Charles Henry Coolidge of the United States Army. Technical Sergeant Coolidge was with the 36th Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on October 24, 1944, near Belmont-sur-Buttant, France.

As Technical Sergeant Coolidge led a platoon to cover part of the 3rd Battalion, they ran into an enemy force and engaged in a fierce firefight. With no officer present, Technical Sergeant Coolidge assumed command of the new replacements and led his men through 3 days of hard fighting. Armed with a bazooka, he advanced within 25 yards of the tanks before it failed to function. Then, gathering as many hand grenades as he could, he inflicted heavy casualties upon the enemy.

It is for his superior leadership and bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Technical Sergeant Charles Henry Coolidge.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL LEO THORSNESS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell the story of a courageous Congressional Medal of Honor recipient living in Alabama's Fifth Congressional District.

Pilot Lieutenant Colonel Leo Thorsness was on a mission over North Vietnam when he lost his wingman. As the crew members parachuted to the ground, Colonel Thorsness destroyed a MIG–17 that was threatening their safety. Low on fuel, Colonel Thorsness went in search of a refueling tanker, but upon hearing that the downed men were again threatened—this time by four MIGs—he immediately returned to their aid. Low on fuel and perilously close to crashing himself, Colonel Thorsness attacked the four MIGs, damaging one, driving them away, and saving the downed men and their rescuers. Then he flew further afield to refuel, aiding another plane that needed the emergency fueling station.

Lieutenant Colonel Thorsness' extraordinary heroism, self-sacrifice, and personal bravery saved many lives, and our Nation is forever grateful for his service.

HONORING SPECIALIST FOURTH CLASS JOHN PHILIP BACA

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Specialist Fourth Class John Philip Baca of the United States Army.

Specialist Baca was a member of the 1st Cavalry Division, the ''First Team.'' His Medal of Honor was awarded for extraordinary bravery in action on February 10, 1970, in Vietnam. On that February day, a platoon from Specialist Baca's company came under enemy fire. Upon realizing his team could be of assistance, Specialist Baca jumped into action. He led his unit through enemy fire to a position within the patrol's defensive perimeter. But before they were able to attack, an enemy grenade was thrown directly into their unit. Specialist Baca covered the grenade with his helmet and fell on it, absorbing its blast. His quick action bravely saved eight of his fellow soldiers from death or serious injury.

It is for this brave act and his unwavering courage that I am proud to honor the actions of Specialist Fourth Class John Philip Baca.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT CLINTON ROMESHA

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of former Staff Sergeant Clinton Romesha of the United States Army. Staff Sergeant Romesha was with the 4th Infantry Division and awarded the Medal of Honor for his acts of gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his own life in Afghanistan on October 3, 2009.

Attacked by an estimated 300 Taliban fighters, Staff Sergeant Romesha moved uncovered to conduct a reconnaissance and seek reinforcements. Romesha took out one enemy machine gun team and was wounded attempting to take out the second. Despite his wounds he continued fighting and directed air support, resulting in the elimination of over 30 enemy fighters.

Clint, his wife Tamara, and their three children—Dessi, Gwen, and Colin—live in Minot, North Dakota, and are the pride of our State.

It is for his extraordinary heroism and resolute commitment to his fellow soldiers that I am proud to honor Staff Sergeant Clinton Romesha.

HONORING CORPORAL DUANE EDGAR DEWEY

(Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Corporal Duane Edgar Dewey of the United States Marine Corps. Corporal Dewey was with the First Marine Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on April 16, 1952, near Panmunjom, Korea.

While receiving medical attention for his own wounds after a fierce night attack by a numerically superior and aggressive enemy force, an enemy grenade landed close to the position of Corporal Dewey and his fellow soldiers. Disregarding his own safety and intense pain, Corporal Dewey pulled his corpsman to the ground, shouted a warning to other marines, and covered the grenade with his own body, absorbing the explosion and saving his comrades from possible injury or death.

It is for his indomitable heroism and consummate devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and to remember the actions of Corporal Duane Edgar Dewey.

FORT HOOD HEROES ACT

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a nice evening to be introducing what I have to say. This Roll Call of Heroes is inspiring to any and all Americans, including myself.

Yesterday I dropped into the hopper a bill entitled Fort Hood Heroes Act, H.R. 3111. This bill was introduced with 119 original cosponsors on a bipartisan basis.

This bill declares the shooting that took place at Fort Hood an act of terrorism that should have been prevented and that Nidal Hasan was an Islamic extremist. The bill would award Purple Hearts to the soldiers who were killed or wounded in the attack, and award the Secretary of Defense Medal of Freedom to civilians who were killed or wounded in the attack.

This bill would provide benefits to the victims of the attack who were killed or wounded and their families, deeming the killing or wounding to have occurred:

For soldiers, in a combat zone and at the hands of an enemy of the United States;

For civilian DOD employees, by hostile action while serving alongside the Armed Forces during a contingency operation and in a terrorist attack.

The possible benefits they will receive will be:

Combat-related special compensation;

Maximum coverage under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance;

Tax breaks after death in combat zone or terrorist attack;

Special pay for subjection to hostile fire or imminent danger;

Unearned portions of bonuses;

Combat-related injury rehabilitation pay; and

Meals at military treatment facilities.

HONORING MAJOR DREW DENNIS DIX

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Major Drew Dennis Dix of the United States Army who hails from the hometown of heroes, Pueblo, Colorado. Major Dix was a military adviser for the Army of the Republic of Vietnam and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on January 31, 1968.

Major Dix led a force to rescue trapped civilians from a city. When the rescue team entered the city, they were greeted with intense automatic rifle fire and machine gun fire from the Vietcong. Major Dix personally engaged and killed six Vietcong in a building where two civilians were trapped. The following day, Dix assembled a 20-man force to clear the Vietcong out of the city. The group captured 20 and attacked several who had entered the residence of the deputy province chief, successfully rescuing the official's wife and children.

It is for this indomitable heroism and supreme bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Major Drew Dennis Dix.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL RONALD ERIC RAY

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Colonel Ronald Eric Ray of the United States Army. Lieutenant Colonel Ray, who lives in Tarpon Springs, Florida, was a platoon leader in the 25th Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for profound bravery in action on June 19, 1969, in Vietnam.

When one of his patrol teams was ambushed, Lieutenant Colonel Ray set up a defensive perimeter while eliminating multiple Vietcong positions with grenades and rifle fire. Lieutenant Colonel Ray then began directing air and medical support into the area. When a grenade fell between two of his men, he threw himself upon it, shielding them from the blast, but sustaining multiple shrapnel wounds himself. Though wounded, Lieutenant Colonel Ray remained on the field and provided effective fire support until the last of his men were safely extracted.

It is for his courage and commitment to his men that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Colonel Ronald Eric Ray.

□ 1830

HONORING SPECIALIST FIFTH CLASS CLARENCE EUGENE SASSER

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Specialist Fifth Class Clarence Eugene Sasser of the United States Army.

A native Texan, from Rosharon, Specialist Fifth Class Clarence Sasser was with the 9th Infantry Division and received his Medal of Honor for actions of immense gallantry on January 10, 1968, in Vietnam.

While his company was making an air assault, they were surrounded at the landing zone and suffered 30 casualties in the first few minutes. In order to assist the wounded, Specialist Fifth Class Sasser ran through open fire several times. He ignored his own need for medical attention in order to provide care to his fellow men. When both of his legs were immobilized, Sergeant First Class Sasser dragged himself into a position to assist others and then encouraged soldiers to crawl to safety where he tended to their wounds until evacuation.

It is for his upholding of the highest military values that I am proud to honor the actions of Specialist Fifth Class Clarence Eugene Sasser.

I'm RANDY WEBER, and that's the way it is in America.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS ERNEST EDISON WEST

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Private First Class Ernest Edison West of the United States Army.

Private First Class West served with Company L, 25th Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action in Korea on October 12, 1952.

When Private First Class West's patrol was ambushed, he ordered his fellow men to withdraw while he braved enemy fire to reach and assist the patrol leader. In the evacuation process, he and his wounded leader came under intense enemy attack. Private First Class West used his body to shield the wounded officer and killed the attacking enemy. Although Private First Class West lost his eye and was seriously wounded, he returned again through intense fire to help evacuate more wounded soldiers.

Because of his valiant efforts and extraordinary military spirit, I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private First Class Ernest Edison West of Kentucky's Fourth District.

HONORING SPECIALIST MICHAEL JOHN FITZMAURICE

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

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a hero of our country and the State of South Dakota, Specialist Michael John Fitzmaurice, of the United States Army. Specialist Fitzmaurice, serving in the 3rd Platoon, Troop D, was awarded the Medal of Honor for his bravery in action on March 23, 1971, in Vietnam.

When three enemy explosive charges landed in their bunker, Specialist Fitzmaurice quickly removed two and smothered the other charge with his body and flak vest. Despite his injuries, he charged the enemy, engaging at times in hand-to-hand combat. Fitzmaurice refused medical evacuation and continued fighting.

It is because of his extraordinary bravery and devotion to duty that I am proud to honor the actions of Specialist Michael John Fitzmaurice today.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL CHARLES CHRIS HAGEMEISTER

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant Colonel Charles Chris Hagemeister of the United States Army.

Lieutenant Colonel Hagemeister was with the 1st Cavalry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on March 20, 1967, in Vietnam.

When Lieutenant Colonel Hagemeister's platoon came under attack, he disregarded his own safety and raced through deadly fire to provide aid to two of his wounded comrades. He then crawled forward to assist and encourage the platoon leader and other soldiers.

While under fire at close range, the lieutenant colonel took a rifle from a fallen soldier, killed a sniper, three advancing soldiers, and silenced an enemy machine gunner.

Unable to move the wounded, he again braved enemy fire and returned with help. Lieutenant Colonel Hagemeister then continued to administer aid and help remove his wounded brothers.

It is for his extraordinary bravery and selflessness that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Colonel Charles Chris Hagemeister.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS ARTHUR J. JACKSON

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

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Private First Class Arthur J. Jackson of the United States Marine Corps.

Private First Class Arthur J. Jackson was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Japan.

When Private First Class Arthur J. Jackson's platoon's left flank advance was held up by the fire of Japanese troops, Private First Class Jackson charged a large pillbox housing approximately 35 enemy soldiers. Pouring his automatic fire into the opening of the fixed installation to trap the occupying troops, he hurled white phosphorous grenades and explosive charges demolishing the pillbox and killing the enemies. He advanced two smaller positions and stormed one gun position after another until he succeeded in wiping out a total of 12 pillboxes and 50 Japanese soldiers. His gallant initiative and heroic conduct in the face of extreme peril reflect the highest credit upon Private Jackson and the U.S. Naval Service.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private First Class Arthur J. Jackson.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS DON J. JENKINS

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Medal of Honor recipient Don J. Jenkins of the United States Army for his brave service in Vietnam.

Under heavy crossfire, Don Jenkins maneuvered forward to an exposed position and began placing suppressive fire on the enemy. He exposed himself to extremely heavy fire when he repeatedly ran and crawled across open terrain to obtain resupplies of ammunition until he had exhausted all that was available for his machine gun. Displaying tremendous presence of mind, he then armed himself with two antitank weapons and, by himself, maneuvered through the rapid, hostile fire to within 20 meters of an enemy bunker to destroy that position. After moving back to the friendly defensive perimeter long enough to secure yet another weapon, a grenade launcher, Don Jenkins moved forward to a position providing no protection and resumed placing accurate fire on the enemy until his ammunition was again exhausted.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor the actions of Private First Class Don J. Jenkins of Morgantown, Kentucky. I have the great privilege of knowing him personally, and I'm proud to call him my friend.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT RICHARD A. PITTMAN

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Master Sergeant Richard Allan Pittman of the United States Marine Corps.

Master Sergeant Pittman was with Company I, 1st Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for consummate gallantry in action on July 24, 1966, in Vietnam.

When the company fell under intense enemy fire, Master Sergeant Pittman grabbed a machine gun and rushed toward the front to provide support. Through withering enemy fire, Master Sergeant Pittman rushed to the front of the patrol and eliminated multiple enemy positions. Master Sergeant Pittman then charged an additional 50 yards to retrieve three downed marines. In establishing a defensive position, he was able to engage and inflict heavy casualties upon an enemy force of 40 and successfully ward off their advance, saving the lives of many of the company's men.

It is for his bold fighting spirit and extreme devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Richard Allan Pittman.

HONORING SERGEANT ALLEN JAMES LYNCH

(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, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor a true American hero—Sergeant Allen James Lynch of Gurnee, Illinois.

Sergeant Lynch received the Medal of Honor for his brave actions in the Vietnam war where he risked his life to save three of his comrades.

On December 15, 1967, Lynch, serving as a radio-telephone operator for the United States Army, ran through open enemy fire to rescue three wounded soldiers. As the rest of the company withdrew, he stayed behind and single-handedly defended their position for 2 hours until reinforcements could be sent to evacuate them. Sergeant Lynch was just 22 years old at the time.

His meritorious actions extend far beyond his service in Vietnam. He continues to serve as a staunch advocate for disabled veterans and remains an inspiration to the community, often visiting with local schools and challenging students to be the next great leaders in America.

I commend his actions and his continued service to my community and to our country—a true inspiration.

I am proud to honor Sergeant Allen James Lynch and his outstanding courage.

HONORING MAJOR JAMES ALLEN TAYLOR

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

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Major James Allen Taylor of the United States Army. I have personally known Major Taylor in the north State for about a decade through personal involvement with veterans issues and events in the north State.

I also wish to extend my heartfelt thanks to my colleague, Representative JARED HUFFMAN, whose district Major Taylor actually resides in. Also, Major Taylor had been a constituent of mine for several years when I represented Trinity County.

Major Taylor was with the 1st Cavalry Regiment and awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action on July 11, 1969, in Vietnam.

His men were engaged in an attack on a fortified position when a cavalry assault vehicle was hit and all five crew members were wounded. Major Taylor extracted the wounded despite heavy enemy fire. When a second vehicle was hit, Major Taylor moved forward again to rescue the wounded. While evacuating the wounded, Major Taylor engaged the enemy, killing several. At the evacuation point, a final vehicle was hit. Again, Major Taylor assisted in removing the wounded men and ensured that all wounded were safely evacuated.

I've met and known Major Taylor for several years, and it is my privilege to call him a friend.

It is through his selfless spirit and service to his crew that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Major James Allen Taylor.

HONORING LIEUTENANT MICHAEL EDWIN THORNTON

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Michael Edwin Thornton of the United States Navy in Montgomery, Texas.

Lieutenant Thornton was a senior adviser to Vietnamese Navy SEAL patrols and was awarded his Medal of Honor for extreme bravery in action on March 6, 1976, in Vietnam.

Lieutenant Thornton and his team snuck behind enemy lines. At sunup, the team made contact with an enemy force and engaged in a furious firefight with the enemy, inflicting many casualties before withdrawing. When some of the men were cut off from the team, Lieutenant Thornton went back in, through enemy fire, to find the wounded men and carry them to safety. In killing several enemy combatants and hauling the wounded out, Lieutenant Thornton saved the life of his superior officer.

It is for his heroic spirit in service to our Nation that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Michael Edwin Thornton.

HONORING SPECIALIST FOURTH CLASS GARY G. WETZEL

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Specialist Fourth Class Gary George Wetzel of the United States Army.

Specialist Fourth Class Wetzel served in the 173rd Assault Helicopter Company and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his extreme heroism in action in Vietnam on January 8, 1968.

While going to the aid of his aircraft commander, Specialist Fourth Class Wetzel became critically wounded. Although his left arm was severed, Specialist Fourth Class Wetzel held his position and engaged the enemy. After eliminating three, he refused treatment and attempted to assist his aircraft commander. Due to the severity of his wounds, Specialist Fourth Class Wetzel lost consciousness. Once he regained consciousness, he persisted in his efforts to drag himself to the aid of his fellow crewman and assisted in bringing the commander to safety.

Because of his valiant efforts towards his fellow crewmen, I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Specialist Fourth Class Gary George Wetzel.

□ 1845

HONORING COLONEL JAMES FLEMING

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of a man from Manvel, Texas—an American hero, Colonel James Fleming of the United States Air Force.

Colonel Fleming was the pilot of a helicopter in the 20th Special Operations Squadron. He was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action on November 26, 1968, in Vietnam.

On that day, Colonel Fleming was ordered to rescue a six-man Special Forces patrol that was pinned down by enemy fighters. Already aware of one downed helicopter in the area, Colonel Fleming dropped his helicopter into the combat zone. Despite a failed first attempt and low fuel, Colonel Fleming did what every member of the U.S. military is trained to do—he left no man behind. He came back and hovered with an open cargo door while his helicopter was being raked by enemy fire. The six Green Berets jumped into his helicopter with the enemy 10 feet behind. Thanks to his heroic efforts, the six Green Berets made it out alive.

I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel James Fleming.

HONORING COLONEL WALTER JOSEPH MARM, JR.

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of United States Army Colonel Walter Joseph Marm, Jr., of Fremont, North Carolina.

Colonel Marm demonstrated indomitable courage and was awarded the Medal of Honor during a combat operation in Vietnam.

As his company was moving to relieve a surrounded friendly unit, he realized that his platoon was receiving intense fire from a concealed machine gun. He deliberately exposed himself to draw its fire. Colonel Marm charged 30 meters across open ground and hurled grenades into the enemy position. Although severely wounded, Colonel Marm continued the momentum of his assault on the position, and he killed the remainder of the enemy, breaking the enemy assault.

It is for his gallantry on the battlefield and his extraordinary bravery at the risk of his life that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Walter Joseph Marm, Jr.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL HAROLD ARTHUR FRITZ

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

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant Colonel Harold Arthur Fritz, who served in the United States Army and is a resident of the 18th District of Illinois.

Lieutenant Colonel Fritz served in Vietnam with the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extraordinary gallantry in action on January 11, 1969.

While in Vietnam, Lieutenant Colonel Fritz' armored unit was ambushed, and his vehicle took a direct hit. Despite being seriously wounded himself, he fearlessly ran from vehicle to vehicle, positioning, providing aid and resupplying his men. The enemy attackers charged twice, but under Lieutenant Colonel Fritz' leadership, the unit stood its ground. Following the second charge, he led a brazen counteroffensive, forcing the oncoming enemy to withdraw. With the unit free from attack, he selflessly made sure that all of his men were cared for before allowing his own wounds to be treated.

So I am honored to stand and to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Harold Arthur Fritz for his undaunted courage, extraordinary bravery and fearless leadership.

HONORING SPECIALIST FOURTH CLASS PETER C. LEMON

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Specialist Fourth Class Peter C. Lemon of the United States Army.

Specialist Fourth Class Peter C. Lemon was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

When the base came under heavy enemy attack, Sergeant Lemon engaged a numerically superior enemy with machine gun and rifle fire from his defensive position until both weapons malfunctioned. He then used hand grenades to fend off the intensified enemy attack launched in his direction. After eliminating all but one of the enemy soldiers in the immediate vicinity, he pursued and disposed of the remaining soldier in hand-to-hand combat. Lemon carried a more seriously wounded comrade to an aid station, and as he returned, was wounded a second time by enemy fire. Disregarding his personal injuries, he moved to his position through a hail of small arms and grenade fire. Sergeant Lemon immediately realized that the defensive sector was in danger of being overrun by the enemy, and he unhesitatingly assaulted the enemy soldiers by throwing hand grenades and engaging in hand-to-hand combat. He was wounded yet a third time, but his determined efforts successfully drove the enemy from the area.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Specialist Fourth Class Peter C. Lemon.

HONORING COLONEL DONALD E. BALLARD

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Colonel Donald Everett Ballard of the Kansas National Guard and formerly of the United States Navy.

Colonel Ballard, a Corpsman Second Class at the time, was with the 3rd Marine Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme fortitude and gallantry in action on May 16, 1968, in Vietnam.

Colonel Ballard's company was ambushed as they were evacuating a landing zone. Upon seeing wounded fellow marines, Colonel Ballard braved enemy fire to render medical assistance. As they prepared to move the wounded marines, an enemy soldier hurled a grenade that landed near the marines. After shouting a warning, Colonel Ballard threw himself upon the grenade to protect his fellow soldiers from the blast. When the grenade failed to detonate, Colonel Ballard continued his treatment and saved countless marines.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Donald Everett Ballard.

ROLL CALL OF HEROES

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is again an honor for me to be here today with my colleagues to honor the 79 living Congressional Medal of Honor recipients.

To continue what we started earlier, I'd like to yield to my colleague from the great State of Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

HONORING CAPTAIN HOWARD V. LEE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and friend for the recognition and for the opportunity to recognize Captain Howard V. Lee from Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Captain Lee was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

When Lee realized that the unit had suffered numerous casualties, depriving it of effective leadership, and being fully aware that the platoon was even then under more heavy attack by the enemy, Major Lee took seven men and proceeded by helicopter to reinforce the beleaguered platoon. Major Lee disembarked from the helicopter with two of his men, and braving withering enemy fire, led them into the perimeter, where he fearlessly moved from position to position, directing and encouraging the overtaxed troops. Although painfully wounded by fragments from an enemy grenade in several areas of his body, including his eye, Major Lee continued undauntedly throughout the night to direct the valiant defense, coordinate supporting fire and apprising higher headquarters of the plight of the platoon. The next morning, he collapsed from his wounds and was forced to relinquish command.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Captain Howard V. Lee. Semper Fi.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, my good friend Mr. SHIMKUS.

At this point, I would like to yield to my colleague from the 20th Congressional District of the great State of New York (Mr. TONKO).

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS FRANCIS SHERMAN CURREY

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlewoman from Hawaii for bringing us together in a bipartisan, spirited way to recognize the living Medal of Honor winners, who are much applauded and much recognized and deeply loved by this Nation.

I rise this evening to honor the heroic efforts of Sergeant First Class Francis Sherman Currey of the United States Army.

Sergeant Currey served with the 30th Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for acts of conspicuous gallantry on December 21, 1944, near Malmedy, Belgium.

While defending a strong point, Sergeant Currey's platoon was overrun by German tanks, leading to the withdrawal of his platoon. Sergeant Currey was able to obtain a bazooka despite taking heavy fire from enemy tanks and infantrymen just a short distance away. Pushing forward, Sergeant Currey eliminated one tank and cleared three German soldiers from a house. In discovering five trapped American soldiers, Sergeant Currey acquired several anti-tank grenades. In driving the tank men from their vehicles, he provided enough cover fire to free the five soldiers.

It is for his indomitable heroism and consummate devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Sergeant First Class Sherman Currey. I thank you for the opportunity to share with you this evening on behalf of this wonderful gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much for being here to honor a true hero.

I would like to now yield to my colleague from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN).

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS HECTOR ALBERT CAFFERATA, JR.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlelady from Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Private First Class Hector Albert Cafferata, Jr., of the United States Marine Corps.

Private Cafferata was awarded the Medal of Honor for his bravery in action in Korea on November 28, 1950, while serving with the famed 1st Marine Division.

As the only unwounded member of his squad, he singlehandedly engaged the enemy while under heavy fire from machine guns, mortars and grenades. For over 7 hours, he was able to successfully fend off wave after wave of enemy attacks until reinforcements could arrive. However, as reinforcements moved in, an enemy grenade landed in his trench. The private immediately grabbed the grenade and threw it from the trench before it detonated. Though wounded by the blast,

he saved the lives of many of his men serving with him that day.

It is for his supreme bravery and courageousness in carrying out his duties that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private First Class Hector Albert Cafferata, Jr.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my colleague from Florida.

I would like to now yield to my colleague Mr. HECK from Washington's 10th Congressional District.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS LEROY ARTHUR PETRY

Mr. HECK of Washington. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my expression of gratitude both to the gentleman from the State of Illinois and to the gentlelady from the State of Hawaii for the honor of participating in this.

I rise now to acknowledge the gallantry of a couple of more residents of Washington State's 10th Congressional District who are recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor. I've had the great privilege of meeting both of these gentlemen.

First, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Sergeant First Class Leroy Arthur Petry of the United States Army.

Sergeant First Class Petry was with the 75th Ranger Regiment and was awarded the Medal of Honor for exceptional bravery in action on May 26, 2008, in Afghanistan.

Though seriously wounded following an enemy attack, Sergeant First Class Petry was able to move himself and a companion to safety and communicate the situation to the rest of the squad. When another Ranger moved forward to assist them, a grenade fell between the men. Sergeant First Class Petry unhesitatingly sprang for it and attempted to throw it away. Although he saved the lives of the two men with him, the grenade exploded and seriously wounded Sergeant First Class Petry. Indeed, he lost a good part of his right arm, and his right hand is a prosthetic.

□ 1900

I've shaken that hand on multiple occasions, and I cannot explain the magic that it is among the warmest handshakes I've ever experienced.

It is for his extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty thought I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Sergeant First Class Leroy Arthur Petry, a resident of Steilacoom, Washington.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT WILBURN KIRBY ROSS

Mr. HECK of Washington. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Master Sergeant Wilburn Kirby Ross of the United States Army.

Master Sergeant Ross was with the 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on October 30, 1944, near Saint-Jacques, France.

After his company had attacked a German company, Master Sergeant Ross placed his machine gun in front of their line in order to absorb the initial impact of a counterattack. Master Sergeant Ross then fired with deadly effect on the assaulting force and repelled it. He continued to man his machine gun, holding off six more German attacks. Master Sergeant Ross killed 40 and wounded 10 of the enemy, broke the assault single-handedly, and forced the Germans to withdraw. Master Sergeant Ross remained at his post that night and the following day for a total of 36 hours.

In a coda to his story, he was a careerist in the United States Army and was inadvertently shipped to Korea after World War II, which was against Department of Defense policy. Not discovered until he was halfway to Korea, his commanding officer asked him what he was doing there. He said, Well, I can hardly swim back now, sir. On the very first day in Korea, Sergeant Ross was wounded again, for which he received the Purple Heart.

It is for his extraordinary bravery that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Wilburn Ross, a resident of Dupont, Washington.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my good friend from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

HONORING COLONEL JACK H. JACOBS

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor the military service record of Colonel Jack H. Jacobs of Far Hills, New Jersey.

Colonel Jacobs was awarded the U.S. Army's Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

Under intense heavy machine gun and mortar fire from a Viet Cong battalion, Colonel Jacobs called for and directed air strikes on the enemy positions to facilitate a renewed attack. Due to the intensity of the enemy fire and heavy casualties to the command group, including the company commander, the attack stopped.

Although wounded by mortar fragments, Colonel Jacobs assumed command of the allied company, ordered a withdrawal from the exposed position, and established a defensive perimeter. He returned under intense fire to evacuate a seriously wounded adviser to the safety of a wooded area where he administered lifesaving first aid. He then returned through heavy automatic weapons fire to evacuate the wounded company commander.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Jack H. Jacobs.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. LANCE.

Mr. Speaker, since the first Medal of Honor was given on March 25, 1863, only 3,461 men have also earned it. Today, as has been mentioned, only 79 living recipients remain.

In order to properly honor these heroes, as you know, we've invited our fellow Members of Congress in bipartisan fashion to come to the floor and speak on each one of the living recipients of this great Medal of Honor. But I'd first would like to personally thank my colleague, Congresswoman TULSI GABBARD, for joining me in this effort across the aisle. As a veteran and a current member of the Hawaii National Guard, Tulsi exemplifies the values and discipline of our armed services.

I would also like to recognize Garrett Anderson, my district staffer, who handles veteran issues and who was able to join me tonight for this special occasion. Garrett is a veteran of the Iraq war and has become a leader for all veterans and wounded warriors not only in his home community of Champaign-Urbana, but throughout our Nation.

Representative TULSI GABBARD and Garrett Anderson are not only role models to young folks across this great country, but to my own children as well. I'm honored to have their support tonight.

I now yield to my colleague, TULSI GABBARD.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I'm so proud personally to be able to join with my friend and colleague, Representative RODNEY DAVIS, as we lead this bipartisan Special Order to remember and to honor the extraordinary sacrifice and displays of true love of country that have been exemplified by the proud warriors who served in conflicts past and present.

President Kennedy once said:

> A Nation reveals itself not only by the men it produces, but also by the men it honors and the men it remembers.

I had the privilege last year as the reunion was held in Hawaii for these remaining living Medal of Honor recipients. We had a dinner on the bow of the Mighty Mo at Pearl Harbor, and it was so incredible and moving to be there in the presence of people I had read about, been inspired by, and been motivated by as a child but also throughout my time training when those days felt dark and you felt tired and you felt like maybe I just can't do this. It was these men who truly exemplified and gave us, as we were training, energy to move forward.

Each of these 79 living veterans has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest military decoration for valor in combat. As we stand here this evening, we represent our constituents and the sentiments and appreciation of a grateful Nation.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT ALLAN JAY KELLOGG, JR.

Ms. GABBARD. The select few, like Staff Sergeant Allan Jay Kellogg from my State of Hawaii, who also lives in my hometown of Kailua, consciously made the decision, at the point when it mattered most, to do an extraordinary thing: that if need be, they would give their lives for others. And what is so incredible about all of these men we have had the honor to meet is they are humble heroes who would do it in a heartbeat again if necessary.

They made tremendous sacrifices protecting our ideals and freedoms to keep our Nation safe. It's because of their sacrifice and their service that we can be here today to speak our minds—sometimes agreeing, sometimes disagreeing—where we can practice our faith, and pursue our dreams. That's the reason we gather today—Members of Congress from both parties and from across the country—to stand in awe of their sacrifice and to pay tribute to their heroic actions.

We also remember the parents and the community that raised these heroes, the families that stood behind them, the military that trained them, and their battle buddies, the men and women who served by their side.

I think I can safely say that I speak for all Americans when I say that we are incredibly grateful for what they have done for us and what they have done for our country. The courage they have shown, the example they have set for us is truly special. None of the words that we can say will ever be truly worthy of their sacrifice or their service, but we do our best to pay our tribute and express our gratitude.

HONORING SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUYE

Ms. GABBARD. While tonight we're honoring the remaining living veterans who have been recipients of the Medal of Honor, I would like to take a moment to remember a Medal of Honor recipient who is near and dear to my heart, to the State of Hawaii, to the country, and who is no longer with us.

Senator Daniel K. Inouye enlisted in the U.S. Army at age 17 just after the attack on Pearl Harbor. He served with E Company of the 442 Regimental Combat Team, made up entirely of Americans of Japanese ancestry at a time when our country was putting Japanese Americans in concentration camps. In 1945, Senator Inouye lost his arm and suffered multiple injuries as he charged a series of German machine gun nests on a hill in Italy. His selfless acts during this battle later earned him the Medal of Honor. Continuing his lifelong commitment of service to Hawaii and the Nation, Danny Inouye was Hawaii's very first Congressman and served in the Senate since 1963. Senator Inouye was a true servant leader and an American hero of the highest order, and he continues to be an inspiration to me and countless others around the world.

Congressman DAVIS and I now have the honor to be joined by some of our colleagues as we continue to honor these courageous heroes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Tulsi. It is an honor to be standing here with you in this great Chamber to honor our heroes.

I now yield to my good friend from the great State of Washington (Mr. KILMER).

HONORING SERGEANT JOHN HAWK

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative DAVIS and Representative GABBARD for organizing this important time.

It's my honor to stand on the floor and recognize the heroic actions of two distinguished recipients of the Medal of Honor that I have the pleasure of representing, John Hawk and Bruce Crandall.

Sergeant Hawk was with the 90th Infantry Division and awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry while serving in France during World War II and particularly for his actions on August 20, 1944.

While manning a light machine gun, Sergeant Hawk successfully pushed back the infantry forces with his machine gun fire. When an artillery shell knocked out his gun and wounded his thigh, Sergeant Hawk secured a bazooka and pursued the remaining tanks, forcing them into a wooded section. While organizing two machine gun squads and facing intense enemy fire and with tanks in close proximity, Sergeant Hawk repeatedly climbed to an exposed knoll in order to direct fire until two of the tanks were knocked out and the third was driven off. Even while suffering a painful wound, Sergeant Hawk continued to direct fire until the enemy surrendered.

He showed that day, like many of our soldiers do, fearless initiative and heroic conduct.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL BRUCE PERRY CRANDALL

Mr. KILMER. That heroism was also displayed by Lieutenant Colonel Bruce Perry Crandall of the United States Army. Assigned to A Company, 229th Assault Helicopter Battalion, Lieutenant Colonel Crandall was awarded the Medal of Honor for his actions in Vietnam.

On November 14, 1965, then-Major Crandall led the first major division operation of air mobile troops into Landing Zone X-Ray, bringing ammunition and supplies and evacuating the wounded. Flying more than 14 hours in a single day in unarmed helicopters, Major Crandall and his team rescued more than 70 wounded soldiers. Under the most extreme fire, his brave decision to land under fire instilled in the other pilots the will to continue and ensured that the ground forces would be resupplied.

It's for his indomitable heroism I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Colonel Bruce Crandall.

Let me just say in closing that our Nation is stronger for the service and sacrifices of these two distinguished Medal of Honor recipients, for all of the recipients of the Medal of Honor, and for all of those who serve our country.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you.

Now I yield to my colleague from the great State of California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

HONORING SERGEANT MAJOR JON R. CAVAIANI

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the courageous acts of Sergeant Major Jon R. Cavaiani. Sergeant Major Cavaiani earned his Medal of Honor during the war in Vietnam.

On the morning of June 4, 1971, Sergeant Major Cavaiani's camp came under intense enemy fire. Repeatedly exposing himself to that enemy fire in order to move about the perimeter, Cavaiani was able to direct the platoon's fire in a desperate fight for survival. When the platoon was called to be evacuated, Sergeant Major Cavaiani volunteered to remain on the ground and to direct the evacuation. The following morning, the enemy attack continued. Unable to slow down the assault, Sergeant Major Cavaiani ordered his platoon to escape while he stayed behind to provide cover fire, thus protecting the men of his platoon.

On behalf of a grateful Nation and a respectful and loving community, I'm proud to salute the heroism and recount the actions of Sergeant Major Jon R. Cavaiani of Columbia, California.

□ 1915

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

Right now I would like to yield to my good friend from the great State of Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

HONORING SERGEANT SAMMY L. DAVIS

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of a great Hoosier, Sergeant Sammy L. Davis of the United States Army. Sergeant Davis, then Private First Class Davis, distinguished himself while serving in a remote support base in Vietnam.

On November 18, 1967, Sergeant Davis' support base came under enemy mortar attack, and he was also threatened with a ground assault from across the river. Detecting a nearby enemy position, Sergeant Davis seized a machine gun and provided cover for his gun crew. But the enemy managed a direct hit. Ignoring warnings to seek cover, Sergeant Davis returned to the howitzer, which was burning furiously.

Although he was painfully injured by enemy mortar, Sergeant Davis relentlessly continued firing. Disregarding his injuries and his inability to swim, Sergeant Davis crossed the river on an air mattress, where he aided in returning three soldiers to the support base. Refusing medical attention for his own wounds, he joined another gun crew, firing at the enemy until they fled.

I am proud to honor and remember the extraordinary heroism of Sergeant Sammy L. Davis.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. MESSER.

I would like to now yield to my colleague from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

HONORING CLARENCE EUGENE SASSER

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleagues for allowing me to join you this evening in what I think is an enormously important tribute.

As I present this distinguished gentleman, this hero, I just want to make mention of my friend Clarence Eugene

Sasser, a Medal of Honor winner born September 12, 1947, who received his Medal of Honor for his actions in the Vietnam War. He's now passed, and I know that those who live recognize their fellow recipients for their heroism.

But we are honoring tonight those who live. And so it is my privilege to be able to salute Sergeant Major Kenneth E. Stumpf of Tomah, Wisconsin.

HONORING SERGEANT MAJOR KENNETH EDWARD STUMPF

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Sergeant Major Kenneth Edward Stumpf of the United States Army. Sergeant Major Stumpf was with Company C of the 25th Infantry Division and received the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action on April 25, 1967.

Might I just say, Mr. Speaker, we know that as our Vietnam vets came home, the response was not an American response. I'm grateful to be able to stand on the floor today to say that their valiant service evidenced by so many, and certainly through the honoring of this great Medal of Honor winner, now comes to the full attention of America where we will never, never welcome our soldiers home in any other manner than to say ''thank you.''

Sergeant Major Stumpf's company approached a village and encountered a well-fortified bunker complex. Three men were wounded in front of a hostile machine gun emplacement. Sergeant Major Stumpf and his squad successfully eliminated two bunker positions, but one still remained a serious threat.

Armed with hand grenades, Sergeant Major Stumpf ran through enemy fire, and as he reached the bunker, he pulled the pins on two grenades and directed them directly into it. With the bunkers eliminated, Sergeant Major Stumpf was able to rescue the three wounded servicemen.

It is for his fighting spirit and ultimate concern for the lives of his fellow soldiers that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Sergeant Major Kenneth Edward Stumpf. We will always remember the valiant efforts of our soldiers. Wars have agreement and disagreement, but no one, no one in America ever disagrees with the service, the sacrifice, the love, the valiant efforts of our men and women in the United States military.

Sergeant Major Kenneth Edward Stumpf, Medal of Honor winner, we salute you.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to the gentlelady from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now be in the process where Ms. GABBARD and I are going to read some of the remaining speeches in honor of some of our heroes who are living today. And I would first like to go through a few for my colleagues that are going to be submitted for the RECORD but are unable to be here tonight due to extenuating circumstances.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS GARY LEE LITTRELL

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. My good friend BILL YOUNG from Florida submitted for the RECORD a speech in honor of Sergeant First Class Littrell of Florida. He was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in the Republic of Vietnam on April 8, 1970.

Sergeant First Class Littrell was assigned to the United States Military Assistance Command, and he distinguished himself while serving as a light weapons infantry adviser with the 23rd battalion.

HONORING COLONEL ROGER HUGH CHARLES DONLON

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would also like to submit for the RECORD in honor of my colleague LYNN JENKINS from the State of Kansas, to honor Colonel Roger Hugh Charles Donlon of Leavenworth, Kansas, who was awarded the Medal of Honor in 1964 for distinguished service in Vietnam. While defending a U.S. military installation against an attack by hostile forces, Colonel Donlon directed the defense operations in the midst of an enemy barrage.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL PATRICK HENRY BRADY

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Also submitting for the RECORD on behalf of my colleague from Texas, LAMAR SMITH, we are going to honor Major General Patrick Henry Brady. Major General Brady was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme heroism on January 6, 1968, in Vietnam as a member of the 54th Medical Detachment. He rescued dozens of seriously wounded men from an enemy-held territory blanketed by fog and braved enemy fire to save his comrades.

HONORING PETTY OFFICER ROBERT INGRAM

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Also, on behalf of my colleague ANDER CRENSHAW from the great State of Florida, I would like to honor Petty Officer Robert Ingram from Jacksonville, Florida, for the valiant efforts of Hospital Corpsman Third Class Robert Ingram, who was in the United States Navy and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in the Republic of North Vietnam on March 28, 1966. He accompanied a point platoon as it engaged an outpost of a North Vietnamese battalion. As the fighting moved from a ridge to a rice paddy, the tree line exploded with a hail of bullets from 100 North Vietnamese regulars. In mere moments, the platoon ranks were decimated, but he proceeded to collect the ammunition from the dead and offered aid to the wounded.

I would also like to now yield to my colleague from the great State of Hawaii to honor some more of our heroes.

Ms. GABBARD. Thank you. Also, on behalf of two of my colleagues who unfortunately could not be here, I will honor their honorees.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT BRIAN THACKER

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of CHRIS VAN HOLLEN from the State of Maryland, I would like to honor First Lieutenant Brian Thacker of the United States Army. He was with the 92nd Field Artillery Regiment and received his Medal of Honor for actions on March 31, 1971, in Vietnam.

When his base was attacked, he assisted in its defense and remained in position when it became apparent that the evacuation of the base was necessary. He organized and directed the withdrawal of the remaining friendly forces with complete disregard for his personal safety. Lieutenant Thacker remained inside the perimeter alone to provide covering fire until all friendly forces had escaped. Due to his selfless acts, he remained trapped behind enemy lines for 8 days before he was finally rescued.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER FOUR HERSHEL WOODROW WILLIAMS

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, also on behalf of my colleague Congressman RAHALL from West Virginia, I, with great pleasure, rise to honor Hershel Woodrow Williams and his heroic efforts and service.

I had the honor of meeting Hershel last year when he and the other Medal of Honor recipients were in Hawaii and heard directly from him. Even as he sat in a wheelchair, his courageous and bold spirit was alive and well. And it was such an honor to meet him, I asked him for his autograph.

He was with the Third Marine Division when he was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry on February 23, 1945, on the island of Iwo Jima. Flanked by just four riflemen, time and again Corporal Williams advanced into the enemy defenses to set charges and wipe out enemy positions with a flamethrower. He brazenly charged pillboxes and enemy defenses to pave the way for his fellow soldiers. Truly, his ''unyielding determination and extraordinary heroism'' are legendary.

But Woody's devotion did not end there. Back home, upon returning to his family, he served as a civilian counselor and as a volunteer in his church, community, and with veterans' organizations. He continued to dedicate his life to repay those who gave all so that he and countless others could come home, resulting in a lifelong commitment to service.

For his valiant devotion to our Nation, I'm so proud to honor Chief Warrant Officer Four Hershel Woodrow Williams.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS THOMAS J. KINSMAN

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would like to now, Mr. Speaker, rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Private First Class Thomas J. Kinsman of the United States Army.

Private First Class Kinsman was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantly and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

As his company was proceeding up a narrow canal in armored troop carriers, it came under sudden and intense rocket attack, automatic weapons and small arms fire from a well-entrenched Vietcong force. The company immediately beached and began assaulting the enemy bunker complex. As they were moving through heavy enemy fire to effect a link-up, an enemy soldier in a concealed position hurled a grenade into their midst. Mr. Kinsman immediately alerted his comrades of the danger, then unhesitatingly threw himself on the grenade and blocked the explosion with his body. As a result of his courageous action, he received severe head and chest wounds.

Through his indomitable courage, complete disregard for his personal safety, and profound concern for his fellow soldiers, Private First Class Kinsman averted loss of life and injury to the other seven men of his element. It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private First Class Thomas J. Kinsman.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL JOE M. JACKSON

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Colonel Joe M. Jackson was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

Colonel Jackson volunteered to attempt the rescue of a three-man U.S. Air Force combat control team from the Special Forces camp at Kham Duc. Hostile forces had overrun the forward outpost and established gun positions on the airstrip. The camp was engulfed in flames, and ammunition dumps were continuously exploding and littering the runway with debris. To further complicate his landing, the weather was deteriorating rapidly, thereby permitting only one airstrike prior to his landing.

Although fully aware of the extreme danger and likely failure of such an attempt, Lieutenant Colonel Jackson elected to land his aircraft and attempt the rescue. Displaying superb airmanship and extraordinary heroism, he landed his aircraft near the point where the combat control team was reported to be hiding. Once that team was onboard, Colonel Jackson succeeded in getting airborne despite the hostile fire.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant General Joe M. Jackson.

HONORING CHAPLAIN ANGELO J. LITEKY

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Chaplain Angelo J. Liteky of the United States Army. Chaplain Liteky was awarded the Medal of Honor.

Chaplain Liteky was participating in a search and destroy operation when Company A came under intense fire from a battalion-size enemy force. Observing two wounded men, Chaplain Liteky moved to within 15 meters of an enemy machine gun position to reach them, placing himself between the enemy and the wounded men. Inspired by his courageous actions, the company rallied and began placing a heavy volume of fire upon the enemy's positions. In a magnificent display of courage and leadership, Chaplain Liteky began moving upright through the enemy fire, administering last rites to the dying and evacuating the wounded. Upon the unit's relief on the morning of December 7, 1967, it was discovered that, despite his painful wounds in the neck and foot, Chaplain Liteky had personally carried over 20 men to the landing zone for evacuation during the savage fighting. Through his indomitable inspiration and heroic actions, Chaplain Liteky saved the lives of a number of his comrades and enabled the company to repulse the enemy.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Chaplain Liteky. And for reasons unbeknownst to many of us, Chaplain Liteky has renounced his Medal of Honor, but still on this floor of the House deserves to be honored for the heroism that he demonstrated that day in 1967.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT NICHOLAS ORESKO

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Master Sergeant Nicholas Oresko was a platoon leader with the Company C, 94th Infantry Division of the United States Army and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his action on January 23, 1945, in Germany.

While Company C was conducting an attack, it came under heavy enemy fire from its flanks, pinning the unit down. Master Sergeant Oresko swiftly moved forward alone, engaging the first bunker at point blank range and eliminating the enemy. Despite being wounded by grenade shrapnel, he pushed forward and managed to eliminate a second bunker with a grenade and clearing the remaining enemy with rifle fire.

□ 1930

Although severely wounded, Master Sergeant Oresko refused to leave the field until the mission was complete. It's for his quick thinking, indomitable courage, and devotion to duty in this attack that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Nicholas Oresko.

HONORING SERGEANT EINAR H. INGMAN, JR.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit, for the RECORD, on behalf of my colleague from the great State of Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), in honor of the valiant efforts of Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr., of the United States Army.

Sergeant Ingman's company was pinned down by enemy fire that wounded all squad leaders and several other men. Then-Corporal Ingman assumed the command, reorganized and combined the two trapped squads, and proceeded to charge the enemy machine guns alone.

He took out one crew with a grenade before being hit by a second machine gun. Seriously injured, and with incredible courage and stamina, Corporal Ingman rose and killed the entire gun crew, using only his rifle, before falling unconscious from his wounds.

As a result of this singular action, the defense of the enemy was broken, his squad secured its objective, and more than 100 hostile troops abandoned their weapons and fled in disorganized retreat.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion that I'm proud to honor, on behalf of my good friend and colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), and remember the actions of Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr.

HONORING PRIVATE GEORGE TARO SAKATO

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Private George Taro Sakato served with the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, the most highly decorated unit in the United States Army's history to this day. He was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme gallantry on October 29, 1944, in France.

During a devastating assault by his platoon, Private Sakato killed five enemy soldiers and captured four. When his unit became pinned down by enemy fire, and without regard for that enemy fire surrounding him, Private Sakato charged forward and encouraged his squad to advance as well.

During the maneuver, Private Sakato's squad leader was killed. In taking charge, Private Sakato relentlessly pushed his men forward. Private Sakato and his unit were ultimately victorious in halting the enemy's attack. During this entire action, he managed to kill 12 enemy soldiers, while wounding two others.

It is for his gallant courage and fighting spirit that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private George Taro Sakato.

HONORING LIEUTENANT THOMAS ROLLAND NORRIS

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris of Hayden Lake, Idaho, on behalf my colleague from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR.)

Lieutenant Norris was a SEAL Advisor, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action from April 10 to April 13, 1972, in Vietnam.

During the 3-day period, Lieutenant Norris and a 5-man team established a Forward Operating Base deep within heavily-controlled enemy territory to conduct a rescue of several downed pilots. Although the first pilot was located and rescued on the evening of the first night, a second pilot was missing.

On the last day, Lieutenant Norris and one Vietnamese, dressed in fishermen disguises, traveled in a sampan up-river and located the last pilot. Lieutenant Norris and his companion were then able to safely return the pilot for medical care and evacuation.

It is for his outstanding display of leadership and courage that I am proud

to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris.

HONORING PRIVATE 1ST CLASS ROBERT ERNEST SIMANEK

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Private 1st Class Robert Ernest Simanek was serving in Company F, 2nd Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division, and received his Medal of Honor for his heroic actions in Korea on August 17, 1952.

When his unit came under attack by mortar and small arms fire, this private displayed an enormous level of commitment to his fellow troops by throwing himself on a grenade that was hurled in the midst of his unit. Although sustaining serious wounds, Private 1st Class Simanek's valiant action saved his fellow Marines from serious injury and death.

It is for his act of great personal valor and service to his country that I am so proud to honor the actions of Private 1st Class Robert Ernest Simanek.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend and colleague from the great State of South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL JAMES EVERETT LIVINGSTON

Mr. SANFORD. I thank both of you for what you're doing tonight.

Mr. Speaker, as we well know, there are many heroes from across this country. Most recently we've seen them here in the Capitol with the tragedy of the Naval Yard. But I think that you all are doing something very special by recognizing military heroes in their different acts of heroism and courage over the years.

I'd like to single out a resident from my home State of South Carolina, Major General James Everett Livingston. And his story's an interesting one, as are so many of the stories that you've read.

But back on May 2 of 1968, he found himself as a young captain in the most unenviable of positions, in that a Marine company had been, basically, partitioned and was separated, and he and other men courageously went in to basically extract that Marine company.

In the process, he was hit twice by grenade shrapnel, but he, himself, declined medical help until they were able to go in, extract those Marines, and get them out.

I think it's in keeping with the military tradition of never leaving a man or a woman behind, and it says a lot about his personal courage, that he would, again, keep in the fight, even after withstanding personal injury, until those Marines were, again, up, out and extracted.

And so with that, I would simply like to single out his 33 years in the Marines, single out his wife, Sara, and his daughters, Melissa and Kimberly, for what they know, which is they have a hero for a dad and, indeed, a recipient of the Medal of Honor.

Thank you again for what you all are doing.

HONORING LIEUTENANT JOSEPH R. KERREY

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Joseph Kerrey, of the United States Navy, was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in taking action against the enemy in Vietnam.

Kerrey led his SEAL team on a mission to capture important members of the enemy's area political cadre, known to be located on an island in the bay of Nha Trang.

Splitting his team into two elements, and coordinating both, Lieutenant Kerrey led his men in the treacherous downward descent to the enemy's camp. Just as they neared the end of their descent, intense enemy fire was directed at them, and Lieutenant Kerrey received massive injuries from a grenade which exploded at his feet and threw him backward onto the jagged rocks.

Utilizing his radioman, Lieutenant Kerrey called in the second element's fire support, which caught the confused Viet Cong in a devastating crossfire. Lieutenant Kerrey resolutely directed his men, despite his near unconscious state, until he was eventually evacuated by helicopter.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am so proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Joseph R. Kerrey.

HONORING COLONEL BERNARD FRANCIS FISHER

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from the great State of Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher of the United States Air Force and of Kuna, Idaho.

Colonel Fisher was with the 1st Air Commando Squadron, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his conspicuous gallantry on March 10, 1966, in the Republic of Vietnam.

A Special Forces camp was under attack, and hostile troops had positioned themselves between the airstrip and the camp. Colonel Fisher observed a fellow airman crash on the airstrip. In the belief that the pilot was injured and in danger of capture, Colonel Fisher decided to land and attempt a rescue. Directing his own cover, he landed and taxied the full length of the runway to rescue the pilot.

Colonel Fisher's aircraft was struck 19 times. In the face of fire, he applied power and took off at the overrun airstrip.

It is for the risking of his life above the call of duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher.

HONORING LIEUTENANT THOMAS G. KELLEY

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Thomas G. Kelley was awarded the Medal of Honor for his actions, and going above and beyond the call of duty, against the enemy in Vietnam.

Lieutenant Kelley was in charge of a column of eight river assault aircrafts which were extracting one company of U.S. Army infantry troops on the east bank of the Ong Muong Canal in Kien Hoa province when one of the armored troop carriers reported a mechanical failure of a loading ramp.

At approximately the same time, Viet Cong forces opened fire from the opposite bank of the canal. After issuing orders for the crippled troop carrier to raise its ramp manually and for the remaining boats to form a protective cordon around the disabled craft, Lieutenant Commander Kelley, realizing the extreme danger to his column and its inability to clear the ambush site until the crippled unit was repaired, boldly maneuvered the monitor in which he was embarked to the exposed side of the protective cordon, in direct line with the enemy's fire, and he ordered the monitor to commence firing.

Sustaining serious head wounds from the blast which hurled him to the deck of the monitor, Lieutenant Commander Kelley disregarded his severe injuries and attempted to continue directing the other boats.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Thomas G. Kelley.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT RONALD E. ROSSER

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my colleague from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) to honor the heroic efforts of Master Sergeant Ronald Eugene Rosser of the United States Army.

Master Sergeant Rosser was serving with the 2nd Infantry Division and received his Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on January 12, 1952, in Korea.

When Master Sergeant Rosser's platoon came under heavy enemy fire from two sides, he charged the enemy's positions, taking the hill, and killing seven. Master Sergeant Rosser then descended to rearm and retake the hill once more, while eliminating enemies along the way.

After he had taken the hill a third time, and killed at least 13, Master Sergeant Rosser helped retrieve the wounded men and make a successful withdrawal.

It is for his gallant actions and courageous and selfless devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Ronald Eugene Prosser.

HONORING CORPORAL TIBOR RUBIN AND 2ND LIEUTENANT WALTER DAVID EHLERS

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, it is on behalf of my colleague from California, ALAN LOWENTHAL, that I am proud to honor two of his constituents who've been recipients of this prestigious Medal of Honor.

The first is Corporal Tibor Rubin, who served in the United States Army with the 1st Cavalry Division and received his Medal of Honor for his actions on July 23, 1950, to April 20, 1953, in Korea.

While the regiment was withdrawing, Corporal Rubin singlehandedly held off

enemy charges, allowing the 8th Cavalry to complete its withdrawal. On October 30, a number of Chinese forces mounted an assault on Corporal Rubin's unit. He maintained his firing position until he had exhausted all of his ammunition.

Although inflicting heavy casualties on the enemy, Corporal Rubin was eventually captured. While in prison camp however, the Corporal continued his resistance and selflessness by caring for his sick comrades.

Also from Congressman LOWENTHAL's district is one of our heroes, 2nd Lieutenant Walter David Ehlers. He served with the 1st Infantry Division of the United States Army and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his service in France.

Second Lieutenant Ehlers was part of the second wave on D-day. When the first wave became pinned down, his unit was sent forward to assist. On June 9, he led his unit's attack against German forces and defeated several enemy machine gun nests.

The very next day his platoon came under heavy fire, and he singlehandedly diverted enemy fire so his fellow servicemen could withdraw. Despite being wounded, 2nd Lieutenant Ehlers carried another wounded rifleman to safety. Even after he was treated, he refused to be evacuated so that he could return to leading his squad.

It's for his display of indomitable courage that I'm so proud to honor and remember the actions of 2nd Lieutenant Walter David Ehlers.

HONORING TECHNICIAN 5TH GRADE ROBERT D. MAXWELL

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of my colleague from the great state of Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) to honor Technician 5th Grade Robert Dale Maxwell of the United States Army.

Technician 5th Grade Maxwell was in the 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action on September 7, 1944, in France.

Technician 5th Grade Maxwell and three others, armed only with .45 caliber sidearms, defended the battalion headquarters against an overwhelming onslaught by an enemy platoon. Despite withering enemy fire, Maxwell aggressively fought off the advancing enemy and inspired his fellow soldiers to continue. When an enemy hand grenade landed among the squad, Mr. Maxwell unhesitatingly hurled himself upon it, using his blanket and body to absorb the full force of the explosion. The act of incredible heroism permanently maimed Technician 5th Grade Maxwell but saved the lives of his comrades and enabled vital communications to continue during the withdrawal from the headquarters.

It is for his valiant efforts and relentless spirit that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Technician 5th Grade Robert Dale Maxwell.

HONORING CAPTAIN THOMAS J. HUDNER, JR.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Captain Thomas Jerome Hudner, Jr., served with the United States Navy's Fighter Squadron 32 and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his brave actions on December 4, 1950, in the air over Korea.

When Captain Hudner's wingman was shot from the air and crash-landed behind enemy lines, he courageously circled his comrade and attempted to fight off enemy advancing on his wingman's position. Upon noticing that his wingman was stuck in his burning plane, Captain Hudner crash-landed his own plane into the rough mountains and in close proximity to the enemy's position in an attempt to save his buddy. Captain Hudner ran to his wingman's position and attempted to free him from the burning wreckage. Unable to free him, Captain Hudner returned to his aircraft to call in a rescue helicopter and support personnel.

It is for his exceptionally valiant actions that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Captain Thomas Jerome Hudner, Jr.

□ 1945

HONORING SERGEANT GARY BURNELL BEIKIRCH

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the bravery and courage of Sergeant Gary Burnell Beikirch of the United States Army.

Sergeant Beikirch was with the 1st Special Forces and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme gallantry in action on April 1, 1970, in Vietnam. When an enemy force launched an attack, the allied defenders suffered a multitude of casualties. Without regard for his own well-being, Sergeant Beikirch sprinted from position to position to treat the wounded servicemen. Upon receiving notice that an American officer had been wounded and left exposed, Sergeant Beikirch charged through enemy fire and carried the officer to safety. Instead of allowing for his own wounds to be treated, Sergeant Beikirch continuously ran between the aid station and the field of battle to retrieve the wounded.

It is for his complete and utter devotion to the welfare of his fellow soldiers that I'm proud to honor the actions tonight of Sergeant Gary Burnell Beikirch.

HONORING LIEUTENANT GENERAL ROBERT FRANKLIN FOLEY

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant General Robert Franklin Foley served in the United States Army, where he received the Medal of Honor for leading his unit, Company A, 2nd Battalion, 27th Infantry 25th Division, on November 5, 1966, in the Republic of Vietnam. While moving to aid a besieged unit, Lieutenant General Foley's company clashed with a strong enemy defense post. Lieutenant General Foley, directing three platoons, was able to attend to the wounded soldiers while advancing them. Coming under intense fire, the Lieutenant General, alone, continued to advance until the wounded had been evacuated. Then, after being struck by a grenade himself, Lieutenant General Foley refused medical aid and led an assault to destroy three enemy positions.

It is for his outstanding leadership and selflessness that I'm so proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant General Robert Franklin Foley.

HONORING COLONEL HARVEY CURTISS BARNUM, JR.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the supreme heroism of Colonel Harvey Curtiss Barnum, Jr., of the United States Marine Corps. Colonel Barnum was with the 3rd Marine Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on December 18, 1965, in Vietnam.

Colonel Barnum's company became pinned down by enemy fire. Upon discovering the company commander and radio operator were seriously wounded, he took control of the radio and assumed command of the rifle company. Colonel Barnum began positioning the men into firing positions and began identifying targets to engage. Behind his leadership, the units maintained their composure in the face of extreme danger and potential disadvantage. Colonel Barnum took point and led the platoon on a successful counterattack, eliminating key positions, and evacuated the wounded.

It is for his extraordinary courage that I'm proud to stand here to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Harvey Curtiss Barnum, Jr.

HONORING COLONEL GORDON RAY ROBERTS

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Colonel Gordon Ray Roberts was a rifleman in the 101st Airborne Division and awarded the Medal of Honor for his service on July 11, 1969, in Vietnam.

Colonel Roberts' platoon was sent to provide assistance to a sister company. When his platoon became pinned down by heavy gun and grenade fire, Colonel Roberts, with utter disregard for his own well-being, charged forward beyond the perimeter and safety of his unit. Without fear or concern, Colonel Roberts eliminated four enemy positions and linked up with the imperiled company. He assisted with evacuating the wounded and supervised the withdrawal from the position before returning to his own unit.

It is for his gallant and selfless actions contributing directly to saving the lives of his fellow soldiers that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Gordon Ray Roberts.

HONORING LIEUTENANT JOHN JAMES MCGINTY, III

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant John James McGinty, III, of the United States Marine Corps, who is from Beaufort, South Carolina. He was with Company K and was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action on July 18, 1966, in Vietnam.

While providing rear security to guard the withdrawal of the battalion, Lieutenant McGinty's 32-man platoon came under heavy fire. During the barrage, two of McGinty's squads became

separated. Disregarding his own safety, McGinty ran through automatic weapons and mortar fire to convene with the separated squads. Upon arriving, he found 20 men wounded and the medical corpsman killed. He quickly reloaded ammunition for the wounded men and, though wounded, continued to encourage his troops and direct their fire. Through multiple close encounters, Lieutenant McGinty was able to adjust artillery and effectively fight off the enemy.

It is for his indomitable heroism and devotion to duty that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant John James McGinty, III.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to Ms. GABBARD for some closing comments.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, it has truly been a privilege and a high note of my service as a Member of Congress to be able to stand here with my friend and colleague, Congressman DAVIS, to be able to read the highlights of the courageous actions of heroes whose service has allowed us to be here today. This is a moment that I will never forget—a moment that I look forward to sharing with many of my battle buddies, my servicemembers back home.

It's a time for us to reflect. As we've heard through reading through these courageous actions, it's like reading through a storybook. These are the actions of heroes and legends that maybe we imagined as children. But we know that these are living heroes who not only put their lives on the line in the service of our country overseas, but have come home and continued that service. They have only accepted this Medal of Honor in a humble way, and we honor those who did not make it home.

I look forward to us in our work here in Congress to be able to live up to the standard that they have set and to honor their service and sacrifice as we do our best working in the people's House to serve our country.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this would not happen without great people helping to put this information together to honor these true heroes. I want to thank some folks who have worked with me: Nick Cozzo, Jordan Wellinghoff, Cathryn Ayers, Shontee Pant, Jenny Baldwin, Drew Collins, Frank Santana, and Osborne Crosby, among many others that I'm sure I'm going to forget to mention tonight.

Remember, this is an honor tonight. We are not Republicans. We are not Democrats. We are Americans coming together to honor in a bipartisan fashion 79 individuals who fought to protect the freedoms that we enjoy and to be able to stand here on this House floor in freedom and to be Americans and to govern.

It is with great pride that I was able to be joined tonight by my colleague, my friend, TULSI GABBARD, also a member of our military today. Thank you for your service, TULSI. Thank you for your service to your country here and your service as a member of the Hawaii National Guard.

It is with great privilege that I was honored to stand here tonight to recognize so many true American heroes. And it's a privilege that I will never forget throughout my career.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING COLONEL BERNARD F. FISHER

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher of the United States Air Force.

Colonel Fisher was with the 1st Air Commando Squadron and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his conspicuous gallantry on March 10, 1966 in the Republic of Vietnam.

A Special Forces camp was under attack and hostile troops had positioned themselves between the airstrip and the camp. Colonel Fisher observed a fellow airman crash on the airstrip. In the belief that the pilot was injured and in danger of capture, Colonel Fisher decided to land and attempt a rescue. Directing his own cover, he landed and taxied the full length of the runway to rescue the pilot. Colonel Fishers' aircraft was struck 19 times. In the face of fire, he applied power and took off at the overrun airstrip.

It is for the risking his life above the call of duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher.

HONORING LIEUTENANT THOMAS R. NORRIS

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris of the United States Navy.

Lieutenant Norris was a SEAL Advisor and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action from April 10 to April 13, 1972 in Vietnam.

During the three-day period, Lieutenant Norris and a 5-man team established a Forward Operating Base ("FOB") deep within heavily controlled enemy territory to conduct a rescue of several downed pilots. Although the first pilot was located and rescued on the evening of the first night, a second pilot was still missing. On the last day, Lieutenant Norris and one Vietnamese, dressed in fishermen disguises, travelled in a sampan up-river and located the last pilot. Lieutenant Norris and his companion were then able to safely return the pilot for medical care and evacuation.

It is for his outstanding display of leadership and courage that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT BRIAN THACKER

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of First Lieutenant Brian Thacker of the United States Army.

First Lieutenant Thacker was with the 92nd Field Artillery Regiment and received his Medal of Honor for actions of great gallantry on March 31, 1971 in Vietnam.

When First Lieutenant Thacker's base was attacked he assisted in its defense and remained in position when it became apparent that evacuation of the base was necessary. He organized and directed the withdrawal of the remaining friendly forces with complete disregard for his personal safety. First Lieutenant Thacker remained inside the perimeter alone to provide covering fire until all friendly forces had escaped. Due to his selfless acts, First Lieutenant Thacker remained trapped behind enemy lines for eight days before he was finally rescued.

It is for his valiant efforts and selfless spirit in service to our nation that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of First Lieutenant Brian Thacker.

HONORING CORPORAL TIBOR RUBIN

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Corporal Tibor Rubin of the United States Army.

Corporal Rubin was with the 1st Cavalry Division and received his Medal of Honor for extraordinary heroism in action from July 23, 1950 to April 20, 1953 in Korea.

While the Regiment was withdrawing, Corporal Rubin single-handedly held off enemy charges allowing the 8th Cavalry to complete its withdrawal. On October 30, 1950, a number of Chinese forces mounted an assault on Corporal Rubin's unit. Corporal Rubin maintained his firing position until he had exhausted all his ammunition. Although inflicting heavy casualties on the enemy, Corporal Rubin was eventually captured. While in a prison camp, however, the Corporal continued his resistance and selflessness by caring for his sick comrades.

It is for his unyielding courage and bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Corporal Tibor "Ted" Rubin.

HONORING TECHNICIAN FIFTH GRADE ROBERT D. MAXWELL

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Technician Fifth Grade Robert Dale Maxwell of the United States Army.

Technician 5th Grade Maxwell was in 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action on September 7, 1944 near Besancon, France.

Technician 5th Grade Maxwell and 3 others, armed only with .45 caliber side arms, defended the battalion headquarters against an overwhelming onslaught by an enemy platoon. Despite withering enemy fire Maxwell aggressively fought off the advancing enemy and inspired his fellow soldiers to continue. When an enemy hand grenade landed among the squad, Technician 5th Grade Maxwell unhesitatingly hurled himself upon it, using his blanket and body to absorb the full force of the explosion. The act of incredible heroism permanently maimed Technician 5th Grade Maxwell, but saved the lives of his comrades and enabled vital communications to continue during the withdrawal from the headquarters.

It is for his valiant efforts and relentless spirit that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Technician Fifth Grade Robert Dale Maxwell.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS GARY LEE LITTRELL

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, comprised solely of Medal of Honor recipients. During this week, the recipients will assemble to honor and remember all who have served our country and to further the brotherhood among one another. This year, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania has been chosen as the site for the convention and Sergeant First Class Litterell of the United States Army and his valiant efforts will be recognized and he will be the featured hero of this year's convention.

Sergeant First Class Littrell was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in Kontum province, Republic of Vietnam, on 4–8 April 1970. Sergeant First Class Littrell was assigned to the United States Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, and Advisory

Team 21. He distinguished himself while serving as a Light Weapons Infantry Advisor with the 23d Battalion, 2d Ranger Group, Republic of Vietnam Army, near Dak Seang. After establishing a defensive perimeter on a hill on April 4, the battalion he was assigned was subjected to an intense enemy mortar attack which killed the Vietnamese commander, one advisor, and seriously wounded all the advisors except Sergeant First Class Littrell. During the ensuing four days, Sergeant First Class Littrell exhibited near superhuman endurance as he single-handedly bolstered the besieged battalion. Repeatedly abandoning positions of relative safety, he directed artillery and air support by day and marked the unit's location by night, despite the heavy, concentrated enemy fire. His dauntless will instilled in the men of the 23rd Battalion a deep desire to resist. Assault after assault was repulsed as the battalion responded to the extraordinary leadership and personal example exhibited by Sergeant First Class Littrell as he continuously moved to those points most seriously threatened by the enemy, redistributed ammunition, strengthened faltering defenses, cared for the wounded and shouted encouragement to the Vietnamese in their own language. When the beleaguered battalion was finally ordered to withdraw, numerous ambushes were encountered. Sergeant First Class Littrell repeatedly prevented widespread disorder by directing air strikes to within 50 meters of their position. Through his indomitable courage and complete disregard for his safety, he averted excessive loss of life and injury to the members of the battalion. The sustained extraordinary courage and selflessness displayed by Sergeant First Class Littrell over an extended period of time were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit on him and the U.S. Army. It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remind our fellow Americans of the actions of Sergeant First Class Littrell.

HONORING SECOND LIEUTENANT WALTER D. EHLERS

Mr. LOWNETHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Second Lieutenant Walter David Ehlers of the United States Army.

Second Lieutenant Ehlers was with the 1st Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action near Goville, France.

Second Lieutenant Ehlers was of part of the second wave on D-Day. When the first wave became pinned down, his unit was sent forward to assist. On June 9th he led his unit's attack against German forces and defeated several enemy machinegun nests. The next day, his platoon came under heavy fire and he singlehandedly diverted enemy fire so his fellow servicemen could withdrawal. Despite being wounded, Second Lieutenant Ehlers carried another wounded rifleman to safety. After treatment, he refused to be evacuated and returned to leading his squad.

It is for his display of indomitable courage that I am proud to honor and remember the action of Second Lieutenant Walter David Ehlers.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER FOUR HERSHEL WOODROW WILLIAMS

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Hershel Woodrow Williams and his heroic efforts and continued selfless service to his fellow veterans.

Corporal Williams was with the 3rd Marine Division when he was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on February 23, 1945, on the island of Iwo Jima. Flanked by only four riflemen, time and again, Corporal Williams advanced into the enemy defenses to set charges and wipe out enemy positions with a flamethrower. He brazenly charged pillboxes and enemy defenses to pave the way for his fellow soldiers. His ''unyielding determination and extraordinary heroism'' are legendary.

But Woody's devotion nor did he feel his duty ended there. Back home he served as a civilian counselor and as a volunteer in his church, community and with veterans' organizations. A lifetime dedicated to repay those who gave all so that he and countless others could come home; a lifelong commitment to assisting veterans, their spouses and children.

For all his valiant devotion to our Nation, I am proud to honor Chief Warrant Officer Four, Hershel Woodrow Williams.

HONORING SERGEANT EINAR H. INGMAN, JR.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr. of the United States Army.

Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr. was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Korea.

Members of Sergeant Ingman's company were pinned down by pinned down enemy fire that wounded all squad leaders and several other men. Then Cpl. Ingman assumed command, reorganized and combined the two trapped squads, and proceeded to charge the enemy machine guns alone. He took out one crew with a grenade before being hit by a second machine gun. Seriously injured, and with incredible courage and stamina, Cpl. Ingman rose and killed the entire gun crew using only his rifle before falling unconscious from his wounds. As a result of this singular action, the defense of the enemy was broken, his squad secured its objective, and more than 100 hostile troops abandoned their weapons and fled in disorganized retreat.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL PATRICK HENRY BRADY

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today we honor Major General Patrick Henry Brady of the United States Army.

Major General Brady was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme heroism on January 6, 1968, in the Republic of Vietnam as a member of the 54th Medical Detachment.

Major General Brady rescued dozens of seriously wounded men from an enemy-held territory blanketed by fog. He braved heavy enemy fire and risked his own life to save the lives of them. By the end of the day, Major General Brady had employed three different aircraft to evacuate 51 wounded men, most of whom would otherwise have perished.

It is for his unwavering courage that we are proud to honor and appreciate the actions of Major General Patrick Henry Brady, who lives in New Braunfels, Texas.

HONORING COLONEL ROGER HUGH CHARLES DONLON

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Roger Hugh Charles Donlon of the United States Army.

Colonel Donlon was with Army Special Forces Detachment A–726 and awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme gallantry in action on July 1964, in Vietnam.

While defending a U.S. military installation against an attack by hostile forces, Colonel Donlon directed the defense operations in the midst of an enemy barrage.

He marshaled his forces and ordered the removal of needed ammunition from a blazing building. He then dashed through small arms fire, detected the enemy and quickly dispatched them.

Colonel Donlon sustained a severe stomach wound and disregarded his own injury for the wellbeing of his men.

As daylight brought defeat to the enemy, Colonel Donlon reorganized his defenses and administered first aid to the wounded.

It is for his extreme display of bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Roger Hugh Charles Donlon.

HONORING PETTY OFFICER ROBERT R. INGRAM

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Hospital Corpsman Third Class Robert R. Ingram of the United States Navy.

Petty Officer Ingram was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in Republic of North Vietnam on 28 March 1966.

Petty Officer Ingram accompanied a point platoon as it engaged an outpost of a North Vietnamese battalion. As the fighting moved from a ridge to a rice paddy, the tree line exploded with a hail of bullets from 100 North Vietnamese regulars.

In mere moments, the platoon ranks were decimated. Oblivious to the dangers, Petty Officer Ingram crawled across the bullet-spattered terrain to reach a downed Marine.

Ingram was injured, but he proceeded to collect ammunition from the dead and offered aid to the wounded.

From 4 pm until just prior to sunset, Petty Officer Ingram pushed, pulled, cajoled, and doctored his Marines. Despite pain and the probability of his own death, Petty Officer Ingram's actions, initiative and dedication to duty saved many lives.

In 2001, I was honored to be able to dedicate the Medical clinic at our local Navy base in honor of his courage and unwavering devotion to duty.

In Jacksonville, he continues his work as a nurse and is considered a local hero. I am proud to recognize the bravery and heroism of Petty Officer Ingram.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT RONALD E. ROSSER

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Master Sergeant Ronald Eugene Rosser of the United States Army.

Master Sergeant Rosser was serving with the 2nd Infantry Division and received his Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on January 12, 1952 in Korea.

When Master Sergeant Rosser's platoon came under heavy enemy fire from two sides, he charged the enemy's positions, taking the hill, and killing 7. Master Sergeant Rosser then descended to rearm and retake the hill once more while eliminating enemies along the way. After he had taken the hill a third time and killed at least 13, Master Sergeant Rosser helped retrieve the wounded men and make a successful withdrawal.

It is for his gallant actions and courageous and selfless devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Ronald Eugene Rosser.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO COMMIT, THREATEN TO COMMIT, OR SUPPORT TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–63)

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2013.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 18, 2013.*

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY FOR COOPERATION REGARDING ATOMIC INFORMATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–64)

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, consistent with sections 123 and 144 b. of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153 and 2164(b)), the text of the Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information, including a technical annex and security annex (hereinafter collectively referred to as the ''ATOMAL Agreement''), as a proposed agreement for cooperation authorizing the exchange of U.S. Restricted Data and Formerly Restricted Data within the context of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) between the United States of America and the following member of NATO: the Republic of Croatia (hereinafter the ''New Party'').

In addition, I am pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party, with a copy of the memorandum of the Secretary of Defense with respect to the agreement. The ATOMAL Agreement entered into force on March 12, 1965, with respect to the United States and the other NATO members at that time. The Czech Republic, the Republic of Hungary, the Republic of Poland, Spain, the Republic of Bulgaria, the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Latvia, the Republic of Lithuania, Romania, the Slovak Republic, and the Republic of Slovenia subsequently became parties to the ATOMAL Agreement. The New Party has signed this agreement and has indicated its willingness to be bound by it. The ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party meets the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Although the ATOMAL Agreement continues in force with respect to the United States and the other current parties to it, it will not become effective as an agreement for cooperation authorizing the exchange of atomic information with respect to the New Party until completion of procedures prescribed by sections 123 and 144 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

For more than 40 years, the ATOMAL Agreement has served as the framework within which NATO and the other NATO members that have become parties to this agreement have received the information that is necessary to an understanding and knowledge of, and participation in, the political and strategic consensus upon which the collective military capacity of the Alliance depends. This agreement permits only the transfer of atomic information, not weapons, nuclear material, or equipment. Participation in the ATOMAL Agreement will give the New Party the same standing within the Alliance with regard to nuclear matters as that of the other current parties to the ATOMAL Agreement. This is important for the cohesiveness of the Alliance and will enhance its effectiveness.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the Department of Defense (DOD) and other interested agencies in reviewing the ATOMAL Agreement and have determined that its performance, including the proposed cooperation and the proposed communication of Restricted Data thereunder with respect to the New Party, will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party and authorized the DOD to cooperate with the New Party in the context of NATO upon satisfaction of the requirements of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

The 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 begins upon receipt of this submission.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 18, 2013.*

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to be here on the floor to speak to America and those around the world who watch and understand all that we try to do in this Congress. It gives me great pleasure and honor to speak tonight about a very important issue that faces America but is just as important to people from all over the world.

The United States of America is the country where dreams come true. It's not hard to see that citizenship is a cornerstone of that American Dream. We're a Nation of immigrants—and immigration remains one of the great strengths of our great Nation.

Yesterday, we celebrated Citizenship Day and were reminded of the important contributions immigrants have made to America—immigrants from all over the world.

As Congress continues to delay the passage of comprehensive immigration reform, we're again reminded that the inclusion of a pathway to citizenship is essential to ensuring that all immigrants are able to fully contribute to our economy, workforce, and to our communities.

One of the major reasons that we have so many undocumented workers in this great Nation is because our legal immigration system is broken. We should work as hard as possible to ensure that hardworking men and women who simply want to live the American Dream can do so—and that they can do so as American citizens.

What happens when immigrants are able to become citizens rather than just seeing their immigration status legalized? The answer is simple. We—all of us in America—will have a stronger and more integrated Nation, a stronger

economy, and stronger communities. The economic benefits of citizenship are undeniable. Research shows failure to include a path to citizenship would have significant economic costs in terms of lost opportunity for growth, earnings, tax revenues, and jobs for Americans.

Providing only legal status with no pathway to citizenship would result in $568 billion less in national productivity and $321 billion less in total income, 820,000 fewer total jobs would be created, and Federal and State governments would lose out on $75 billion in additional tax revenue, according to outside estimates.

□ 2000

Refusing immigrants the opportunity to become U.S. citizens hurts America. It hurts Americans as well. It hurts our economic interests as a country.

I want to fix our immigration system and to give those who are willing to work hard for this Nation and sacrifice of themselves an opportunity to do so as Americans. This is why I will continue to work with Democrats, Republicans, and anyone willing to listen to pass an immigration reform bill that is comprehensive and includes a path to citizenship.

At this time, I would like to take the opportunity to introduce Congressman STENY HOYER, the minority whip from Maryland. Maryland is one of the earliest States where immigrants landed. Even your State, Congressman HOYER, has a flag that represents those immigrants and their contributions to Maryland; correct?

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

He is absolutely correct, of course. The Maryland flag, which I think is one of the more distinctive State flags, has four quadrants, two of which represent the Baltimore family to which the Royal charter was given, as the gentleman observed, and two represent the Crossland family, which was the wife of Lord Baltimore. So I appreciate the gentleman referring to that. And of course all of us live in States that were started by immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my friend, Representative CÁRDENAS, and other distinguished Members who are here tonight to pay tribute to the immigrant heritage of our country.

''From her beacon hand glows worldwide welcome,'' wrote the poet Emma Lazarus. She went on with her poem to say:

> ''Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp,'' cries she with silent lips. ''Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to be free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shores. Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed, to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door.''

That iconic image we see so often is a symbol of America's welcome to those who would participate in making it better. But the poet was wrong. It was not the wretched refuse of the teeming shores that came to America. It was some of the most risk-taking, courageous, entrepreneurial people. It took courage to leave their land, to leave their language, and to come to America. But because they had ambition and vision and hope, they came. And they helped to build the greatest Nation the world has ever seen. Those words engraved on the Statue of Liberty are a creed of which our Nation must always keep faith.

For Americans, citizenship means more than belonging to a place. It represents a sacred bond not only between those who carry it, but a sacred duty to make sure others can earn it who share our devotion to liberty and justice for all. Yes, those immigrants, they believed that declaration intoning pursuit of happiness. What a wonderful concept that ''we hold these truths to be self-evident.'' Pursuit of happiness is one of those values that we hold forth to all the world.

You know, we hear a lot of talk, Mr. Speaker, on this floor and in our national discourse about what makes America exceptional, about what makes us unique and special among the nations of the world. The answer, I believe, is that we have brought together the best of all the nations of the world. Those who come seeking shelter on our shores do so because they want to work hard to succeed. They're willing to take the risk of leaving all that they know just for a chance to make it in America. That is why the Congress must pursue, Mr. Speaker, comprehensive immigration reform that includes a path to citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, 40 percent of all the Nobel Prize winners in America were born on foreign shores. They came here, contributed here, excelled here, and made our country better. Those who have come here to build a strong America—and those who were brought here as children and have known no other home—deserve a chance to keep contributing to this country through their hard work and their service to our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am the son of an immigrant, an immigrant from Denmark. Serving with me in this Chamber are the sons and daughters, grandsons and granddaughters, great-grandsons and great-granddaughters, and yes, even more generations before. Grandsons of immigrants from Mexico, from Italy, from China, from Africa, from Eastern Europe, from the Caribbean, from Asia—indeed, from every land in this world.

In marking Citizenship Day, which was yesterday, it is up to us to make sure that our exceptional American idea of citizenship continues to manifest itself as an extended hand to all who love freedom, are committed to justice, and wish to build a strong America for all its people. Comprehensive immigration reform will enable us, as it has in the past, to keep that hand extended and bring into our society and economy those who believe in the power of the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, let us work together, not as Democrats and Republicans, but as fellow immigrants. First, second, third, fourth, fifth, however many generations, we are the children of immigrants. Let us work together to fix our immigration system and ensure that the lamp beside the golden door continues to shine its light to enrich our Nation and continue to offer hope and inspiration for all the world.

I want to thank my colleague, TONY CÁRDENAS, from California. He is a new Member, but an extraordinarily experienced Member. He knows about immigration firsthand. I want to thank him for taking this Special Order because it is important for America to keep that lamp lifted. And to do so, Mr. Speaker, we need, as Mr. CÁRDENAS has said, to pass a comprehensive immigration bill. And, Mr. Speaker, we ought to pass it this year.

I thank the gentleman for taking the time. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman HOYER. I appreciate those eloquent words and also the fact that you pointed out that you are definitely a proud American, yet at the same time you are proud to say that you're the son of immigrants. That's a beautiful thing for us to welcome and embrace in this country. I hope and pray that we do, in fact, pass comprehensive immigration reform and pass it soon. So thank you so much for your leadership.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite to share a few words with all of us my colleague, MARC VEASEY, from the Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex area.

Congressman VEASEY, I know Texas is a State of proud patriots, and they must have been very proud when we read from the Constitution earlier this year at the beginning of our session. That document is the basis of a lot of what makes our country so appealing to those people from all over the world who want to come here and contribute to this great Nation; isn't it?

Mr. VEASEY. Absolutely.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Why don't you tell us a little bit about what being a citizen is like and what it means to you and the folks in your district, many of whom protect and defend our great Nation.

Mr. VEASEY. Congressman CÁRDENAS, I thank you very much for doing this. I would like to thank my friend from the Golden State of California for leading this important discussion. I'm also very proud that this is a very diverse group that is here today to talk about the importance of citizenship and diversity.

As it was pointed out a minute ago by STENY HOYER, our whip, he talked about his background and him being a first-generation American. So many of the contributions and so many of the things that make America what it is today is because of immigrants. This discussion is very important. And Congressman HOYER is right; we need to

pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill because it's the right thing to do.

When you talk about the growth and you look at the gross domestic product, U.S. personal income, I can tell you in my own personal State of Texas what immigrants mean to our vibrant economy. We have so many people that are moving to our State every day. And much of that success that we are experiencing in Texas, the Lone Star State, particularly in Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex, is because of immigrant growth.

This week we celebrate 226 years since the U.S. Constitutional Convention was signed into law. Since that time, America's Constitution has been seen as the backbone for the rights and freedoms of all U.S. citizens. The U.S. Constitution is the epitome of what it means to be an American citizen in our country. September 17, the day it was adopted, is a day to celebrate what this document means for those who have become or who aspire to be U.S. citizens.

Throughout our Nation's history, immigrants have embraced the spirit of liberty, justice, and equality for all. These were the same principles that guided the Framers of the Constitution as they built a stronger republic. The Founding Fathers felt that the people who immigrated and spent years building lives in this country deserved citizenship. We should have that same spirit today in this body.

They were keenly aware that making new immigrants wait a long time for citizenship denied them the very rights that Americans had just fought to claim for themselves. By guaranteeing a uniform rule of naturalization, the Constitution presupposes an immigrant nation. Let's join the Framers by pledging to support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America.

Each year during Citizenship Day, we recognize the newest members of the American family as they pledge allegiance to our Constitution in naturalization ceremonies across our great country. This week, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services will welcome over 18,000 new U.S. citizens during more than 180 naturalization ceremonies hailed across the country.

As thousands take their first step towards the American Dream, we must all recognize the obstacles that still exist for so many others who long to contribute to the next chapter of America's story. The steps toward becoming a citizen are riddled with difficult, confusing, and very expensive hurdles. In addition to the cost and bureaucracy, there are also some individuals in the community preying on immigrants, taking their money and telling them they are guaranteed citizenship.

Our national, economic, social, and cultural vibrancy are the direct result of labor and efforts of generations of immigrants. According to the Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration at the University of Southern California, income rises an average of 8 to 11 percent when immigrants become citizens.

Delaying and ignoring real problems in our broken immigration system for political purposes has not brought solutions; it has only brought heartache for the many families who wish to assimilate and make America stronger.

In the spirit of Citizenship Day, I stand with my colleagues to recognize the many benefits that immigrants bring to the United States of America.

Mrs. Velasquez-Acosta came to this country from El Salvador and became a naturalized U.S. citizen. Now her son Sam works in the office of a Member of the United States House of Representatives. In fact, he serves the constituents of the 33rd Congressional District in the congressional office that I represent. He is truly a living person that can tell you the benefits of immigration—he and his family.

I believe that there is a level of optimism because I see it in Sam and I see it in so many others who reside in the 33rd Congressional District, the level of optimism that immigrants have historically brought to this country and to our State. When you bring new people into the American family, you energize and get others involved.

□ 2015

We must focus on the urgency of helping the almost 9 million legal permanent residents who are eligible for citizenship in this country. We must help them take those final steps toward the American Dream so they can fully become a part of the Democratic process. That's what it's all about.

Today, we must rededicate ourselves to pass comprehensive immigration reform. This fair, commonsense system would include a pathway to citizenship for those here now, a family reunification system, and a market-based structure that meets legitimate labor needs, protecting both the interest of American workers and industry.

As a nation of immigrants, let us celebrate the long line of aspiring citizens who have had a positive impact on our history. Immigrants have enriched our character, contributed to our economy by founding businesses and creating jobs, and have sacrificed their livelihoods so that they could defend our freedoms and secure a brighter future for our children.

The men who signed our Constitution 226 years ago—226 years ago—envisioned the United States as a land of opportunity. Today, as legislators, we are charged with building on that same vision, and our Nation will be stronger for it.

I thank my friend from California for using this time to talk about something that is so important to our country. We can no longer wait. The time is now.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman VEASEY. Thank you for sharing those words with all of us.

Mr. Speaker, next I would like to introduce KYRSTEN SINEMA from Arizona. She knows what dreams are made of and what it takes to be a participant in making those dreams come true.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Mr. CÁRDENAS, for holding this event this evening. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, many others who will be speaking this evening will spend time talking about the numbers or the benefits of changing our immigration laws in our country.

I'm going to tell just one brief story about my district. When I was elected to Congress earlier this year, I was invited, as many Members of Congress are, to address and welcome newly sworn-in citizens. As the swearing-in ceremony was happening on a day that I was in Washington, a member of my team back in Phoenix joined that citizenship ceremony and spoke on my behalf.

After the event was over, I asked her how it went. It was her first time speaking publicly on behalf of our office, and I asked her what it was like. She answered by telling me about her experience.

The staffer who went to the citizenship ceremony on my behalf is a young woman named Erika Andiola. Erika Andiola is a Dreamer. She was born in Mexico and brought to this country as a young person. She went to junior high and high school in Phoenix, Arizona. She later went to Arizona State University and graduated with high honors. She now works for me in my office as an outreach director.

Erika spoke to the individuals who had just become citizens at the citizenship ceremony and welcomed them as new citizens to our country. What she said to me afterwards was that one day she hopes to sit in that citizenship ceremony herself and to become a citizen of these United States.

Mr. CÁRDENAS, members of the Ninth District, fellow citizens of this country, this is the reason we must get the immigration reform. Young people like Erika Andiola have lived in this United States for almost their entire lives and know no other country. While they watch others become citizens, they still dream for that day themselves.

Mr. CÁRDENAS, we must make that happen for Erika.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman SINEMA.

Next, I would like to invite to share a few words with all of us Congressman O'ROURKE from Texas.

Congressman, a lot of us have talked about citizenship and what it means when you raise your hand and swear allegiance to this country, and the many ways that immigrants have contributed to our great Nation. But for you I think it touches a little closer to home.

I've heard there's a new American citizen in your district who has made a major contribution to your congressional office. Can you share with us that story?

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am very honored to be here today to speak on the topic of immigration reform, immigration reform that is humane, that is rational, that is fiscally responsible, and to be doing so with the guidance and leadership of Congressman CÁRDENAS, my friend from California, who despite his short tenure in Congress has really emerged as a leader on this very important issue—important to me, important to the community I represent in El Paso, Texas, important to our State, and important to our country. Frankly, just to extend it one more time, important to the world, because I think the world's eyes are on us today, they're on us as we decide how we are going to respond to this opportunity, this once in a 20- or 30-year opportunity to make meaningful, positive changes in our broken immigration system, because as STENY HOYER said earlier, ''we are proudly a Nation of immigrants.''

I'm sure it is this way for the gentleman from California, but for me the moral and ethical reasons are the most compelling—to do the right thing for those people who are already in our communities, for the people who have so much to offer who have yet to come to our shores and will add to the economy, to the civic strength of our communities and make the places that we live in and the country that we call home a better place.

I think of Edgar Falcon, a constituent of mine, a U.S. citizen, who is working. While he's working, he's also going to nursing school to improve his life, his ability to compete in the marketplace, his opportunity to contribute back to the community that we live in.

To complete his life beyond his education and his work and everything that he has done in the community, he wants to marry the woman of his dreams, a woman named Maricruz, who currently lives in Durango, Mexico, who would love to be here with the man that she loves.

But unfortunately, because of our current broken immigration system, she's unable to live here in the United States with the man that she loves. He's unable to bring her here because when she was a child, her sister, while they were crossing into the United States, falsely claimed citizenship for the both of them. Under our current broken immigration system, that has earned her a lifetime ban from reentry to the United States.

So despite the fact that an American citizen, someone I represent, someone who pays taxes into our government, someone who is by all measures doing everything he can to make our community and our country a better place, he cannot be with the woman he loves because of what I think to be a very arbitrary and unhelpful law that is separating two people who deeply love each other.

What we need to do is correct this through comprehensive immigration reform and through a measure that we'll be introducing this week, the American Families United Act, that will allow judges some level of discretion in cases like these where we have someone who poses no threat to our country, who can pay a fine, do some sort of penance for a mistake they made or a family member made on their behalf, and then if it makes sense for our community and our security is secured, they are able to join our community, the person that they want to marry, a U.S. citizen.

I hope that we'll have others who will join us in cosponsoring this legislation that we'll introduce this week because there are literally thousands upon thousands of American families, families of U.S. citizens, who are affected negatively by this immigration law.

As I said earlier, we want to do the right thing for the right reasons, for the moral imperative. Coming from El Paso, Texas, we really have been the Ellis Island for much of Latin America, including Mexico. The people who came through our ports of entry ended up in Los Angeles, they ended up in California, they went to Chicago, they went to New York, they went to all points east, west and north, and then many tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, chose to stay in El Paso.

It is because of those immigrants, both legal and unauthorized immigrants I would argue, that El Paso today is the safest city in the United States. It was the safest city last year as well, it was the safest city the year before that. For the last 10 years, El Paso has been one of the top five safest cities in the United States.

When we hear people, who I think out of ignorance, say that we need to secure the border before we move forward with comprehensive immigration reform, I tell them that today we are spending $18 billion on border security, more than we are spending on all other Federal law enforcement agencies combined, that we've built hundreds of miles of fencing, that net migration last year from Mexico was actually zero, that El Paso is the safest city, San Diego is the second-safest. The U.S. side of the U.S. border compared to the rest of the country is far safer. We do not have a border security problem today. The border has never been more secure or more safe.

For all of those reasons, all of the moral ones and all of the commonsense ones that I just cited, we should do the right thing. Yet that is not enough for some people.

I will conclude by saying this. It is in our moral interest as a country that wants to do the right thing. It makes all the common sense in the world to do the right thing. But if we look at our economic self-interest, today it is already proven that immigrants, including unauthorized immigrants, contribute far more to our economy, they contribute far more to our tax base, they contribute far more to job opportunities and quality of life than they take in benefits. That has, I think, been proven beyond a shadow of a doubt.

What we also know is that if some form of the current proposal for comprehensive immigration reform passes, the CBO has scored it such that within the first 10 years these new immigrants to our country who will be on a path to citizenship will be able to reduce our deficit by more than $150 billion. In the next 10 years, those same immigrants will reduce our deficit an additional $800 to $900 billion. They'll also be contributors into Social Security, one of the pillars of our social safety net, one that is unable to meet its obligations in the not too distant future. This is surely going to help us to shore up Social Security as well.

So whether we look at the moral dynamic, whether we look at what makes common sense for our communities and our country, or whether we look at our economic self-interest, comprehensive immigration reform that is rational, that is humane, and that is fiscally responsible makes sense for this country.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman O'ROURKE. We appreciate the opportunity to hear a perspective from your part of Texas and our great country.

Next, I would like to welcome and talk a little bit with Congressman BILL FOSTER of Illinois, a little bit right now.

Congressman FOSTER, part of the American Dream is owning a home. I, myself, was a real estate broker before getting involved in elected office, and I know that it's tough for those people who want to own a home if they don't have their documentation in order or their citizenship in order. We have a lot of vacant homes around the country, and I know we have some in your district and in my district.

Do you think that more American citizens working hard and contributing to our economy would help our homebuying market?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to highlight the many important contributions that immigrants make to our Nation and our economy, to our scientific progress, and to say a few special words on the positive impact that comprehensive immigration reform will have on the real estate market in our country.

We are a Nation of immigrants. Many of us are second- or third-generation Americans, and we have all benefited from the sacrifices that our ancestors made in search of a better life in America.

In fact, my wife is a first-generation Asian-American who came to the United States to pursue her education, and was able to become a legal immigrant and a citizen and a Ph.D., in fact, but who knows that even our legal immigration system does not work as well as it should.

Every day, families come to this country in search of the American Dream—better jobs, better education, and a better life for their families.

I am proud to represent many of these families, but would like to share just one incredible story of one of my constituents, Juventino Cano. Growing up, Juventino lived on a farm in Colima, Mexico, with his parents and six brothers and sisters. Their home didn't have lights or electricity, and they all worked long hours on the family farm to make ends meet.

When he was 17 years old, his stepbrothers encouraged him to come to Aurora, Illinois, and told him about the wonderful opportunities that awaited him in America. He was able to get a job with his stepbrothers at a packaging company.

By 1986, Juventino not only held a steady job and had learned English, but he had opened his own company, Cano Container Corporation, in Aurora, Illinois. What started with a single machine and three employees has now grown into a company with over $20 million a year in annual sales. Today, not only is Juventino the president and CEO of the Cano Container Company, he also serves on the board of directors for the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and as the president of the board of directors of the Aurora Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

□ 2030

Cano Container Company has also received its share of accolades, including being named the minority manufacturer of the year by the United States Department of Commerce in 2007.

The city and the economy of Aurora, Illinois, have greatly benefited from Juventino's many contributions to the community. His story reminds us that immigration reform is good for economic growth. More than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were founded by immigrants or children of immigrants. These American companies represent seven of the 10 most valuable brands in the world and collectively employ more than 10 million people and generate annual revenue of $4.2 trillion. That's a quarter of our economy.

Additionally, immigrants have a huge impact on our housing market, and passage of comprehensive immigration reform will have a huge positive impact on our still-recovering real estate markets. A study from Harvard University found that in recent years, foreign-born households accounted for 30 percent of the overall growth in the housing sector.

According to the ''2012 State of Hispanic Homeownership'' report, it is likely that comprehensive immigration reform would generate 3 million new Hispanic home buyers over the next several years. Every day that we fail to pass comprehensive immigration reform, we are forfeiting millions of dollars of economic growth and tax revenue and slowing the recovery of our housing markets.

If we passed immigration reform that provides a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, it would increase State and local tax collections by almost $150 million a year in Illinois alone. On the other hand, if all unauthorized immigrants were removed from Illinois, the State would lose $25.6 billion in economic activity, $11.4 billion in gross State product, and approximately 120,000 jobs.

As a scientist, I've also seen firsthand the valuable contributions that immigrants make. For 20 years, I worked as a physicist at Fermi National Lab in Illinois, and every day the flags from dozens of countries flew outside the facilities representing the nationalities of all of the scientists performing experiments at Fermilab.

Thousands of students from other countries have come to the U.S. to get their Ph.D.s and training at our research facilities, and it has been the policy of our country to turn most of them away when the work is done and their education is complete. While this may have made sense in the years after World War II when we were trying to avoid the brain drain from countries trying to rebuild themselves, times have changed. The economic winds are now blowing in both directions, and we need to stop pushing our accomplished scientists and researchers out of our country and instead encourage them to stay here and to build businesses, expand their research, and help grow our economy. The comprehensive immigration bill passed by the Senate does exactly that: it encourages the best and brightest scientists and researchers to stay here and add to our economy and our R&D capabilities.

As we contemplate a pathway to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants and consider reforming our legal immigration system, let's remember all of the contributions that immigrants, past and present, have made to our country.

Our Nation has a long and proud history of welcoming immigrants in search of a better life for themselves and their families, but our current immigration system is broken. We now have a historic opportunity to bring 11 million people out of the shadows.

We have to remember that at any moment we are just 5 days away from passing immigration reform and having it be the law of the land. All it will take is for Speaker BOEHNER to wake up one morning and listen to the voices of his church, listen to the voices of the chambers of commerce, listen to the voices of business and ordinary people all over this country and decide to bring the Senate immigration bill up for a vote where it will pass with a bipartisan majority and be signed into law by the President.

This would be a historic moment and exactly the kind of bipartisanship that people expect from their elected representatives. If and when Speaker BOEHNER decides to act and allow the House a vote to pass the Senate immigration bill, we could boost our economy, including our real estate markets, reduce our national debt and, most importantly, bring 11 million people out of the shadows. We cannot let this opportunity pass us by.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much.

Next I would like to yield to Congresswoman LOIS CAPPS.

Congresswoman, both of us are from California, and we've seen the incredible impact that immigrants have made in our great State of California. Recognizing those contributions is not a partisan matter for us in California now, is it?

One thing that I'd like for you to share with us, please, is your perspective on whether or not this is a partisan issue.

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague from California, TONY CÁRDENAS. And, yes, I do have a letter that I will share, but I want to discuss the matter in general first and thank my colleague for organizing all of us to be here to address a topic that is of central importance to our State of California and the entire country.

I join my colleagues in strong support for comprehensive immigration reform. We honor the many contributions that immigrants have made to our country during Citizenship Day this week, but we cannot forget the millions of immigrants left behind by our broken immigration system. These are the immigrants who contribute to key sectors of our economy. They are such a vital part of agriculture, housing, manufacturing, retail, hospitality, tourism, engineering, technology, and on and on.

These are hardworking people, immigrants who often face separation from their families, lower wages, and face the fear of deportation; and this forces them to take their skills often to our competitors at great disadvantage to our own economy. We can all agree that our current immigration system is not working. It's holding back our country and our economy, and now is the time to fix it.

While I've been traveling in my congressional district, I've heard personally from business sectors of our economy on the central coast of California that are hurt on a daily basis by this broken immigration system. There are high-tech companies in Goleta, California, frustrated by seeing many of our brightest UC Santa Barbara graduates being sent back to their native countries to work for competitive companies and countries because of a lack of high-skilled worker visas.

I've met with growers in California's agriculture industry who are so important in my local economy, critical to our national economy, and who struggle to find a stable and a consistent workforce. This threatens the sustainability of our crops.

I've met with workforce and labor organizations who want to ensure workers can earn fair wages and contribute to our economy and our communities. We must act now to establish a fair, but tough, pathway to citizenship to provide the security and stability our economy needs.

I now refer to the chart which indicates so graphically the difference between a path to legalization only and the strong advantages of that pathway to citizenship.

Comprehensive reform would boost California's economy alone by $7.3 billion. It would create nearly 77,000 new jobs in our State of California just next year. This should be one of our Nation's top priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I would also note for the record that while Members of my party are very enthusiastic about advancing comprehensive immigration reform, this is an issue with strong bipartisan support. For example, the Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform on a strong bipartisan vote not too long ago, and just last week a number of Republican members of the California State legislature made their voices heard on this issue—and that's the letter to which you referred. They sent a letter to their Federal counterparts urging us to take action in the House. These are Republican legislators from California on comprehensive immigration reform. I would like to now submit this letter into the RECORD.

This letter outlines components of comprehensive reform that most of us agree need to be included, that is, the opportunity for undocumented residents to earn their way to citizenship.

Wisely, the California State Republican legislators wrote—and this is a quote from their letter:

> There is no policy debate more important to the future of California and of America than passing comprehensive immigration reform.

I could not agree more.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, it is time that we have the opportunity here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives to debate and to finally have a vote on comprehensive immigration reform. Our country, our economy simply cannot wait any longer.

Thank you for the time, my colleague from California.

CALIFORNIA STATE
REPUBLICAN LEGISLATORS

To: California Republican Congressional Delegation:

Doug LaMalfa, 1st District
Tom McClintock, 4th District
Paul Cook, 8th District
Jeff Denham, 10th District
David Valadao, 21st District
Devin Nunes, 22nd District
Kevin McCarthy, 23rd District
Buck McKeon, 25th District
Gary Miller, 31st District
Ed Royce, 39th District
Ken Calvert, 42nd District
John Campbell, 45th District
Dana Rohrabacher, 48th District
Darrell Issa, 49th District
Duncan Hunter, 50th District

We, the undersigned California State legislative Republicans, strongly support federal comprehensive immigration reform and urge our state Republican Congressional delegation to encourage Speaker John Boehner to call a vote on immigration reform.

Components should include thoughtful and strong border security, employer sanctions, and opportunity for undocumented residents to earn their way to full citizenship, but only behind those who have applied to become citizens through the current citizenship process.

There is no policy debate more important to the future of California and America than passing comprehensive immigration reform. By providing legal clarity to the status of millions of people in California, we can spur an economic renaissance, solidify families, and create an entirely new population of full taxpayers, many of whom who have strong entrepreneurial and work ethics.

We stand with the business community, the labor community, farmers, manufacturers, communities of faith, and most importantly Californians, in our call for Congress to act on reform this year to put this challenge behind us as a state and nation. We strongly urge House Republicans to demand a vote.

While some members in Congress may not support the legislation, every member deserves the opportunity to vote. We understand that members have divergent views on reform, but this is the time to address the many serious issues immigrants and their employers face every day.

This group of Republican legislators is asking our friends in business, labor and agriculture, who work with these immigrants in their fields, homes and factories every day to join us in asking Congressional Leaders to ''Call the Vote.''

Respectfully,

Senator Anthony Cannella, SD 12; Senator Steve Knight, SD 21; Senator Bill Emmerson, SD 27; Senator Tom Berryhill, SD 14.

Assembly Republican Leader Connie Conway, AD 26; Assemblymember Jeff Gorell, AD 44; Assemblymember Kristin Olsen, AD 12; Assemblymember Rocky Chavez, AD 76; Assemblymember Katcho Achadjian, AD 35; Assemblymember Jim Patterson, AD 23; Assemblymember Allan Mansoor, AD 74; Assemblymember Don Wagner, AD 68; Assemblymember Brian Maienschein, AD 77; Assemblymember Eric Linder, AD 60; Assemblymember Brian Dahle, AD 1.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman CAPPS.

I now yield to Dr. RAUL RUIZ, who represents the southern part of California, to express some of his understanding of why comprehensive immigration reform is good for America and good for Americans.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from California, Congressman CÁRDENAS.

Immigrants from all over the world have made tremendous contributions to our society and our economy since the birth of our Nation. Our immigrant families are an invaluable part of our country.

For far too long, Congress has failed to act on a comprehensive plan for immigration reform.

I believe that any immigration reform plan would be bipartisan, secure our borders, uphold the immigration laws we already have, protect our workers and businesses, and include a pathway to citizenship for those who work hard and play by the rules.

Passing a commonsense comprehensive immigration reform bill would lead to an economic boom in the Coachella Valley and across the country.

Nonpartisan, independent studies have shown that comprehensive immigration reform will reduce the deficit by nearly $850 billion over the next 20 years and reduce our Federal debt. It will also increase economic growth and strengthen our economy by expanding our labor force, increasing investment, and increasing overall productivity. It will also provide a significant boost to our tourism and agriculture sectors, two of the top industries in my district in the Coachella Valley.

In the Coachella Valley, tourism industries will benefit substantially from some of the provisions in the bipartisan Senate bill, like the Visa Waiver Program. Additionally, our U.S. agriculture output and exports will grow once our farmers have access to the stable workforce they need.

Comprehensive immigration reform means more jobs and more opportunity for people in my district and across the country, but only if we act.

I stand ready to work with both Democrats and Republicans toward a comprehensive immigration system that is rooted in common sense. It is time to put aside the political games and work together in a bipartisan effort to address this critical challenge.

Thank you, Congressman CÁRDENAS, for this session.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you so much, Congressman RUIZ.

Before I call up our next Congressman from Florida, I'd like to share a story with everyone, Mr. Speaker, about economics and innovation.

Cesar Millan was born in 1969 in Culiacan, Sinaloa, Mexico. He grew up working with animals on his grandfather's farm in Sinaloa.

Young Millan crossed the border in the U.S. without a visa at the age of 21. He spoke no English and did not know anyone in this country. He first worked in a dog grooming store working with the most aggressive dogs that nobody else would want to work with.

Mr. Millan became a permanent resident in the year 2000. He was focused on rehabilitating especially aggressive dogs and founded the Dog Psychology Center in south Los Angeles, and he held that center there from 2002 to 2009, which, in fact, was a business.

He started a television series, ''The Dog Whisperer with Cesar Millan,'' which was broadcast in more than 80 countries around the world between 2004 and 2012. The show became National Geographic's number one show during its first season.

Starting in January 2013, Cesar Millan has hosted another series, ''Cesar Millan's Leader of the Pack.'' Cesar Millan has written three books, all of which became New York Times bestsellers. In 2009, Cesar Millan launched ''Cesar's Way'' magazine in the United States and Canada, which combines advice from Cesar and articles about relationships between dogs and humans. It is the number one selling dog magazine in North America.

□ 2045

In 2007, Cesar and Ilusion Millan created the Cesar and Ilusion Millan Foundation, a not-for-profit to aid and support the rescue, rehabilitation, and placement of abused and abandoned dogs. Cesar Millan has also supported other projects, including K–9 Connection for at-risk teens, Pups on Parole for inmates, and It Gets Better that supports at-risk LGBT youth as well.

I was present in 2009—and it was a proud moment for me and a proud moment for Cesar Millan and his family—when he raised his hand and was sworn in as a United States citizen in 2009 in Los Angeles, California. And I can tell you, his efforts and his contributions to this great Nation go much further.

While watching television, my wife, Norma, looked at the TV and she said, You know what, Tony? You need to meet Cesar Millan. He looks like a good man, and he looks like somebody who can help you create good legislation for the city of Los Angeles, when I was on the city council of Los Angeles.

So I invited him to my office, and immediately he said he'd be more than happy to help me. And as a result of that one meeting, he helped me create the first spay and neuter program in the largest city in the United States of America. Now it's the model for cities around the country. And it was his advice and his expertise that allowed me to do that.

Los Angeles, for over 20 years, had not prosecuted one person for cruelty to animals, and it was Cesar Millan who urged me that we need to put an end to that. And with that, in Los Angeles, I was able to pass an ordinance that created an animal cruelty task force. And today, we have prosecuted over 200 individuals with felony charges for cruelty to animals.

Basically what I'm saying is it was an undocumented immigrant who came to this country who taught me, an American-born citizen, how I can take my craft as an elected official to a level that had never been done before. And it's that kind of example that I believe we have example after example after example in this country that immigrants who come to this country, documented or undocumented, seize the opportunity of the atmosphere that we've created in this great country. And they are tremendous contributors not only to our economy, but to good legislation and making our communities a better place.

And now I would like to invite to speak a few words Congressman JOE GARCIA from Florida to share what his perspective on comprehensive immigration reform means to this country and why it's so important to our great Nation.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I have the great opportunity to come from a community that, in large part, has been built by immigrants. I am the son of refugees to this great country. And here's what we know:

We know that immigrants add to America's way of life; they create more opportunity for all; they make our country better; they make American citizens richer.

Here's what we know:

We know that in the next 10 years, if we find a pathway for legalization, over $100 billion of additional capital will be added to our country. What we know is that in the next 20 years, that will be over $870 billion. In fact, what we know is that they will almost provide $1 trillion of economic growth over the next 20 years.

It's important to understand that immigrants bolster our country, make our country better, and they add to it.

I lived in south Florida during very tough times for immigrants. I remember, as a young man, seeing bumper stickers on the back of cars that said, ''Would the last American leaving Miami please bring the flag.'' What I know is that the flag still flies high in Miami. It is a leading beacon for work and opportunity in our country because people didn't give up on the dream of our country. They continued to work and they continued to make a difference.

And that is exactly what we have to understand is that immigrants bolster our country. They bolster America's private sector by consuming more goods, more services, providing increased income. All this, in turn, creates more jobs and greater income for all Americans.

What we know is that by 2022, over 820,000 more workers will be created because of the need, $321 billion of increased income for all Americans. The GDP increases by $568 billion if all noncitizens, undocumented and those illegal residents in the country, were to be legalized. This is a boon for our country. It creates opportunity. It makes for a better America.

I thank the gentleman from California for doing this because of course what he's doing is trying to save this country, to make it better. There has never been a great country, a great nation in the history of the world that was shedding citizens. In fact, all great countries welcome opportunity. They welcome those who come to provide.

We need a comprehensive immigration system not only because we need more workers, but we need the intellectual capital that they bring. We need that drive, that vigor that they add to our country. And the fight for comprehensive immigration reform is one that makes all Americans better, makes our country richer, and makes opportunity for all, creating the motto that lives in our country.

So again, I want to thank the gentleman from California for his efforts. I know he's one of many in the House. And what we do know is that if a bill came to this floor, it would have majority support. The Senate passed it, and this House could pass it if the leadership would allow it to get to the floor.

More than enough of the Members of this Chamber understand the benefits of immigration, understand that it is necessary for our country's greatness, and understand that it is what we will do inevitably. Let's do it now. Let's do it right. Let's get it done.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you, Congressman GARCIA. I really appreciate that perspective and your sharing with America those perspectives.

I would like to share another story of someone that I'm friends with and someone who has a business in my district and also lives in my district.

Alonso Arellano was born in 1966 in Tijuana, Mexico. He came to America when he was 10 years old with his mother and stepdad and brother. His family settled in Huntington Park, California, where his father worked at a factory job and his mother sold goods to make some extra money. He had to withdraw from high school in the 10th grade because of the family's economic hardships and began working to help support his family. But he had a passion for learning and was determined to get an education, so he completed high school by taking night classes while working full-time, and went on to take courses at a junior college to continue his education.

In 1986, he got married. And when he found out his wife was pregnant a couple of years later, he began to reevaluate his life and what he was going to do next for his family. So he joined the United States Air Force in 1988, where he won the Airman of the Quarter Award three times, received a commendation medal, and graduated from training with honors. He was granted the permission to take classes at Eastern New Mexico University nearby the base where he was stationed, and he eventually earned a bachelor's degree in physics and a master's degree in mathematics.

After the war, Alonso applied for and was granted U.S. citizenship, which opened the door for his future career. When he left the military in 1994, he began training at UCLA to become a radiation medical physicist while working part time at UCLA at a cancer research center. He currently works as a radiation medical physicist at a private hospital. In addition to that, he owns and runs a restaurant called Rocio's Mole de los Dioses. And right now, he's planning on opening up another business, creating jobs for Americans, creating jobs in our community, our corner of America.

I think it's important for people to understand that immigrants have such an insatiable appetite to appreciate their surroundings, appreciate their opportunities, just like Alonso, who had to get out of school at the 10th grade, who worked full-time, went to night school to get his education, went on to get a bachelor's degree, a master's degree, and now is contributing in a health care facility for patients with cancer, who is actually contributing by opening several businesses where he employs American citizens.

I want to thank my colleagues for joining me tonight on this floor to share the stories of truth and the stories about how important comprehensive immigration reform is to the economy of America. Once again, 82,000 more jobs if we allow these new Americans to become citizens, $568 billion more growth in GDP to the United States economy if we allow them to become citizens, $75 billion more in revenue to local States and governments if we allow them to become citizens, $321 billion of growth in dollars in the pockets of American families that will be spent throughout our communities in America.

As I close, I would like to thank NALEO, NCLR, and countless other businesses, chambers, labor, civil rights, religious, and law enforcement organizations, individuals who are continuing to push for the truth, to push Congress to please have comprehensive immigration reform meet the floor of both Houses so we can reconcile this, fix our broken immigration system, and put it on the desk of the President of the United States, and we will see an economic boon that this country has not seen for decades.

Americans deserve for us to operate in these Chambers the way we should, to put aside the partisan bickering, to look at the economic benefit of every community in our country, to do the right thing, to live the spirit of what the United States of America portends to be around the world. We need to start at home and realize that we have 11 million hardworking people in this country who are doing the toughest jobs, changing the diapers of our children, working in the kitchens of every nice, wonderful restaurant in America, people who are working with our grandparents to help them live a better life. Many of those individuals deserve the opportunity to come out of the shadows, and not only come out of the shadows, but to contribute to this great Nation with more economics that we need to see. We have an ailing economy, ladies and gentlemen. And with that, Mr. Speaker, we will see growth in America. We will see more Americans go to work if we do the right thing and pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a wonderful hour of truth and message to the American people, and I hope and pray that in these Chambers we have the opportunity to vote for comprehensive immigration reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SMART SPENDING CUTS STARTING WITH THE CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back here working on the floor of this House. As we have gotten back started, there are a lot of issues, there are a lot of things being debated, even here tonight being spoken of from a factor of truth and things that I think the American people sent us here to do.

They sent us here to look after the people's House, to do the business of America and make sure that the important interests that they care about, which are their lives and their businesses, their families, those are the things that we need to be about. And I know from our prospects on the Republican side, that is exactly what we're looking at to foster jobs and create growth and to do the things that matter.

But while I was home over the August work period, I got a lot of questions from longtime friends and also folks that had I not met. Over the time frame, we spoke to more groups than I could count. We talked to individuals, whether they be in the Kroger shopping center, whether they be in a coffee shop, whether they were in town hall meetings or all over, we experienced the Ninth District again as we went out and listened to our constituency. And what I had learned about the first few months was a lot of things that they wanted to ask me about.

You see, I have got questions about the budget. I have got questions about taxes. I have got questions about how we were going to prevent ObamaCare from going into effect. And I'm glad to stand here tonight and say that this Friday we're living up to the promise, as we have already worked to repeal parts of this legislation and to put this back on a foundation which the President can no longer just do by executive order whatever he would like, even in contradiction to black letter law.

When we look at the issues of ObamaCare going forward on Friday on this House floor, we are going to move forward with a continuing resolution to keep this government functioning while, at the same time, protecting Americans from a bad health care law.

□ 2100

Do not let anyone—if you're watching tonight, do not let anyone tell you any different. Republicans want to keep the government functioning and protect Americans at the same time. We can do that. That's why we were sent here.

All those things that we were asked questions about, from ObamaCare to taxes to budget, but also Benghazi and IRS. And a little over a year ago, on the floor of this House, and all of America, we were horrified at the sights of Benghazi. And to know that this week we're continuing to look and to find the truth, so not just we look backwards and remember, but that we look forward so that we can put into place things that matter and things that will help those from the Ninth District of Georgia and all over the country who want to go into Foreign Service, who want to serve their country, so that when they go overseas to serve, they will know that if trouble comes we have their back. Those are the things that the Ninth District were talking to me about, and those are the things that this Congress and this Republican majority are putting a priority on.

But while I was at home, I was also fortunate enough to get to talk to people who don't have time to focus on inside-the-Beltway issues. In fact, they really don't look to inside the Beltway to determine how they're going to get up and live each day.

In fact, when I go home and visit constituents in hardware stores and pharmacies and small businesses where regular Americans go on a daily basis, I'm reminded of why my constituents elected me to be here. These are the places populated by the people who don't ask for much for their government. They just pay their taxes. They pay their bills.

They get up in the mornings, they send their kids to school, and they go to work, and they come back home in the evenings and they go to ball games and they go to their parents' house. They take care of their relatives, they take of their neighbors. They look after their schools. They look after their communities.

And what they want is just a government that leaves them alone, that does what it's supposed to do, while they do what they're supposed to do.

You see, they don't believe that government is the solution to all problems. In fact, they don't look to Washington for their solution. They look for Washington to do what it was supposed to do, as the Founders intended: to be a form of limited government, a place that provides a healthy playing field, but it only provides it within the limited confines of the Constitution and what the Founders intended this organization and this government to be.

When we look at this, they look around, they scratch their head and they say, when they see Washington not working, when they see it overreaching, when they see it getting into their lives and affecting their businesses and keeping their business from expanding by regulation that continues to tear down the fabric of new business growth through our banking sector and others, through our manufacturing sector, and removing the jobs at the expense of growing government jobs, they want to know, they say, ''Doug, can Washington be fixed?''

Fixing the small things sometimes is not real vogue in this town. And when we think about that, and when they ask me the question, can Washington be fixed, I'm able to tell them that we can fix Washington, but it's going to take hard work and a lot of focus, which the people of the Ninth District of Georgia know a lot about, and also a lot of our country. In fact, our country is based on hard work and focus, and that's what makes this country great.

First of all, we're going to have to start by fixing the small things. They

sent us here to Washington to fix it, but we often get so focused on the big ticket items of the day that we miss out on reforming the small things that are right in front of us, the things that can actually be fixed without a drawn-out, partisan fight.

And I say so many times, people say, what are you fighting about? And many times it's hard to explain. But there are some things that we can do that we can all agree upon. There are spending categories all over the Federal Government where billions of dollars are being wasted and not put to good use.

In fact, in my time here looking back through the reports from the Government Accountability Office, you see the same programs listed as high risk year after year. We're ignoring billions of dollars in savings by overlooking the small things.

I am a big believer that if you do the small things regularly and consistently, they become habit. And we, as a government, if we would focus on the small things, if we focused on the things that mattered and the things that we could get agreement on, then the American people would, slowly but surely, begin to rebuild the trust that they have in this institution.

You see, one of the things I want to talk about tonight, I serve on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and I serve on the Subcommittee on Federal Work Force, U.S. Postal Service and the Census.

Now, I have to admit, when I first was assigned to this subcommittee I thought to myself, what does this committee do, and why am I on it?

And then I began to look into it, and I began to see what it actually works toward, and what are the things that are under its jurisdiction, whether it be the Federal work force and the issues involved there, or it's the Postal Service, which affects every American, or the census. Yes, the census.

One small thing that we spend money on is actually a pretty big thing. It's a decennial census. Using inflation-adjusted dollars, the cost of the census that the government administers every 10 years has risen over 600 percent since 1970.

If you look at this chart right here, you can see, since 1970, see the growth that has happened in the cost of the census. The census cost just $17 per household in 1970, but it's almost doubled in cost every 10 years, to the point that the 2010 census cost $115 for every household in America.

Now, I'm going to stop right here for just a second. And I'm sure that maybe if you are tuning in tonight you're going to say, maybe you would ask if you're watching this on another medium, and I'm sure a lot of you are asking right now, why is DOUG COLLINS on the floor talking about the census?

I'm here because the census is a great example of how we can start to save taxpayer money by reforming the small things.

This government has a spending problem. We spend money on more agencies and bureaus than most Americans can possibly comprehend. All these pieces add up to budget problems that we face today. And if we don't start fixing the small pieces now, how will we ever begin to address the big ones?

We spent almost $15 billion on the census in 2010, $15 billion. And if we don't start planning now, some projections indicate we could spend as much as $25 billion in 2020, $25 billion in 2020, a little over 10 years, we're again adding 10, and some estimates think it could go as high as $30 billion.

In a subcommittee of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee last week, we heard from the new Director of the Census Bureau about steps that can be taken to keep these costs from going up.

However, the National Academy of Sciences has stated that it is possible that the 2020 census could cost even less than the 2010 version. With the technological developments that have taken place over the last decade, we now have the ability to utilize the Internet and mobile devices in ways that can dramatically cut costs.

We know that the younger generation of Americans is the most difficult to obtain responses from when the census is issued. They're mobile, they're busy, and they just have no interest in filling out surveys with a pencil and paper and mailing it back.

They are much more comfortable using the Internet than any previous generations. They're digital natives. It comes natural to them.

Luckily, we have the ability to utilize the Internet for responses in 2020. We already allow individuals to file their income tax returns online. Implementing an online option for the census is a no-brainer. Instead of sending out multiple mailings, and sending an hourly worker to gather the data, the Census Bureau can use a secure online survey.

This also cuts down on the time it would take for someone to transcribe a written response into an electronic record. Both of these measures have the potential to cut labor costs and, most importantly, to save taxpayer money.

Another way that we can encourage people to take part in the census is through incentives. At a cost of over $100 per household, we need to consider creating incentives to reduce follow-up responses.

Improving the initial response rate by just 1 percent saves $85 million in taxpayer money. Remember, taxpayer money. It's a word thrown around up here in Washington a lot, but let's just make it very simple: taxpayer money is what's in your wallet right now. That is all that we have to run on, unless we're borrowing it or printing it.

We need to remember where our money comes from and why it's important to save it.

Whether it is through a small targeted incentive, or a partnership with a local school or community, or something that we have not even thought of yet, beginning these discussions now will prepare us to implement them in time for the 2020 census.

This is important because many of you say it's still several years away. But I'm often amazed, as when I was pastoring, I used to talk to people all the time who would find themselves in March and April, and they could not understand why they were in debt.

And I would often hear them make this statement. They made the statement that, you know, Christmas and the holidays just snuck up on me this year. And I'd think to myself, it's the same time every year. How did it sneak up on you?

And in 10 years, we do the census every year. Why aren't we putting our thought into it now?

And I'm glad to see that our committee is doing that.

When we heard from the Census Bureau at a hearing, we also learned that some of the built-in costs of the census come from needing to ask questions requested by congressional committees. We have the power to add questions, but we should also consider using that same power to remove some.

Every question asked on the census adds more cost to the process and requires taxpayer funding.

I hear from constituents often that the census and the American Community Survey are too long and too intrusive. While we can debate this issue at another time, there is no doubt that we should consider the cost-saving potentials of revisiting these questions asked because people do not have time to fill out long surveys that they find too intrusive and too over-the-top and too overbearing, accompanied with that famous, If you don't fill it out, you're under a penalty of criminal law.

We've got to get back to what really matters. And one of the things is saving money and time.

Another area of savings we should be looking into is technology based on mapping software. As anyone who has had a smartphone really can attest, the mapping technology in a small device is truly remarkable.

A significant cost that adds to the census is when surveyors drive their cars through urban and suburban areas and then have to get out and walk to individual houses.

Oftentimes they have to deal with traffic, depending on the time of day or the part of town that they may be in. As mapping technology is evolving, we now have the ability to minimize the amount of time census employees spend in traffic.

We have seen this technology in action in the private sector. You would expect the private sector to know how to save money and to earn the profit. That's exactly what they're in business to do.

A company like UPS has been able to develop software that optimizes the efficiency of their employees so that

they take as few left turns as possible. A driver might make three right turns to avoid making a left turn.

While this seems counterintuitive, they found that it actually saves money. The employees spend less time sitting at traffic lights and are able to service more households per day. If the census can an employ a mobile technology along these same lines, the bureau has the ability to save taxpayer dollars.

Now, understand something: none of these cost-saving measures are truly revolutionary. None of them will shock people or cause a partisan divide. I doubt that our offices will be flooded with constituent calls asking us to adopt them.

But simply put, they're all commonsense measures that will save taxpayer money. The ideas have worked in other areas of government, and have worked in the private sector.

Sometimes it doesn't take a revolutionary idea to be a good one. It often takes a group of leaders deciding to focus on an issue and keep pushing it until the process improves. We have a chance to improve the census and to rein in the costs.

As previously stated, we have the ability to save $10 billion in future taxpayer cost. As I said earlier, the big things will always work themselves out. We can even run from crisis to crisis up here, and people will focus on the big things, and we will continue to work on those because they matter.

But it's time we gave some consideration to the small things. When we add the small pieces together, we start to actually reduce the deficit and get this country back on solid financial ground.

This is not a small thing. This is what matters to the people back home. This is what matters when they come up to me in the grocery store and they talk about Washington being broken. They want to know how it affects them at their table, at their homes, and with their families.

When we start focusing on the small things, the big things get in perspective even clearer, and we're up here doing exactly what we are supposed to be. And the Republican majority is focused on limited government, focusing on jobs, and getting America back to work again with a government that does what it's supposed to do and gets out of the way.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to speak on this subject tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 687, SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1256, RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3102, NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–215) on the resolution (H. Res. 351) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; providing for consideration for the Bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION, H.J. RES. 59 CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–216) on the resolution (H. Res. 352) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2115

REVIEWING THE BASICS

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 morning, I met with a group of Nebraskans, as we do every week. It's called the Nebraska Breakfast. It's about a 70-year tradition that we have here in the Congress where the House Members and the Senators get together. We've been doing that decade after decade. It's a wonderful way to welcome people to Washington and one of the highlights of our week. What we do as a delegation is talk about the issues of the day and hear from our constituents as well.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be important to just review a few basics. Some of the terminology and some of the language that we throw around here with great ease is often, I think, disconnected from people out there in the country—words and phrases like continuing resolutions; the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare; sequestration, and debt limits. The reason that I point all this out is there is a convergence of all of these factors right now that is creating the great debate and this moment of drama in the United States Congress.

So let's take those one at a time.

First of all, the continuing resolution. What does that mean? Well, each year, if it worked in an ideal fashion and a proper fashion, the President submits a budget to Congress. Congress can take that budget up or not. The House passes a budget. The Senate passes its own budget. The two are reconciled. We set a budgetary goal, and then the appropriations committees go to work on various aspects of funding the government, whether that's the Defense Department, military services, labor and health and human services, transportation, financial, agriculture support, and the rest of the so-called appropriations bills. Basically, the budget sets up a fence and then the appropriations bills divide up how that money is to be spent each year. That, again, is in an ideal world, which has become very broken of late.

When Congress cannot seem to get a budget agreement between the House and Senate, we come to the end of the fiscal year, which ends this September, and we have to figure out a way to fund the government going forward or else it shuts down. When the government shuts down, there is the potential for planes not to fly, trains not to run, and veterans not to get their services. It's not a proper way to govern. It's not good for the country to have this uncertainty looming out there. We want to do everything we can to try to avoid a government shutdown while moving forward on fiscally responsible policies that return us to what we call ''regular order'' here and try to get back in place a system of governance that gives some proper planning horizons for the communities at large out there across America and brings it back into an orderly process here.

So if we are not able to pass a budget, the continuing resolution is a vote by both the Senate and the House as to how to move forward either in a temporary fashion or a long-term fashion based upon what current government policies are.

The frustration here is that each year of late we've been going through all of these difficult decisionmaking

processes, particularly through the appropriations process, about which programs are important, which are necessary public policies to help bring essential services to the American people, and which programs are older, antiquated, no longer effective and should either be reduced or eliminated.

We've gone through a number of those processes this year; but because of the disagreements between the two bodies, because of the deep philosophical divide in this Chamber, we have not been able to find a resolution that gets us to what we call regular order—passing appropriations bills under a budgetary framework. So now we are faced with a continuing resolution—the decision as to how to fund the government, moving forward, either for a short term—a month or 2, maybe a few weeks, or even a few days—or long term.

The continuing resolution means we just pick up government where it is and move it forward, basically spending the same amount of money that we did last year and not getting any of the reforms. So it might come to that, but that's an unfortunate way to govern. And I know it's adding cynicism, Mr. Speaker, in the American people's perspective as they watch this deep philosophical divide play itself out on the House floor and seemingly not being able to get anything constructively decided.

Mr. Speaker, I'm from Nebraska. We have a saying, Let's get 'er done. I think that's what most Americans want. Let's find a constructive way, a proper and balanced way, to appropriately reduce spending in areas that are necessary to do so, perhaps even the right type of tax reform to get this fiscal house in order.

Now why is this important? Well, we have a $600-plus billion deficit this year. Year after year, because we've had these deficits, we've piled up debt. There's now $17 trillion of debt. By some measures, it's approximating the size of the output of the entire economy. It's a real red flag.

That's why it is so imperative that this body strive to work together, again, in a constructive manner, to figure out the right type of spending and tax policies that deliver essential services, reduce the overspending, increase accountability in effective and smart government and delivery of policy, while also having a fairer and simpler Tax Code. That should be the objective, and I think it is for most Members here. But, unfortunately, the system is working very dysfunctionally at the moment and we're going to be faced with eleventh-hour decisions as to how to fund the government in the short term so that it doesn't shut down. That's called the continuing resolution.

Complicating that this year is the whole debate about the future of health care in America. A couple of years ago, the Affordable Care Act was passed. I did not support it. It's now known as ObamaCare. We do need the right type of health care reform in our country—a health care reform that is going to improve health care outcomes while reducing costs. I think most Americans are beginning to see and realize this now because it's hitting them and it's hurting them. Instead, what we have in the new health care bill is a shift to more unsustainable costs and an erosion of health care liberties, and a significant amount of Americans are experiencing not affordable care but an escalating cost of their premiums.

Now, there's some components of the health care law that I think are reasonable; and as we move forward, we should retain them, such as keeping kids on health insurance up to the age of 26. I supported that policy before the health care bill. Removing caps on health insurance in case a family would cap out, that doesn't save the system any money. The family simply has to go find another job and an insurance provider, creating great duress. That doesn't make sense. Appropriately dealing with the problem of preexisting conditions. There have been a number of Americans who were priced out of the insurance market, who could not find affordable, quality insurance. And that's a real crack in our market system, so that it's necessary that public policy deal with that.

But what we've gotten instead is a massive turning over of our entire health care system. It's creating havoc. Prices are going up. People aren't sure as to whether or not they can keep their doctor or their health care plan. Some people are experiencing unemployment as companies either don't expand or have to reduce numbers because they want to get under the threshold by which they have to provide health insurance for their employees. And some employees are having reduced hours. This is a very big problem.

Another component of this is that the President and the administration have exempted certain entities. Recently, the implementation of the business demand that they provide health care has been delayed. It's really not fair because individuals are saying, if you can delay the business mandate, the corporate mandate, why not the individual mandate?

The fullness of ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, is coming into full force very shortly. So this is colliding as well with our budgetary discussion, and it's creating dramatic dynamics as we end the month here at the end of the fiscal year.

The other aspect of this is called sequestration. A couple of years ago, we were in a very similar situation in which we were faced with raising the debt ceiling—and I'll return to that Washington phrase in a moment—or not. A special committee was set up to review the Tax Code and to review spending, and they were going to come up with a process by which there was a fair and balanced approach to spending and taxes going forward.

But that supercommittee failed. The incentive for them to act in a constructive manner was something called ''sequestration,'' which is the implementation of automatic budget cuts, primarily affecting the defense of our country, and what we call nondefense discretionary spending.

Nondefense discretionary spending is basically everything else the government does, other than the defense and veterans and retirement and health security programs—basically, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. So a third of the entire budget is what is being affected by sequestration, and many Members of Congress have seen the furloughs in their districts and cutbacks on vital programs.

I think there's widespread support, particularly where I come from, on, again, ensuring that we have the right type of spending reductions while there is also a proper delivery of important essentials. We have to do this in a smart manner. The sequestration does it across the board. It's a very clumsy, awkward way to do this. It's not judicious. It's not using discretion. It's not taking the best judgment through our normal processes of considering a budget and appropriations bills and saying, that program may have been good at one time, but it no longer fits modern needs. Let's get rid of it and save that money and bring down spending or apply it to something new that's innovative that can really help people.

That's what sequestration is doing. That's what it did this year. Because that supercommittee failed to meet its goal, there were automatic budgetary reductions put in place. They will continue unless, again, we can come to an agreement as to how we replace sequestration with a more prudent form of spending reduction that would hopefully be coupled, again, with the right type of tax reform.

Let me talk about that fourth Washington phrase, those two words, the ''debt ceiling.'' We used to never hear much about this. The debt ceiling was something that kind of came and went. Congress has to give the authority to the President to go out and borrow money. Usually, that was automatic; but because our debt has gotten so large, so severe, at $17 trillion, most Members of Congress are saying this is so severe that it demands creative thinking and bold resolve, or else we will undermine not only our economic well-being but also national security.

Now, how so? What does $17 trillion of debt mean?

Mr. Speaker, we are a people that self-governs. This debt is not sitting out there as somebody else's problem. It's America's problem. So if you divided it all up between every man, woman, and child in this country, every one of us would have to write a check for $53,000 in order to pay off the current debt.

Now, that doesn't even consider the projection of debt in the future based

upon the way in which current spending programs are constructed. If we take the present value of the future obligations of programs as they are now written, the debt would so accelerate that each person in America right now, if nothing changes, would owe $300,000.

Mr. Speaker, I have five children. There are seven of us in the family. Obviously, I can't afford a check to the government for $2.1 million to take care of my share of this obligation; nor can most Americans. Something has to change. It will take bold resolve and constructive commitment to fair and balanced outcomes both on the spending side as well as the Tax Code ledger side.

If we don't do this, Mr. Speaker, what are the consequences if we don't deal with this debt successfully? By the way, it can't be done overnight. It's too big. That would be too disruptive to do it overnight. But we have to set a pathway in which we are committed to seriously reducing this debt and getting the fiscal house in order, turning this battleship around.

The consequences are really threefold if we don't. First of all, it's a form of future taxation. We're forcing the children of the future to pay for the way in which we're living now. It's fundamentally unjust, unfair.

Secondly, a lot of this high level of debt is held by foreign countries such as China. What does that mean? That is a shift of the assets of this country—what we own—into the hands of other people. We get all worried that China is undertaking a military expansion. We've sent a heck of a lot of manufacturing over there, sent a lot of our economy over there. They make the stuff; we buy the stuff. They have the cash. We run up debt; they buy our debt.

□ 1930

It's a very dysfunctional marriage. But the consequences are, over time, that is a shift of what we own in this country into the hands of a place like China.

And where does that money go? Well, there is a ruling elite that's doing pretty well there. There's a hybrid communist-capitalistic system that doesn't seem to be very interested in the notion of private property rights and human rights, doesn't seem to be advancing very fast in this regard.

So this economic liberalization, you would hope, over time would help bring about the focus on fundamental human rights and human dignity. But it has certainly empowered a wealthy elite, and it's being plowed back into military infrastructure buildup.

So our debt is a national security problem. Because we hear that the Chinese, for instance, are expanding their navy, expanding their nuclear arsenal. So what is our response? We'll send more ships into the Pacific.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is also a response that needs to be had and that we need to work diligently and quickly and boldly with clear resolve, ideally in a bipartisan manner because this is an American problem. This really isn't about politics, Mr. Speaker. This is about principle. This is about participation in the future welfare of our country, regaining our balance, regaining our strength. This should transcend the partisan political divide. We'll have a big debate about, again, what are the appropriate areas to reduce and what's the right type of tax balance. Fine. But we should all be committed to getting to this goal to quickly reverse this trend, which has severe economic and national security consequences.

The third problem with all this debt is it's potentially inflationary. Now, we have a very expansive liquidity policy going on right now, basically buying up our debt. The consequences over time could be a further unleashing of inflationary impacts, which is a form of taxation, a regressive form of taxation. It hits the poor the hardest, those who are on fixed incomes, seniors the hardest. It is grossly unfair. People who are not in a position in life to adjust prices, if you will, and so that creates a further form of taxation on those who are least able to handle it.

So this is why, Mr. Speaker, this debt problem is so severe. We're bumping up in the near term against this debt ceiling limit. Now, again, what does that mean?

Congress has to give the administration authority to borrow more money. Now, the last time we did this, we actually reduced spending by more than an amount that we borrowed. That was the plan, again, trying to get to this in a manner that is not disruptive but actually begins to reduce the spending in a necessary fashion by more than the amount that we continue to borrow. It's a slow walk toward a better situation.

We may end up there now, I don't know, but this is one of these dynamics that's sitting out there, along with the continuing resolution, the future of health care in this country, called ObamaCare, the sequestration, dealing with these automatic cuts if we don't figure out a constructive way to budget and to appropriate. And then the debt ceiling, in which we have to have a plan to basically continue to pull down this very, very large burdensome debt and all of its economic as well as national security consequences. Mr. Speaker, we must do this, and we must do it now.

So I would urge all of my colleagues, let's transcend the partisan divide here. We're going to have differences. We all come from districts with particular perspectives. We have different philosophical ideas as to how to approach government. Some people want more investment at the Federal level. Those of us who believe in the sole principle called subsidiarity, where those closest to a problem or opportunity should be empowered to solve the problem or seize the opportunity—Federalism, as it used to be known. That has been the robust way in which America gained such economic prowess in the world and was a leader and continues to be a leader for so many people who desire the nature of a system like ours that is rooted in this cultural ideal that each person has inherent dignity and rights and also has responsibility—even responsibility—for government.

So, Mr. Speaker, we're going to have quite a bit of drama, I'm afraid, in the coming days and weeks. Let's hope it doesn't add cynicism to the deepening cynicism toward our institution. People in America have entrusted us to represent them, to make judgments on their behalf. I think most people in America want something constructive done, something that's fair, that's not done in an emergency, 11th-hour scenario, that doesn't disrupt economic well-being because it's either too dramatic or too harsh or done at the last minute, that takes a little bit longer view, gets past the politics of the moment and takes a longer view as to what's right and good for America.

Mr. Speaker, the people who came behind us, who sacrificed so much to build what we have, don't they deserve our best? Don't they deserve a commitment to these higher ideals? Because our economic well-being is tied to our ability to work constructively and creatively together to get this fiscal house together, to get it on the right track, to appropriately reduce spending while also delivering smart public policies that are effective in helping people across this country, that revitalizes our economic strength, that takes the duress off of communities where people can't find jobs and can't find work, that creates a fairer Tax Code that's less convoluted, that's a little bit simpler, where you don't have to have an army of lawyers and accountants to figure out ways around it. That's what we ought to be focused on. That's what we need to get done. That's what I think our people are demanding from us.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to share these thoughts with you and my colleagues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for September 12 until September 20 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 19, 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:

2995. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the OMB Sequestration Update Report to the President and Congress for fiscal year 2014, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 902(d)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2996. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 21 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2997. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Colonel David G. Bellon to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2998. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral James P. Wisecup, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2999. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting A report with regard to the Treasury's agenda with regard to the international financial institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3000. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Student Assistance General Provisions (RIN: 1880-AA87) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3001. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3002. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser 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.

3003. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3004. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of the Interior, transmitting copies of the detailed boundaries for the Roaring Wild and Scenic River and the Sandy Wild and Scenic River, Upper Portion, in Oregon; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3005. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Austin Blind and Jollyville Plateau Salamanders [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0001; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AZ24) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3006. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for Texas Golden Gladecress and Threatened Status for Neches River Rose-mallow [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2010-0064] (RIN: 1018-AX74) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3007. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Texas Golden Gladecress and Neches River Rose-mallow [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0027, 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AZ49) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3008. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Highly Migratory Species; 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 8 [Docket No.: 120627194-3957-02] (RIN: 0648-BC31) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3009. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands; Parrotfish Management Measures in St. Croix [Docket No.: 120510052-3615-02] (RIN: 0648-BC20) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3010. 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; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC757) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3011. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Western Pacific Fisheries; 2013 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures; Correcting Amendment [Docket No.: 121107617-3628-03] (RIN: 0648-XC351) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3012. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the South Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 18 [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-BD04) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3013. 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: 0348-XC769) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3014. 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; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts [Docket No.: 111220786-1781-01] (RIN: 0648-XC811) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3015. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the South Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 15 [Docket No.: 120924488-3671-02] (RIN: 0648-BC60) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3016. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #6 Through #11 [Docket No.: 130108020-3409-01] (RIN: 0648-XC738) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3017. 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; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 130214139-3542-02] (RIN: 0648-XC789) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3018. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Documentation of Nonimmigrants — Visa Classification; T Visa Class (RIN: 1400-AD42) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3019. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting The Report to Congress on the Application of Electronic Health Records (EHR) Payment Incentives for Providers Not Receiving Other Incentive Payments; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

3020. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting the SIGIR's final report to Congress; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

3021. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting A report covering the operation and status of the relevant federal fund accounts; jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform 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. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 351. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill

(H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest system land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act 2008; and for other purposes (Rept. 113–215). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 352. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 113–216). 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. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. REED, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 3119. A bill to prohibit enrollment under Health Care Exchange plans until privacy protections are certified as being in place, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3120. A bill to improve access to oral health care for vulnerable and underserved populations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Veterans' Affairs, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 3121. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and related reconciliation provisions, to promote patient-centered health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Appropriations, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3122. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to promote student physical heath and well-being, nutrition, and fitness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 3123. A bill to ensure prompt access to Supplemental Security Income, Social Security disability, and Medicaid benefits for persons released from certain public institutions; 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. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3124. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend the adoption incentive payments program to incentive payments for foster child exits to reunification, adoption, and guardianship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENYART:

H.R. 3125. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make competitive grants to support research and development, education, and training to produce a bio-based aviation fuel for use by the Air Force and to provide an initial infusion of funds for the grant program; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3126. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to prohibit a government subsidy for the purchase of a health plan by a Member of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 3127. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to small employers for certain newly hired employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 3128. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide additional penalties applicable to psychiatric hospitals and units that fail to comply with Medicare discharge planning process requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3129. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the full exclusion applicable to qualified small business stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 3130. A bill to establish humane practices for the repatriation of aliens at the border, establish effective standards for the treatment of certain aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 3131. A bill to authorize studies of certain areas for possible inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3132. A bill to ensure orderly conduct of Nuclear Regulatory Commission actions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a certain lock and dam should be known and designated as the ''Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 349. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H. Res. 350. A resolution establishing a select committee to investigate and report on the surveillance operations of the National Security Agency; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

137. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial No. 1266 urging the President and the Congress to award the United States 65th Infantry Regiment, the Borinqueneers, the Congressional Gold Medal; to the Committee on Financial Services.

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. PAULSEN:

H.R. 3119.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3120.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States''

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3121.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises,'' and to provide for the ''general Welfare of the United States.''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power to ''make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

This legislation puts forth measures relating to the treatment of existing commerce

and the exchange of health care products, services, and transactions, while retaining the sovereignty and power of respective states as outlined in Amendment X of the U.S. Constitution. The legislation also makes amendments to the manner in which the United States defines and enacts certain taxes, as implemented through the power to collect taxes and provide for the general Welfare.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution provides for those provisions which serve as a means to secure the ends of Clauses 1 and 3 of Article 1, Section 8, as cited above. Such provisions, include, but are not limited to eligibility standards, reporting measures relating to the practical implementation of tax provisions, and instructions specifying the relationship among existing Departments and programs.

Nothing in this legislation shall be construed to restrict due process of the law as defined in Section 1, Amendment XIV of the U.S. Constitution.

This legislation includes a provision to repeal Public Law 111–148 and title I and subtitle B of title II of Public Law 111–152, which exceeds the scope of power vested in Congress by the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3122.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3123.

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

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3124.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. ENYART:

H.R. 3125.

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

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

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3126.

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

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 3127.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 and Clause 18 of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 3128.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3129.

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

Article I, Section 8:

Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 3130.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 3131.

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

Under Article I, section 8, clause 3 and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3132.

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

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 241: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 358: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 419: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 437: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 485: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 508: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 541: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 543: Mr. HONDA and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 679: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 685: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 705: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. OLSON, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 763: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 797: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 809: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 901: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 904: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HURT, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 911: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 920: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 924: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 938: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 975: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1015: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. ROBY, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 1020: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1024: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1077: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1098: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1146: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1176: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1317: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1318: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1326: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1354: Mr. TIBERI, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 1461: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1507: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. JOYCE, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1518: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 1553: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1573: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1588: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1628: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1658: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1666: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1701: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1717: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1726: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FARR, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1752: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1761: Mr. RUSH, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1771: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1787: Mr. WALZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1798: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1801: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1844: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1846: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1852: Mr. POCAN and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1861: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1878: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1884: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CARNEY, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1920: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1971: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1985: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1999: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2003: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2019: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.

H.R. 2041: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 2053: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2101: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 2134: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2146: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 2199: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2247: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 2249: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 2296: Mr. KILMER and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 2302: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2315: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2330: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2399: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2415: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 2500: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 2502: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2523: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2548: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2553: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2575: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 2619: Mr. KILMER and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2638: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2654: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2663: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 2692: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 2717: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 2725: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2738: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2744: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 2772: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2780: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2782: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2785: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2790: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2801: Mr. WALZ, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2805: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 2809: Mr. LONG, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BARTON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 2810: Mr. LATHAM and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2822: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2841: Ms. MOORE and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 2908: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2936: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2943: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2952: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 2957: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ENYART, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2998: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3005: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3040: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3076: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3077: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3082: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 3089: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3093: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 3095: Mr. COBLE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3098: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3103: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3106: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3108: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3116: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.J. Res. 34: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.J. Res. 43: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.J. Res. 62: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 35: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H. Res. 63: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H. Res. 109: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. SCHRADER.
H. Res. 208: Ms. CHU and Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 254: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. DELBENE.

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:

The amendment to be offered by Representative RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, or a designee, to H.R. 687 the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of Rule XXI.

The amendment number 1 to be offered by Representative DAINES, or a designee, to H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

49. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Town of Millbury, Massachusetts, relative to Warrant Article No. 7 urging the Congress to enact H.R. 129; to the Committee on Financial Services.

50. Also, a petition of the City of Kenosha, Wisconsin, relative to Resolution No. 113-13 urging the passage of a constitutional amendment reclaiming democracy from the corrupting effects of undue corporate influence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2013 No. 123

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious Savior, lead our lives so we will bring You pleasure, receiving the smile of Heaven's approval.

Guide our Senators, inspiring them to do justly, to love mercy, and to embrace humility as they walk with You. Lord, strengthen them, making them eager to lift burdens and to respond to human needs. In Your unfailing love, give them the wisdom to follow the leading of Your powerful providence. Do for them immeasurably, abundantly, above all that they can ask or imagine.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 18, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the second 30 minutes.

Following morning business the Senate will resume consideration of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

We have tried really hard to work on this Energy bill. It is no wonder the news is reporting today that this is the least productive Senate in the history of the country.

We have a number of Republican Senators and lots of Republican House Members who don't believe in government. They want to get rid of it. They are doing everything they can to make that a fact. We are waiting now to see what is going to come from the House to fund government or not fund it. As the Presiding Officer knows, they are obsessed with the constitutional law that has been in effect now for 4 years, declared constitutional by the Supreme Court.

The latest we got from our floor staff is that the Republicans on this Energy bill want five nongermane amendments and whatever other amendments are filed dealing with energy, which means we are not going to finish the legislation. That is an understatement. But we will proceed. We have a number of issues we are going to work on. We have one that we filed—what is called a rule XIV procedure—yesterday dealing with continuing to allow our high-tech industry to be competitive.

We will move forward doing the best we can. We will wait and see what the House is going to do. They are still struggling to find out which absurd idea is going to prevail over there.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1513, S. 1514, H.R. 2009, AND H.R. 2775

Mr. REID. I am told there are four bills at the desk due for second readings.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bills by title for a second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1513) to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 1514) to save coal jobs, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 2009) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

A 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.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to all of these bills that were just read into the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bills will be placed on the calendar under rule XIV.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, each year Hispanic Heritage Month offers an opportunity to honor the contributions of a community that has contributed to our country's progress for centuries.

In the State of Nevada the influence of Hispanic Americans is evident even in the name of the State, which means ''snowcapped.'' Of course, our most famous city—one of the most famous cities in the world—means ''the meadows.'' It was a place that in pioneer days was an oasis in the desert, and that is an understatement. Water from artisan wells that bubbled out of the ground was the beginning of Las Vegas—the meadows.

The first non-Native American who set eyes on Las Vegas Valley was a man named Rafael Rivera. We honor him in Nevada. In my office here and in my conference room I have a wonderful painting of Rafael looking down over Las Vegas. He looked so good, all dressed in his finery, but in reality he was lost. He had been with a Spanish expedition and was lost, but he was the first to see Las Vegas, and we recognize that. The picture is terrific. We see him looking down at a place where there was nothing other than the meadows, but now there are 2.5 million people there.

In Nevada and across the Nation we see the contributions of Hispanic Americans in every facet of our society—on the battlefield, in the boardroom, in the courtroom and the classroom, at art galleries, and on the playing field. Hispanic Americans have also played an important role in this Nation's Armed Forces, serving in every conflict since the Revolutionary War. More than 2.3 million Hispanic-owned businesses employ millions of Americans, providing critical goods and services and helping to drive our economy.

Nationwide, Latinos are expected to make up about 60 percent of the population growth in the decades to come. To ensure our country thrives, we must ensure this Hispanic population thrives as well. Hispanic Heritage Month should be one to celebrate but also one to reflect on what we can do to help Hispanic families thrive.

This year affords a special moment for reflection as our Nation commemorates 50 years since the historic march on Washington for Jobs and Freedom. The struggle for equality, justice, and freedom is ongoing, but through engagement Hispanic Americans and all Americans can make heard in Washington their support for quality education, quality health care, a living wage, and the right to vote without intimidation or discrimination.

Congress heard their calls for quality affordable health insurance. That is why we passed, among other reasons, the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare, which was a huge step forward for Hispanic families and Nevadans across the country. In Nevada alone, more than 160,000 Latinos and more than 10 million nationwide who currently lack health insurance will be eligible for coverage through the new marketplaces that are going to start October 1.

Congress heard the calls for opportunity during tough economic times. Democrats made small business loans possible for 11,000 Hispanic-owned businesses. We have significantly cut predatory and discriminatory lending practices that disproportionately affected Hispanic communities. Last year Congress cut taxes for 98 percent of American families, including every middle-class family.

Congress also heard the calls for fair, practical immigration reform, and this year the Senate passed a bipartisan immigration bill that will reform America's illegal immigration system and reduce the deficit by $1 trillion. This measure will also help 11 million people—people who are tired of looking over their shoulders and fearing deportation—to get right with the law and start down an earned pathway to citizenship. The Senate, though, is still waiting, as we have been waiting for lots of things, for the Republicans in the House to allow a vote on the Senate's bipartisan compromise. What better way to celebrate this important month than by passing a bill that will allow millions of families to stay together and reach their full potential?

I look forward to Hispanic Heritage Month as an opportunity to reaffirm my commitment to supporting the 52 million Latinos in America through our work in the Senate. To me, Hispanic Heritage Month is about recognizing the incredible contributions of Hispanic Americans to our Nation, but it is also about building a brighter future for Hispanic Americans in our Nation.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

TROUBLING REALITIES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this week we passed the 5-year mark since the financial crisis hit our country. Incredibly, President Obama tried to use that opportunity to take credit for the fact that things aren't as bad as they were back then, and he is back at it again today. Basically, his message is this: America isn't in a free fall, so everyone should give him a big pat on the back.

Well, as far as deflections go, it is pretty creative, but it is also pretty misleading because in an effort to justify his own failed policies and preserve them, the President is papering over some pretty troubling realities. The truth is, for most Americans, the past few years have felt like anything but a recovery. It has been a story of lost jobs and underemployment and the loss of dignity that comes with both. It has been a period of stagnant wages and an increasing disparity between rich and poor. Then there are all the young people who have been stunned to realize, after graduating from college, that there just aren't any jobs out there. So now is not the time for victory laps because if this is his idea of success, I would hate to see what failure looks like.

Today, nearly 8 million Americans who want full-time jobs can only find part-time work. That is nearly twice as many involuntary part-timers as we had throughout most of the previous administration. And, of course, ObamaCare will make this much worse. What is more, the poor and middle-income folks and those just starting out on their own are some of the people who have been struggling the most in the Obama economy. The unemployment rate for low-income Americans, for instance, now stands at 21 percent—21 percent unemployment for low-income Americans—right about where it was during the Great Depression.

The President likes to claim credit for jobs created since the so-called recovery began, but what he fails to mention is that there are still fewer jobs today than before the crisis hit, while real median wages haven't gone up at all over the past 5 years.

Even though Candidate Obama promised to ''spread the wealth around,'' we find that 95 percent of recent income gains have actually gone to the richest among us. Ninety-five percent of recent income gains have gone to the richest among us. In other words, we are again faced with the tragic irony that those on the left who claim most loudly to be standing for fairness and equality often end up getting the worst results for those who need help the most. To paraphrase President Reagan's old line about the apostles of ''fairness,'' maybe they are fair in one way: Their policies don't discriminate; they bring misery to everybody—unless, of course, we are speaking of the elite of the elite. We all know why that is. Because when government policies hurt economic growth by stifling opportunities and drying up investment, it is the American worker who loses. It is those at the bottom of the economic ladder who suffer the most.

The best thing we can do to help the poor and working class is to get the private sector growing again. And we know how it is done—by implementing things such as a more competitive tax code, regulatory relief, approval of the Keystone Pipeline, and, of course, repealing ObamaCare, which is killing jobs.

The fact is that the policies of today's Washington Democrats actually entrench unfairness and make the playing field even more uneven.

Even the President's allies are beginning to understand. Big Labor wants to rewrite some provisions of the same ObamaCare law they helped muscle through. Why? Because, predictably, ObamaCare is now hurting the 40-hour

workweek and undermining the kind of employer-sponsored plans their members like and were told they would be able to keep. Union bosses also know that the President recently agreed to delay parts of the law for businesses. Now they want relief too. Why for business and not for unions? But what about everybody else? What about the middle class? What about college graduates or young couples trying to make ends meet while they start a family? Don't those folks deserve some relief from ObamaCare too?

That is why Senator COATS and I filed an amendment last week that would allow everyone else to take advantage of the ObamaCare delay already offered to businesses. If companies get to catch a break, then Republicans think the middle class should too. The Democrats who run Washington need to stop blocking us from even taking a vote on this important legislation—legislation that already passed the House of Representatives, by the way, on a bipartisan basis.

After all, as I have already indicated, ObamaCare is a big reason we are turning into a nation of part-time workers and that so many Americans will lose their jobs and the health care plans they like. It is also one of the reasons the rate of those either working or looking for work has dropped back to Carter-era levels—Carter-era levels—and that the average time it takes to find a job is longer than it has been literally in decades.

These are all good reasons not just to delay but to repeal this law and start over with bipartisan reforms that can actually reduce costs instead of killing jobs. I have confidence we will get there eventually because the only person who seems to be happy with ObamaCare is the guy it is named after—the guy it is named after. Because when everyone from union bosses to working moms wants to repeal this act, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the people standing in the way are more interested in what is good for their legacies than what is good for the country.

But, look, I am still holding out hope. I hope the President will take this 5-year anniversary of the financial crisis as a chance to reflect and to change course. I hope he will finally admit that what he has tried thus far has not worked; that it is not enough to just improve the lot of those who have influence in government; that he has to work for the middle class too. I hope he starts working with Members of both parties to start over on health care, to put our economy on a sound and sustainable footing, to get spending under control so we do not leave the same kind of mess to our children, as CBO again warned us yesterday.

Most important, I am hoping he starts thinking of ways to give those who are struggling in this economy a real chance to succeed. When he does, Republicans will be here ready to work with him, as we have since he first came to office.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

The Senator from Texas.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as you know, today marks the fifth anniversary of the 2008 financial panic which threw our country into a severe recession and the worst economic crisis this country has had since the 1930s. It has been 5 years since Lehman Brothers collapsed. It has been 5 years since the Federal Government seized full control of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. It has been 5 years since Washington bailed out AIG, the giant insurance company.

In the weeks and months following the events of September 2008, Members of both parties agreed that one of the most important things we could do is to fix the idea of too big to fail when it came to some of the largest financial institutions in America. Too big to fail—so the only alternative was for taxpayers to bail them out.

We wanted to end it. Five years later, I wish I could say we had succeeded. I wish I could say that too big to fail was a thing of the past. Unfortunately, the very law that was passed by our Democratic friends, primarily, that was supposed to end too big to fail actually codified it, actually made it more certain to occur because it gave Federal regulators the power to identify something called systemically important institutions. Doesn't that sound suspiciously like too big to fail if you are systemically important financial institutions?

We have already seen that systemically important firms enjoy huge funding advantages over smaller competitors, primarily community bankers in places such as my State, mostly because of the perception that these large companies enjoy a government bailout guarantee. In other words, their cost of doing business is lower because people actually perceive they have a Federal Government backstop available to bail them out if they get into trouble—not so for small credit unions, community bankers in places such as my State and around the country.

In other words, Dodd-Frank, rather than weakening this concept, actually strengthened the de facto partnership between Washington, DC, and New York, and primarily Wall Street. That is the exact opposite of what I think the American people thought was happening and certainly the opposite of what they were demanding since 2008. It is exactly the opposite of what our financial system needs in order to operate more safely and to avoid taxpayer bailouts such as we saw following 2008.

This is just another reason the U.S. economy continues to slog along, with the weakest recovery and the longest period of high unemployment since the Great Depression of the 1930s. Nearly 38 percent of America's unemployed have been jobless for more than 6 months. Let me say that again. Nearly 38 percent of Americans unemployed have been jobless for more than 6 months.

Those are tragic statistics because we all know that the longer someone is unemployed, the harder it is for them to get back into a job because they lose skills, they become less competitive in the labor markets.

The only reason unemployment rates actually fell was not because the economy was getting strong enough to create new jobs, but it was because fewer and fewer people actually were looking for work. More and more people actually gave up. All one has to do is go on the Internet and look at the Bureau of Labor Statistics under something called the labor participation rate, and we can see that the percentage of people actually looking for work has declined to the lowest point in about 30 years or so.

A recent study concludes that America is still 8.3 million jobs away from a full economic recovery—8.3 million Americans out of work who need to be back at work in order for us to get back on track.

Is it any wonder that a Pew Research Center poll indicated that 52 percent of people feel as though our job situation has hardly recovered at all since the great recession? Fifty-two percent think things have not gotten that much better.

Nevertheless, there seems to be this divide, this gulf between perception in Washington among the political elites and on Main Street. For example, in an ABC News broadcast this past weekend, President Obama said that since he took office, America has witnessed ''progress across the board.'' I guess ''progress'' is a relative term.

But since the official end of the recession in June 2008, median household income has declined by nearly $2,500. Average working families have $2,500 less to spend, so, of course, they do not feel as though we have had a recovery. They do not feel as though things have gotten better across the board, such as the President. Of course, that is before we even account for inflation. When we adjust the numbers to reflect the increase in consumer prices, the drop in median household income has been significantly larger than the $2,500 I just mentioned.

The President says he is concerned about income inequality, about the difference between the wealthy and average working families and the poor. But the New York Times has reported that the trend of rising income inequality ''appears to have accelerated during [this President's] administration.'' It has gotten worse. Indeed, according to one measure of the income gap, inequality has increased about four times faster under President Obama than it did under President George W. Bush.

Of course, America's income gap is mirrored by a yawning unemployment gap. Earlier this week, the Associated Press reported that ''the gap in employment rates between America's highest- and lowest-income families has stretched to its widest levels since officials began tracking the data a decade ago.''

Again, this is happening under a President who said rising income inequality is morally wrong, a President who believes rising income inequality is holding America's economic recovery back.

But the problem is not in his diagnosis, it is in his proposed remedies, his policies. His proposed remedies for growing inequality include more taxes, more spending by the Federal Government, more debt, and more regulations. It is symptomatic of the idea that Washington knows best. It does not, and we know because of the failed experiments over the last 5 years. Of course, if such policies were truly part of the solution, inequality would be declining. In other words, if the President's proposed solutions of more regulations, more taxes, and more Federal spending would work, we would be well on our way to an economic recovery, unemployment would be back to historic norms, and the economy would be growing. But it is not.

Then there is the cost of health insurance. This is another one of the burdens on particularly small businesses and individuals which are keeping the economy stagnant.

Back in 2008 the President famously promised that premiums for a family of four would decrease by about $2,500 if we would just pass his signature health care legislation, now known as ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, but instead the cost has gone up by nearly $2,400 between 2009 and 2012.

So we have median household income going down about $2,500, but actually the cost of health care, rather than going down, is going up by about the same amount. For that matter, the cost problem will only get worse once ObamaCare is fully implemented, as we are beginning to see as we see what the premiums are like in the individual market for people who buy their health care in the exchanges.

The National Journal found that ''for the vast majority of Americans,'' premiums will be higher under ObamaCare. That is pretty easy to understand because of the way it has been wired. For example, someone has said, it is as though, because of the guaranteed issue aspect of ObamaCare, someone can wait until they are sick to buy health insurance and the insurance company has to sell it to them. So somebody said: That is akin to waiting until your house is on fire before you actually buy fire insurance. That is not insurance anymore, and that runs up the cost for everybody, as does a phenomenon such as age banning, where young people my daughters' age, in their early thirties, are going to have to bear the cost of health care for older Americans because they cannot charge older Americans any more than three times more than what they charge young, healthy people such as my daughters, even though their consumption of health care, we know, will not be anywhere near that ratio.

As projected, the President's health care law will cause individual insurance premiums to skyrocket all across America, including Texas.

Policies such as ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank, as I keep hearing from my community bankers, have increased the cost of doing business and generated enormous uncertainty about the future. I was talking to a businessman in Houston just 2 days ago. He said: The thing that is holding America back, our economy back, is uncertainty. People don't know what their taxes are going to be like, what the regulatory environment is going to be like. They don't know about our failure to deal with our national debt, now about $17 trillion. As the Fed begins to wind down its purchases of our own debt, interest rates start to go back up. What is that going to mean?

It is going to mean we have to pay China and other creditors more money for the money they have loaned to us because of that $17 trillion debt, and it will simply crowd out our ability to fund other priorities such as national security, among others.

The story of our sluggish recovery is ultimately a story of wasted human capital, again another tragedy. It is a story of mothers and fathers who cannot find full-time jobs and who are having trouble supporting their families. It is a story of college graduates who are unemployed, living at home, and drowning in student loan debt.

As economists Keith Hennessey and Ed Lazear have written, ''The severe recession was bad enough, but the slow recovery is doing just as much damage to living standards since it is sustained over a longer time frame.''

I would say to our President: If you care about reducing income inequality, if you care about saving the American dream, let's try something new. You know, the definition of insanity, one pundit said, was doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different outcome. So let's try something new, because we know the status quo has not worked. Instead of piling more burdens on job creators and making it harder for Americans to secure full-time employment, let's embrace policies that make it easier to create jobs and easier to get full-time work. Let's reform our Tax Code so it is progrowth, make it simpler, make it fairer, make it more logical, make it more conducive to that strong economic growth that is going to create jobs.

Let's go back to the drawing board on health care and embrace sensible patient-centered reforms that will reduce costs and increase accessibility. We are never going to change our economic trajectory until we change our economic policies. Again, doing the same thing over and over again is not going to change the outcome. We need to try something new.

The policies of the past 4½ years have given us an economy that is failing to deliver the kind of job creation and income gains Americans want and they need. As the President's own Treasury Secretary said this week, ''Too many Americans cannot find work, growth is not fast enough, and the very definition of what it means to be middle class is being undercut by trends in our economy that must be addressed.''

I could not agree with him more. So isn't it time to try something different?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

ENERGY AMENDMENT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I would like to follow up on some of the comments by Senator CORNYN about these massive burdens on American families, how it is impacting their lives, their quality of life. Those are burdens forced upon them by this administration.

I rise to talk about an amendment I filed to the energy efficiency bill that we will be debating today on the floor. This amendment would stop President Obama's attempt to impose a massive increase to the national energy bill. It will affect all Americans because, in a sense, essentially what we have is a huge energy tax caused by government regulations.

My amendment blocks the issuance of new carbon pollution standards for new and existing coal-fired powerplants. Those standards are due out from the Environmental Protection Agency this very week. They can do great harm to the American economy and to American families.

We need to make America's energy as clean as we can as fast as we can. Everyone knows that. It is important, though, that we do it without hurting our economy and without costing thousands of middle-class jobs. The American people, through their elected representatives in Congress, have rejected President Obama's reckless energy policies in the past. This past June President Obama issued a Presidential memorandum directing the EPA to issue carbon pollution standard regulations.

My amendment would require the approval of Congress for any regulations causing increases of our national energy bill, just like the one the EPA would create with these regulations. If these regulations are allowed to take effect, they will increase energy costs for the people who can bear the burden the least—seniors, low-income families, small businesses.

High energy costs will destroy thousands of jobs in places such as my home State of Wyoming but also in Missouri, Ohio, West Virginia, Montana, and many other States. We have already seen coal-fired powerplants shut down and reduce capacity, putting many people out of work. That has been the President's plan all along. These new regulations would be the latest step.

Remember, President Obama said that under his plan ''electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.'' Skyrocket. That is his word, not mine. He said energy producers could still build coal-fired powerplants, but that the cost would be so high it would bankrupt them. The President should be looking for ways to help businesses grow, to help create jobs, not pushing his regulations to find backdoor ways to bankrupt them.

My amendment accomplishes a number of goals, beginning with protecting American jobs. That has been our focus in this difficult economy. The Nation's recession ended more than 4 years ago. We have not had the recovery, though, we should have had because the President's policies have failed. The President promised he had a plan to create so-called green jobs. People have seen that those green jobs never materialized.

Now the President is going after the red, white, and blue jobs that continue to power our country. The Obama administration and its allies in the fringe environmental movement say we need to get rid of those jobs to make way for new ones. They say coal miners and powerplant workers should fade into history along with the men and women who built stagecoaches, telegraphs, and record players. Their idea is that if we simply let coal die, those folks can start making something new.

That kind of thinking is a luxury a lot of Americans do not want and cannot afford. When excessive Washington redtape crushes a coal mine or a coal-fired powerplant in a small community, those jobs are not the only thing that go. The town loses its revenue base. That hurts its public schools, its police, its fire departments, senior busing services for those who cannot drive. Everything that town does to serve its people suffers because of decisions made by this administration in Washington, DC.

Before long, people start to move away, looking for a better chance somewhere else. Small businesses do not have enough customers, so they shut down, and the town withers away. When Washington uses the heavy hand of excessive regulation, there are a whole host of ways it hurts American communities. One of those ways is its impact on public health.

Studies consistently show unemployment increases the likelihood of illness, hospital visits, and premature death. Families where a parent is out of work are more likely to fall into poverty. Children in poor families are four times as likely as other children to be in fair or poor health.

The bureaucrats at the EPA can shake their magic eight ball to predict health impacts of carbon pollution on virtual people who have not been born yet, years into the future. But if their predictions are wrong, and I expect they are, they will simply shake their magic eight ball again.

Meanwhile, the health effects caused by their excessive regulations are very real for real families, real children, real seniors. My amendment addresses this public health issue. It does it by preventing this massive unemployment that would result from new redtape and higher energy costs.

Finally, my amendment is clear that Congress should act on an affordable energy plan. Nothing in my amendment says Congress should not work with State and local governments to protect communities from severe weather events where lives are at stake. My amendment is clear that these kinds of decisions should be for Congress to make, not for the President to make on his own. That is true whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican. I hope to get a vote on my amendment to ensure that the Obama administration does not impose an increase in our national energy bill on the American people.

Along the same lines, I want to speak briefly about another opportunity we have to ensure a stronger energy future for our country. This week will mark an anniversary that I hope will spur the American people to demand some action from the Obama administration. Five full years ago TransCanada first applied for permission to build the Keystone XL Pipeline. President Obama still cannot make up his mind to approve the permits. He dithers, he delays, he makes excuses.

It is time to act. It is time finally to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline so America can start to get the benefits of this important energy project.

According to the State Department analysis, the pipeline's construction could support 42,000 jobs across the country. The President should be grabbing any opportunity he can to help the private sector create jobs. Instead, he says the jobs the Keystone XL Pipeline would create are ''a blip relative to the need.'' Is this how the President sees the livelihoods of 42,000 American families, a blip?

This is the fourth major pipeline project between Canada and the United States since 2006. All the others were approved and the process took between 15 and 28 months for each of them. The permit process for Keystone XL is now 60 months and still counting. Why is it taking so long? In October 2010, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said her department was ''inclined'' to approve the project. In July 2011, the administration said it was ''publicly committed to reaching a decision'' before the end of the year. That was 2011. The deadline came and it went.

This past June, the President suddenly raised the bar. He said the ''net effects of the pipeline's impacts on our climate will be absolutely critical'' in his decision. We know today what those effects would be. Studies show the Keystone XL Pipeline would not have a substantial impact on greenhouse gas emissions. That is because even if the pipeline does not get built, the energy is still going to be developed. China has absolutely offered to buy the energy from Canada. This pipeline has the support of more than 70 percent of the American people. It has the support of major labor unions, of every State along its route.

A bipartisan majority in the House and 62 Senators support it. Still, President Obama cannot make up his mind. He delays his decisions on this vital infrastructure project and at the same time orders regulations that would impose what amounts to a national energy tax. He stalls a pipeline that would create thousands of jobs and at the same time orders regulations that would destroy thousands of jobs. He stalls a pipeline that would help middle-class families while he promotes a policy that would take more money out of the pockets of hard-working Americans. We need to improve America's energy picture, without destroying jobs or bankrupting our country.

President Obama can help do that. He can do it today by doing two things. First, he should drop his plan to impose a new increase on national energy costs and let it be debated by Congress. Second, he should immediately approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. If the President is serious about helping middle-class families, he will prove it. If he is not ready to join Democrats and Republicans in Congress in making reasonable energy policies that help American families, then the Senate should act.

Struggling middle-class families are asking for our help. It is time to give them the help they need.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Affordable Care Act. At home in Hawaii we have a saying, ''Lucky you live Hawaii.'' That can

mean a lot of different things to different people, but when talking about access to affordable, effective care, this phrase has particular meaning.

In the early 1970s, the rate of uninsured in our State was about 30 percent, meaning roughly 1 in 3 in our population would live in fear that sickness or injury could cause financial ruin for themselves or their families. The people of Hawaii knew this was unacceptable.

In 1974, the State government passed an innovative piece of legislation, the Prepaid Health Care Act. Now simply known as Prepaid, this legislation requires employers to provide affordable and quality care for hundreds of thousands of individuals and their families.

Our uninsured rate is one of the lowest in the country, with only 8 percent of our population lacking any type of insurance. Even though Hawaii has been at the forefront in making health care a right and not a privilege, we still have a way to go. Even with Prepaid, there are more than 100,000 people in our State still uninsured.

When the Affordable Care Act passed 3 years ago, I knew it meant that those who are uninsured or underinsured in Hawaii would find some relief. We have already seen major successes since this landmark legislation passed.

Yet people are still afraid of ObamaCare. This is because a lot of people have spent a lot of time and money to make the American public believe that somehow this legislation is bad for them and will harm them. That is why, when asked about health care reform as a whole, many Americans say they are concerned, they have anxiety. But when you talk to people back in Hawaii and across the Nation, and even those who think they don't like health care reform, they like what it does.

For example, parents like that they can keep their children on their health insurance until the age of 26, which affects 6,000 young adults in the State of Hawaii. People will no longer have to live in fear of lifetime limits on health benefits, which will help more than 460,000 residents of Hawaii, including 115,000 children. More than half a million people in my State will no longer have to worry about being denied coverage because of a pre-existing condition.

As a State that has committed to Medicaid expansion, Hawaii will also now be able to provide care to close to more than 68,000 residents starting in 2014.

People like these policies. People like what health care reform is already doing for them.

While my colleagues across the aisle are looking to repeal this historic legislation, I am looking forward to how we can build on its success.

Let me be clear. The fact that health care reform is working is exactly why the detractors of the ACA are trying so hard to stop it from being fully implemented. They know the American people are embracing ObamaCare because of all the good it will do for our families.

In particular, I am looking forward to the opening of our marketplace, the Hawaii Health Connector, on October 1. Many of the people I have spoken to want to know what the marketplace may mean for them. Simply, the Hawaii Health Connector is going to provide a consumer-friendly way for residents of my State to view and compare a wide variety of plans. Then they will be able to pick the coverage that best suits them and their families. My office has been in constant contact with the Connector, and their staff in Hawaii has been working tirelessly to set up the online and phone interface, and to provide assistance and navigation in the form of kokua, a word in Hawaiian that essentially means pitching in to help your neighbors and your community with no regard for personal gain.

This is reflective of the values we have in Hawaii, that everyone deserves to be healthy and have access to affordable and quality care. That doesn't mean we still don't have a lot of work to do.

I am hoping a number of bills I have introduced, including the Rural Preventive Health Care Training Act and the Strengthening Health Disparities Data Collection Act, will be considered and voted on by the full Senate in order to solve some of our worst issues in providing care to rural and underserved populations in Hawaii and across the Nation.

I believe ACA is working the way it should be. It is increasing the number of insured Americans, promoting preventive care that will help to reduce the human and financial costs of avoidable illness and lowering the costs of care for everyone.

Many of my colleagues in Congress choose not to see any of this. The only option for them is total repeal, with zero tolerance for open discussion or compromise on this landmark legislation, but that kind of thinking is what causes the gridlock Americans are so tired of. I understand there will be parts of this law, which is a sweeping piece of legislation, that will need to be amended over time to resolve any kinks. These kinds of revisions have been done with every other landmark domestic social policy that has been passed in this country, including Medicare and Social Security.

I am willing, as are my colleagues on the Democratic side, to come to the table and work with Republicans to make necessary improvements over time, but I refuse to engage in the process of political and parliamentary gymnastics designed to score small, short-term wins at the expense of the American people and the economy.

It must be pointed out that anyone who wants to grind the entire government to a halt over the implementation of this several-years-old law will cause harm to the economy and harm to their communities, because Federal funding provides essential services and programs to constituents in every State and every county in every district. If improvements or changes need to be made, they can be done through the regular order with hearings, serious discussions, and bipartisan support. Ultimately, what we are seeing in Hawaii and across the Nation is President Obama's historic health care package is making inroads in improving our health care system. Efforts to stop that cannot be tolerated by Members of Congress and the people of this Nation.

I will continue to support its full implementation and look forward to working with all of my colleagues in the Senate to build upon its success.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A MASSACHUSETTS PERSPECTIVE

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, today I am here to give my first speech on the floor of the Senate. I do so with deep respect and reverence for the history of this Chamber and for the giants of the Senate who have served before us. From Massachusetts, our recent roster of Senators reads like a history textbook: President John F. Kennedy, who inspired a Nation—President Kennedy's desk is right here, and it is so appropriate that my extraordinary partner from Massachusetts, Senator WARREN, occupies it today—the legendary Ted Kennedy—he had the vision to make health care a right and not a privilege; Ed Brooke, the first African-American popularly elected to the Senate; Paul Tsongas, a model of independence; for 28 years John Kerry was a champion for the people of Massachusetts. Now he is our chief diplomat to the world, his skill already shown in his ability to bring Russia and Syria to the negotiating table.

America is the greatest country on Earth.

My father drove a truck for the Hood Milk Company. He graduated from the vocational program at Lawrence High School. My mother was going to be senior class president in high school, but her mother died when she was a junior. She had to abandon her college dreams to stay home and take care of her younger sisters.

That was before the New Deal, before Social Security, and before Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In those days the

only social safety net for families was that one of the girls had to stay home.

I was the first in my family to go to college. I drove an ice cream truck to work my way through Boston College as a commuter. I did the same for law school. I took out Federal student loans, like so many millions of American students have to do today.

Thanks to the people of our State, this son of a milkman is now serving the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the U.S. Senate.

I am a son of Malden, but I do not come just to occupy a seat in the Senate. I come here to stand and to speak for all those families, to seek change that uplifts those families and their future. To everyone here I say: That will be how I conduct myself here in the Senate.

I come here today to discuss my perspective, formed by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, guided by its people, practiced in the House of Representatives for more than 36 years, and open to new knowledge, new ideas, and innovative ways to move our country forward.

From its inception, Massachusetts has thrived because it is a wellspring for the advancement of humanity's ideas and ideals. Nearly 400 years ago the pilgrims braved an uncertain passage to Plymouth as religious innovators, but the pilgrims would likely not have survived the new world's harsh environment without learning new ways from the native Wampanoag Indians—the ''people of the dawn,'' as their tribal name translates.

So our bearings were set early in the Bay State. In a sense, we in Massachusetts are all people of the dawn, looking over the horizon toward a new frontier, striving to forge a better tomorrow.

It is no surprise that when America moved from farms to factories it began in Massachusetts. Massachusetts has survived and it has thrived because of our tradition of innovation and imagination.

We invent the materials that power our economy. We initiate the moral discussions that advance a Nation. We are never satisfied with what we have accomplished, instead, always pushing for progress and embracing the promise of the rising sun. We know from experience that when we invest in the future we create jobs here and now in our country.

During the last few decades, the pursuit of the possible that is hard wired into our Massachusetts DNA has helped us weather tough economies and rough international competition better than many other States.

We have become a high-tech, clean-tech, biotech hub for America and for the world. At places such as MIT and at companies such as Bolt, Beranek and Newman in Boston, the underlying architecture of the Internet was envisioned and set in motion.

Earlier in my career, Congress passed three telecommunications bills on a bipartisan basis that I helped author. They removed barriers for innovation and unlocked opportunity for entrepreneurs, creating jobs in Massachusetts and across the Nation by unleashing more than $1 trillion of private sector investment in this emerging technology area.

Now the future of telecom is mobile. Massachusetts has several hundred mobile companies. We have the strongest robotics centers in the Nation. We have the burgeoning digital games industry centered in our State. We are ready for the next generation of technology jobs because we spent decades building our digital foundation.

Massachusetts was once the Nation's leading power producer, when Melville wrote ''Moby Dick'' by the light of a whale oil lamp. Now we are at the forefront of the most recent energy revolution.

Our electricity is getting cleaner, we are using it smarter, and it is getting cheaper. Massachusetts is now the No. 1 State in the country when it comes to energy efficiency. Just yesterday Boston was named America's most energy-efficient city.

Our shores will host the first offshore wind energy farm in the Nation. The same winds that brought the pilgrims to Plymouth Rock will now power a new generation of jobs in Massachusetts.

Massachusetts is seventh in the Nation in solar installed per person, even in a State more known for the perfect storm than for perfect sunny days.

In Massachusetts alone, clean energy now employs 80,000 people across 5,000 businesses in our State.

If we continue our commitments to clean energy, we will put steelworkers, iron workers, welders, and electricians to work building a new backbone for a new energy economy in the United States and around the world.

Massachusetts is the hub for biotech on the entire planet. We are No. 1 in per-capita dollars awarded by the National Institutes of Health, supporting 35,000 jobs Statewide. Health is our first wealth, but in Massachusetts it is also one of the best job creators.

We are an idea factory pumping out new concepts, creating new companies that produce new jobs and discover cures for deadly diseases.

In Massachusetts, we recognize that education is a ladder of opportunity that allows every child to maximize their God-given abilities. The first public school in America was established in Massachusetts. Today, Massachusetts students are No. 1 in the Nation in math, in reading, and tied for No. 1 with New York in science.

For students in Massachusetts and around the country, we should never let the big dreams of attending college be thwarted by the small print of overly burdensome loans.

As children learn in an online environment, we need to make sure they can grow, develop, and make mistakes that won't derail a promising future. That is why I will soon introduce my do not track kids legislation on a bipartisan basis to protect the privacy of children online.

The value of our economy grows because it is imbued with our American values. What unites us is the unshakable belief that no matter where you come from, no matter what your circumstances, you can achieve the American dream. We believe everyone should get a fair shot. No one should be left behind.

It is time to get back to the values that made Massachusetts and this country great. It is time to make real progress, creating an economy that works for everyone. It is time to protect a woman's right to choose. It is time to deliver to the LGBT community all of the protections and rights under the Constitution.

It is time that we put real gun control measures on the books. The horrific mass shooting at the Navy yard is the latest deadly reminder that we need to do more to stem the tide of gun violence in this country. Newtown, Aurora—these tragedies are not inevitable, they are preventable. This senseless carnage must end.

We need a ban on assault weapons, and we need a ban on high-capacity magazines. We need universal background checks combined with comprehensive care for our mentally ill. We need to put an end to the partisan gridlock that prevents even the most basic of gun control measures from becoming law.

In the next few weeks we will see our seventh fight over our debt and deficit in the last couple of years. We need to break down this rampant ideology that threatens to turn a government that works for the people into a government that simply shuts down.

We must also end the mindless across-the-board cuts from sequestration. Cutting programs such as Head Start will leave a generation of kids lagging behind. Slashing investments in science means the breakthroughs that create jobs and cure deadly diseases could go undiscovered. Cutting defense spending mindlessly can undermine our security.

We need a new transportation bill that puts union workers back out there working, rebuilding our roads and our bridges.

While many economists have labeled the recent downturn a recession, for our working families and low-wage earners it has become an economic depression. Economic inequality tears at the fabric that makes our country great. It turns ''E pluribus unum'' into ''everyone for themselves.'' We must raise the minimum wage for the people who are struggling to make it into the middle class.

We need to create an end to the era of climate denial. Climate change is irrefutable. It is raising sea levels. It is giving storms more power.

The planet is running a fever. There are no emergency rooms for planets.

We must put in place the preventive care of unleashing a renewable energy revolution in wind and solar, in biomass and geothermal, and in energy efficiency to avoid the worst, most catastrophic impact of climate change on this planet. We are seeing it on an ongoing basis not just here in our country but across the planet.

Our moral duty to future generations calls for us to address climate change, but it also is an economic opportunity to create new jobs here in our country.

I will soon introduce legislation that will call for America, by 2025, to reach a 25-percent target of clean energy and energy efficiency improvements. This bill will create jobs as it cuts pollution. And I will continue to work to pass climate legislation, as I did in the House of Representatives.

I will also introduce legislation to fix our aging natural gas system in Massachusetts and across the country, making it cleaner and more efficient. We can use affordable natural gas and clean energy, built and delivered through the work of union hands, to power new American manufacturing centers. That is a job-creation triple play—generate new energy, build new infrastructure, and manufacture new American products.

We must not massively export our natural gas abroad or I fear we will continue to export our young men and women to dangerous places all over the world and lose opportunities to lower electricity rates here and to increase the manufacturing jobs here in the United States.

Fifty years ago President Kennedy announced the ambitious goal of sending an American safely to the Moon. He told us that we would need a giant rocket made of new metal alloys, some of which had not yet been invented. It would have to be fitted together with precision better than the finest watch. It would have to be able to be returned to Earth safely at speeds never before approximated by humanity. And it would all have to be done in less than 8 years.

President Kennedy urged us to be bold. I say to this Chamber, it is time for us to be bold. In this era of innovation, there are jobs that are not yet imagined in fields that haven't been created with industries that don't yet exist. We should be bold.

America watched with pride as Neil Armstrong stepped onto the Moon and an American flag was planted as a symbol of our success. In this Capitol Building, there is a flag that was brought back from the Moon. It testifies to the returns we receive when we invest in American ingenuity, when we seek the dawn of discovery, when we invest in our people and in our industries, and when we follow the universal American values of justice and tolerance and liberty and equality.

We can use our talents and our tools to help all people everywhere build a more peaceful, prosperous future.

I look forward to working with every Senator in the months and years ahead to make the 21st century more educated, more healthy, more prosperous, and more fair than the 20th century was. That is our challenge. That is our opportunity. But we must do it together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I extend my appreciation to Senator MARKEY. I had the good fortune of serving in the House of Representatives with him. When he decided to run for the Senate, I was excited, and I am so happy he is here with us. The speech he just gave indicates the work we should be doing. I have always admired him.

I appreciate very much what he has done for the State of Nevada in many different areas. He has been at the forefront of protecting Nevada from the ravages of something that could be an environmental disaster—nuclear waste—and has been someone who has led the country in so many different ways in recognizing the dangers of climate change.

In telecommunications, no one in the last 30 years has done more for modernizing our telecommunications system than ED MARKEY. So I appreciate very much his good work.

As I sat and listened to this remarkably important speech, I thought of the Massachusetts delegation—two new Senators, but what wonderful Senators they are, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN and Senator ED MARKEY. The potential they have is so astounding.

On the news today: This will be the least productive Senate in the history of the country. People, such as the Senators from Massachusetts, are being prevented from doing good. There is no better example of that than the Senator who was on the floor listening to Senator MARKEY, the senior Senator from New Hampshire.

A bill to make our energy consumption around America more efficient, energy efficiency, a bill we should have done a long time ago—we can't do it because we have the anarchists running the House of Representatives, and they are doing a pretty good job over here too. I would say about 40 percent of the Republicans over here are anarchists, tea party-driven.

This Energy bill has five nongermane amendments, most of them dealing with health care. The Republicans are obsessed with what is the law of the land—ObamaCare. It has been the law for almost 4 years. The U.S. Supreme Court has said it is constitutional, but that doesn't take away their obsession to try to undercut this legislation, which is going into effect in a big way on October 1.

It is a shame that we are not able to legislate the way we did. Everything is a squabble and a fight. I came here more than three decades ago having already had a legislative career in the State of Nevada, and we have been able to work together to do so many good things—until recently.

We are now waiting to see what the House of Representatives is going to do, how absurd what it sends us is going to be. We know it is going to be something really strange and weird because the Speaker has to do everything he can to try to mold a piece of legislation to meet the needs of the tea party, the anarchists. And I say that without any equivocation. They do not want government to work on any level—not the local level, not the State level, and certainly not here. Any day that is a bad day for government is a cheering day for them.

So I am so impressed with the Senator's speech, but I am distressed at what is going on here in the Senate as far as trying to get work done. Bipartisanship is a thing of the past. Now all we do is ''gotcha'' legislation.

I was given this assurance by many Republicans: Let's do energy. Energy efficiency—let's do it. We will work together on a bipartisan basis.

And the first thing out of the box is something that will derail this legislation.

So I am thankful that we have a new Senator who is as talented and as good as he is, but I wish his talents could be better put to work here in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I am proud to come to the floor today to welcome my colleague ED MARKEY on giving his first speech on the floor of the Senate.

Long before I became a U.S. Senator, ED MARKEY was in the House of Representatives, became the dean of the Massachusetts delegation, and has been out there working for the families of Massachusetts and the families of this country. He has been a leader on issues ranging from energy and the environment to technology and telecommunications, and he knows how to get things done. That is very inspiring.

I just wanted to come by today to listen to his first speech, congratulate him on his first speech, and to say how much I am looking forward to working with my partner ED MARKEY in the Senate. We are going to do our best to get something done.

Congratulations.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1392, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1392) to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Wyden (for Merkley) amendment No. 1858, to provide for a study and report on standby usage power standards implemented by States and other industrialized nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I also would like to welcome the new Senator from Massachusetts to this body. I listened to his speech, and we will have some discussions over some of those items at some time, I am certain. But I also listened to the leader's speech following that, and I am a little bit disappointed in that speech.

He mentioned that we were the least productive Senate in history. I think there is a reason for that, and the reason is that we are doing dealmaking now instead of legislating.

I came here 16 years ago and have watched for a number of years as we have legislated—and ''legislated'' means getting votes on amendments. Getting votes on amendments happens much quicker than trying to make some kind of deal to limit amendments. Yes, some of the amendments in all those years have not been relevant to the bill we were talking about. Usually, once they have been covered, they are kind of done with and they do not come up on every bill. But the same tactic has been used to stifle amendments to bills, even relevant ones.

Both sides are at fault. It is not just one side. Both sides are stopping amendments from being voted on. We need to vote on amendments. Of course, the first one up is one I have been working on. The reason it is being brought up on this bill is that this is the first bill after a recess on which we can put anything.

During the recess, there was a huge change in the health care reform bill. That huge change was that the President decided he would exempt Congress from being under the bill, from having to do the same thing the rest of America will do. If you work in a business in America, a private business, and your business does not provide insurance and you have to go on the exchange—now, of course, the Senate and Federal Government provides insurance, but we all agreed we would go on the exchange because the American people had to go on the exchange. When we go on the exchange, we should have to abide by the same rules as anybody else who goes on the exchange.

Private business, if they say we are not going to buy insurance, their people have to go on the exchange, and if they go on the exchange, they cannot get a contribution from their employer for their insurance. There is a subsidy for people who earn under, I think it is $42,000 a year as an individual or $92,000 as a family. They can get a Federal subsidy. They cannot get a subsidy from their employer.

The President decided, through the Office of Personnel Management, that Senators should be able to move that contribution over to the exchanges. That is different from everybody else. We should have to live under the same laws we passed. That was the contention we made when we put that amendment in the bill. That amendment went in the bill in the Health, Education, Labor & Pensions Committee. It went in the bill in the Finance Committee. It was agreed to on the floor of the Senate. We said we ought to be under the same rules as everybody else when it comes to the health exchanges, and we ought to try those health exchanges so we can see what America is going through.

We did that. We did it—maybe did it to ourselves—but that is the way government ought to work, with those who pass the law living under the law. All we are asking for is a vote to see if the Senate agrees we ought to live under the law the way the other people will have to live under the law.

As far as delaying the bill, it only takes probably 30 minutes for a 15-minute vote. It should only take 15 minutes for a 15-minute vote, but it takes 30 minutes at least, sometimes a couple hours for a 15-minute vote, if it is a close one and they want to negotiate with some of the people voting on it, but we ought to have to vote on it. We ought to put our names on the line as to how we feel about having the American people in a situation where their employer cannot contribute to their health insurance if they go on the exchange and make that same law apply to us.

I traveled Wyoming during the recess. We traveled about 6,000 miles by car, and I did a lot of listening sessions. I never heard anybody say, no, I think Congress ought to be able to continue doing what they have been doing before; instead, Congress ought to come under the same law.

There is a little addition to this bill that we did not put in the original bill. Maybe that is what is holding it up. That little addition to the bill is saying the President and the Vice President and the President's appointees should come under the same rules as Congress in this instance, going into the exchange. I hope the President, since the bill is kind of named after him, would want to be under the bill just like everybody else. If we are not going to allow contributions from businesses to go to regular people who go onto the exchange, then the same rule ought to apply to us.

That is pretty much what the amendment says. It clarifies the law and makes sure the Office of Personnel Management cannot exempt us without authority. It is more than a clarification, it is a complete reversal of what we passed in this body. When we passed it, I think on the floor it was unanimous. That means it was pretty bipartisan. That means we all agreed that maybe we ought to live under the same laws as the rest of the people in America.

Let's just have a vote on it. As I say, 30 minutes is about all it would take for a 15-minute vote and we could move on to other issues. That is the way we used to do things around here. It was not unusual for a bill to have 150 amendments. I don't ever remember voting on 150 amendments because there is some duplication in amendments that are turned in. There are also some people who realize, as the debate goes along, that their amendment would not pass and they do not want it to be voted on and lose when they might be able to win with it later. Of course I am in favor of doing relevant amendments on bills. You will find usually any amendment I am signed on to is relevant to the bill.

The reason this is an exception is because it came up during the recess and the effect begins on October 1. I do not know what other bills are going to come up before October 1. At the pace we are going, this will not even make it by October 1. Just voting on bills rather than trying to negotiate it down to a 10-vote package—on the immigration bill I think we had 9 votes. It took us 3 weeks. There were about 200 amendments, probably 150 that could have been voted on and in 3 weeks I think we could have been through 150 of them and it would have made it a better bill. That is what legislating is.

All of those would not have passed. Maybe very few would have passed. Maybe only 9 would have passed. But people would have had a decision and would have been able to represent what their people back home are telling them, and that is what we are supposed to do here. The reason the Senate has the rules it does is so we can actually represent the people back home. One of the ways we do that is through amendments. Occasionally, there will be surprises that something that is not relevant might wind up on a bill. Usually, if it is not relevant, it gets defeated. There is usually a way to process a whole lot of amendments in a hurry; that is, with a tabling motion, but we are just not getting the vote. We ought to do some voting around here and move on.

This is an important bill, and there are some good amendments that have been turned in on which we would also like a vote. We should go through them and then we can be a productive body. Then we could cover a lot of bills that would go through in about 3 days, but we spend days negotiating not having amendments, and when we have that pent-up objection to our amendments not getting on there, it gets more pent up, more angry, more divisive, more partisan as the process goes by.

What I have referred to, the way the Senate used to work—just vote on amendments. We will not like all of them. We know some of them will wind up in an ad against us when we run, but that has always been the case and there is no reason to change it now.

I hope we vote on amendments and get busy. It is an important bill. I would like to see the bill finished. We need to do a lot of things on energy for

this country, particularly to keep energy prices down where people expect them to be. Again, let's vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I certainly appreciate the comments from my friend and fellow Senator. He does speak to the obvious. We have an opportunity for some amendments on what I think most of us would agree is an important bill, this energy efficiency bill. How we move forward is indicative of whether this is a body that is going to start working, whether this is going to be a body that is defined as dysfunctional or, as was suggested earlier in a report that came out early in September, that this Senate could prove to be the least productive in our Senate history.

That is not a title or a banner this Senator wants to wear. I think we want to work around here. I think we want to try to produce. I think we want to legislate. In fact, I know that is what I want to do. That is why I applaud my colleagues, Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN, for all of the effort they have given—themselves, their staffs working with the chairman of the energy committee, his staff, my staff working together for a couple of years now—to produce what I think is a pretty good bill. This is a bill that is focused on a piece of our energy portfolio, if you will, that is critically important: the aspect of efficiency and how we work to use less.

What we have in front of us is not legislation that is controversial in the sense that it is pitting different philosophies against one another. We are bogged down in our own inertia and cannot figure out how we even get to start. That is a pretty poor reflection on us. The way we get to start is how we started this debate just a few days ago, when Senator WYDEN and I came to the floor with the sponsors of the bill, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator PORTMAN, and we said: OK, great bill. We talked about the advantages of energy efficiency and all that Shaheen-Portman delivers, this very bipartisan product and effort.

Then we started talking about amendments, amendments that would actually strengthen this bill. We had no fewer than one dozen Members come to the floor, on both sides of the aisle, talking about their good ideas, how we are going to build in more efficiencies—whether it is in our schools or public buildings; how we can help nonprofits. These are all good, strong, healthy ideas.

Then we are here today and, as my friend from Wyoming has indicated, we are stalled out. We are not moving forward. The majority leader suggested this morning—his words, not mine—that we perhaps would not finish this legislation. That is quite disturbing to me. That is quite disturbing to me because if we cannot finish legislation such as an energy efficiency bill, something that most of us would recognize is a good approach to our energy issues in this country, what are we going to be able to do on the very big stuff?

We talk about pent-up demand for amendments. Let me suggest there is a pent-up demand for real energy legislation. For 5 years now we have not seen an energy measure debated on the floor of the Senate. That doesn't mean we have not passed some good energy bills. In fact, I was pleased to work with the chairman in passing two hydroelectric bills just before the August recess. These are good bills. These are truly going to help us as we work to reduce our emissions, provide for jobs, provide for greater electrification across the country. These are good. But we have not had that good, comprehensive discussion about the energy issues that have impacted our Nation in the past 5 years.

Think about what has happened in 5 years. Five years ago, if someone had mentioned the shale revolution, people would not have had a clue what they were talking about.

Think about what has happened with natural gas over the past 5 years. The Presiding Officer knows full well because her State has the lowest unemployment in the Nation. The Presiding Officer represents a State where almost everybody has a job. In fact, most people have two or three jobs.

When you think about the changing dynamics of an energy world, think about it in the context of a timeline. What happened over the last 5 years? Boom. Think about what happened to the economy. We read the articles from just a couple of weeks ago about how natural gas is not only helping those who work in the industry, it is a rising tide that lifts all boats. When people are paying less for their utilities, it allows them to spend more on the economy, and as a result everyone is benefiting. Our economy is benefiting and the unemployment picture is improving.

We are seeing good, positive things because of our energy future. Everybody seems to be bullish about it except us in the Senate because we cannot seem to get an energy bill to the floor. When we do finally have a bill, after years of good hard work by good folks wanting to do the right thing, we get to the floor and we get stalled out.

Again, there is pent-up demand for amendments because what we have known as regular order has not been so regular anymore. The chairman of the energy committee, and I, as the ranking member, think we have worked very hard. We have worked diligently on a daily basis to make sure we are working within our committee. We are producing bills.

In fact, as I understand, our committee has produced more than half of all the bills that have been reported and are ready for action on the floor. We have rolled up our sleeves and said: There are going to be areas where we disagree, but on those areas where we can come together and make some good happen, let's make it happen, and we have been doing that. But you know what. If a committee works hard and produces good things and still doesn't go anywhere—wow. After a while we wonder why we are working so hard around here.

I know why I am working hard. I am working hard because the people in my State pay more for their energy than anyplace else in the country. I am working hard to make sure we have jobs for Alaskans and jobs for all people. I am working hard because I think the energy policy is fundamental to everything we do. We need to have the opportunity to have a full-on debate, and if we have some amendments that are tough, that is the way it is. Nobody asked me to come here and represent the people of Alaska because they knew that every vote was going to be easy. That is not how it works. Let's take some of the hard votes and let's get to the business at hand, which is a good, strong, bipartisan energy efficiency bill. Then when we are done with that one, I want to work with the chairman to address the unfinished business.

I want to work on measures that will help us enhance our energy production, whether it is with our natural gas onshore or offshore, whether it is to do what we can so we truly become an energy-independent nation or whether it is how we deal with some pretty hard issues, such as how we treat our nuclear waste and how we are going to move forward with an energy future that is based on renewables and alternatives, which I am all about.

We all stand here and talk about an ''all of the above'' approach. But you know what. People stop believing it when we just talk about it and we don't do anything to enhance our policies because we cannot get a bill to the floor. Then, when we get a bill to the floor, we hamstring ourselves.

I am not ready to give up on this energy efficiency bill. I am not ready to give up on energy policy or legislating in the energy sector just because we are getting bogged down. We have to demonstrate to the American public that we are governing. They are asking us to lead in an area on which we have not legislated in 5 years.

I know my colleague from Oregon, the chairman, agrees with me when I say we had some issues within our committee, and we are proud of the work we have done. We have proposals that focus on how we can make existing programs better or perhaps we need to repeal them. We have worked hard on a bipartisan basis with the authorizers and the appropriators to develop a good, solid proposal for how we deal with nuclear waste. If we cannot move forward on energy efficiency, how are we going to tackle these hard issues? How are we going to tackle the issues as they relate to this amazing expansion of natural gas and the recognition that we need to have an infrastructure

that keeps up with demand and everything else that is going on?

We are not giving up on this bill. We are not going to give up on the good bipartisan work Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN have crafted. There are many other Members who have stepped forward to say: This is good stuff. Let's make it happen. So there is a lot of pent-up demand. For those who have waited a couple of weeks for their amendment, good. We need to address those too. But let's not sacrifice a good, strong bill that can be made better by good amendments to the bill itself. Let's not sacrifice that. This is a bill that has been in process for a couple of years because folks are saying: I have to have my piece right now. We can figure out how we craft an agreement that is workable from both sides.

I am certainly prepared to continue that work, and if the deal that has been offered at this point in time is not acceptable, OK, let's go back and figure out what is going to be acceptable. Let's not throw in the towel. This is too important. We have too much pent-up demand for energy solutions for this country.

I am here to stay focused on the issues at hand, but what we have in front of us—the bill we are working on—is a good, strong, bipartisan energy efficiency bill, and I want to continue that. I know my colleague, the chairman of the committee, wants to continue with that, and I think that is our effort here.

With that, I thank those who have stuck with us throughout this past week, but I am hoping we are going to be sticking with this for a while longer and we are going to see this bill cross the finish line.

I know the chairman wants to speak as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I could see that we both—the Presiding Officer and I—were riveted by Senator MURKOWSKI and her remarks for a reason. Her remarks were truly inspiring. I will just say I think the Senate needed to hear Senator MURKOWSKI's remarks, and I think that is why the Senator from North Dakota, and all of us, were listening so carefully.

I just want to highlight some of what Senator MURKOWSKI said. The bill we are considering now is pretty much the platonic ideal for consensus legislation. It pretty much follows the kind of rules Senator ENZI and Senator Kennedy used to talk about—that wonderful 80–20 rule. I remember Senator ENZI talking to me about how they would try to agree on 80 percent but may not agree on 20 percent.

The Shaheen-Portman legislation has the Kennedy-Enzi type of principle, where 80 percent of it is common ground that makes sense, doesn't have any mandates, uses the private sector, and focuses on efficiency which creates jobs. Frankly, around the world, some of the other countries try to get ahead by paying people low wages. We are trying to get ahead with legislation such as this, so we can wring more value out of the American economy and save money for businesses and consumers.

I think Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN are going to talk more about the 3 years they put into meeting that kind of Kennedy-Enzi principle of good government and finding common ground. I can tell everyone that when they write a textbook on how we ought to put together a bipartisan bill, these two fine Senators have complied with it.

It is not by osmosis that they got the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Business Roundtable to meet halfway with some of the country's leading environmental groups. It is because—as the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Ohio demonstrated—they were out there sweating the efforts to try to find common ground. Of course, neither side gets exactly what they want, but that is how they built this extraordinary coalition.

Point No. 2 that Senator MURKOWSKI addressed—and I think it is very important as it was highlighted by my visit to the Presiding Officer's State in the last few days—is the whole question with respect to future legislation.

I come from a State—my colleagues know this—that doesn't produce any fossil fuels. We are a hydrostate and we have renewables, so a lot of people said: RON is going to be chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources so nobody is going to talk about anything except hydro and renewables.

The first hearing we held in our committee was on natural gas. The reason why Senator MURKOWSKI and I made that decision jointly is because there ought to be bipartisan common ground on capping the potential of natural gas for our country, our consumers, and the planet. It is 50 percent cleaner than the other fossil fuels. We have it, the world wants it, and a lot of companies are talking about coming back from overseas because they want that pricing advantage.

What I have been talking about to Senators—and I do it at every opportunity—is how do we find a win-win approach that is good for the consumer and good for business and good for the environment? For example, for natural gas we are going to need a way to get that gas to markets, and that is going to mean more pipelines. So one of the ideas that I want to talk about with Senators on our committee as well as off the committee is, wouldn't it make sense to say if we are going to need more pipelines, the pipelines of the future ought to be better, meet the needs of the industry, and also help us get that added little benefit for consumers and the planet by not wasting energy.

I saw folks in North Dakota working really hard to try to deal with flaring and these methane emissions. So what I would like to do is exactly what Senator MURKOWSKI described this morning. She wants to get a bipartisan energy efficiency bill, which is a logical place to start, as the Senator said, on the ''all of the above'' strategy.

When we are done with that, we are going to move on to a whole host of other issues and in each case take as our lodestar this kind of win-win concept that can bring people together to find some common ground so we can tackle big issues. If we do that in the energy context, we will be doing something that helps create good-paying jobs, helps the consumer, and is also good for the planet.

My sense right now is that we have a number of issues colleagues on the other side of the aisle have felt strongly about for quite some time.

I think there is a real chance—and I have been advocating for it—to work out an agreement to deal with the two issues that have been particularly on the minds of some colleagues on the other side of the aisle—the health care issue and Keystone. Certainly I think there is a way to find common ground on those two issues procedurally so we could have a vote on two issues I have heard particularly conservative colleagues say are extraordinarily important to them. At that point, if our leadership could get an agreement on those two—and they could negotiate on any other matters where we could agree—but what we would ensure is we wouldn't have a situation where, in effect, a handful of colleagues who want to offer amendments unrelated to energy efficiency wouldn't be blocking dozens of Senators of both political parties who would like to offer bipartisan energy efficiency amendments. That is what we would face if we don't find a way to work this out.

I am part of this ''we aren't giving up caucus'' Senator MURKOWSKI described, because I think we came here to find a way to come together and deal with these issues. I will say, speaking for myself, if there is one thing I want to be able to take away from my time in public service—just one thing—and I would say to Senator MURKOWSKI that apparently the Presiding Officer was a volunteer in my first campaign; I was a Gray Panther, had a full head of hair and rugged good looks and all that—she is denying that, I can tell—if there is one thing I wish to take away from my time in public service it is what Senator MURKOWSKI alluded to, which is that we did everything on our watch to find common ground and deal with some of these issues.

That is why Senator ISAKSON and I have a fresh approach that I think will appeal to both sides of the aisle on Medicare. I have been involved with Senators on bipartisan tax reform, and Senator MURKOWSKI and I have been working on energy. She said, Let's not miss this ideal opportunity to put good government into action and that is by moving ahead with the Shaheen-Portman legislation.

Let us get an agreement. I think it ought to be achievable in the next few hours. I am going to go back—I have met with leadership on both sides and I am making the case that I think there is a procedural way out. I think Senator MURKOWSKI described it with the goodwill she demonstrated in what I thought was an inspiring address, and I can tell the Presiding Officer thought the same thing. I think we can find our way out of this.

I see the sponsors of the underlying legislation, Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN, on the floor. I wish to thank them for the fact they have consistently said throughout this process they are willing to work with Senator MURKOWSKI and me for this kind of procedural route forward, and I think it is achievable, particularly if Senators reflect on the outstanding remarks just given by the Senator from Alaska.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I am pleased to join Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI on the floor of the Senate today. I want to sign up for the ''get it done caucus,'' because I think this is legislation we can get done. It has bipartisan support from I believe the majority of the Members in this Senate. I think if we can get some agreement to move forward on this legislation and on the amendments, we can show the public, which is very frustrated with what is happening here in Washington, that we can actually get something done.

I wish to thank Senator WYDEN and Senator MURKOWSKI for all of their great work on the energy committee. I had the opportunity to serve my first 4 years on the energy committee. It is a great committee. They have done a terrific job of showing what it is like to be able to get work done, to be able to get people to come together and figure out where they can get agreement and move forward. It was in that spirit that Senator PORTMAN and I started working together 3 years ago, when we were both members of the energy committee, on energy efficiency legislation, working with the Alliance to Save Energy, and a number of members of the business community, and with all of these groups that have endorsed this legislation, to try and put together a bill where we could find some agreement. There has been a lot of division around energy issues in the last decade or so.

That is why it has been I think 6 years—actually since 2007—since an energy bill has come to the floor of the Senate, because there are those of us who believe the best way forward is to focus on fossil fuels and more oil and gas. There are others who believe alternatives and renewables, hydro and solar and wind, are the best way forward.

One of the aspects that is true in this entire energy debate, whether one comes from North Dakota, as the Presiding Officer does, or New Hampshire, as I do, is that energy efficiency benefits all of us. It doesn't matter which form of energy one supports or which region of the country one is from; this is a place where we can get some consensus. It is agreement that allows us to move forward on job creation; it allows us to move forward on saving on pollution.

We have had several Senators on the floor over the last couple of days talking about the challenges of climate change and what is happening with our weather. This is a way to save on those emissions. It is a way to address cost savings. I have been to businesses all over New Hampshire that have been able to stay competitive because they have reduced their energy costs. In a State such as New Hampshire where we have the sixth highest energy costs in the country, it is important for us to figure out how we can lower those costs. That is one of the things this bill does.

The other aspect of the legislation that we haven't talked about as much on the floor is it reduces our dependence on foreign oil and foreign sources of energy, so it is also critical to our national security. As we think about our energy challenges in the future, making sure we can produce the energy we use in the United States is very important. As we think about what is happening in the Middle East, as we think about the challenges we have to stay competitive in the world, energy, as Senator MURKOWSKI said so well, is something that affects everything we do.

This bill has been criticized by some quarters for not being robust enough. I appreciate there are provisions in the legislation I might not have chosen to put in. There are others I would like to have seen in it we didn't get consensus on. But I think that is what we are talking about when we are talking about how do we reach consensus on a bipartisan bill and how do we get something done that can get through not only the Senate but the House. I think we have a good start in this legislation.

The bill would do several things. First, it would strengthen national model building codes to make new homes and new commercial buildings more energy efficient. We know about 40 percent of our energy used in this country is used in buildings, so making sure those buildings are more energy efficient is critical. It is particularly important for those of us who are in the northeast. In New Hampshire we have a lot of old buildings because we are an older part of the country, so we have a lot of buildings that have been there for a long time and we need to do what we can to make them more energy efficient.

Then the legislation would also train the next generation of workers in energy-efficient commercial building design and operation. It would expand on university-based building training and research assessment centers—something that is very important as we think about the future workforce.

Let me go back because when I talked about the national model building codes, I wanted to make sure everybody is clear that these building codes are voluntary; they are not mandatory. As Senator PORTMAN has said so well, there are no mandates in this legislation. This is an effort to look at incentives, to look at how we can encourage the private sector and consumers to be more energy efficient.

Then the bill also deals with the manufacturing sector, which is the biggest user of energy in our economy. It directs the Department of Energy to work closely with private sector partners to encourage research, development, and commercialization of innovative energy-efficient technology and processes for industrial applications. That is a mouthful, but what it says is—and this is something we heard from stakeholders, from those businesses that work in the energy industry, which is they want to have a better working relationship with the Department of Energy. They want to be able to feel as though there is support there as they are trying to take technologies to commercialization. It also helps manufacturers reduce energy use and become more competitive by incentivizing the use of more energy-efficient electric motors and transformers.

About 4 percent of energy use in this country is through electric motors and transformers. I have been interested in transformers because we have a company in New Hampshire called Warner Power that has made the first breakthrough in transformer design in 100 years. If we can get their energy-efficient transformers, or something like them, into buildings and projects across the country, we could save significant amounts of energy.

As we look at the manufacturing sector, the legislation also establishes a program called Supply Star, to help make companies look at their supply chains and figure out how to make their supply chains more efficient. I can remember when I was on the energy committee and we were talking about this whole issue of supply chains and we were debating whether it was important to encourage companies to look at their supply chains, people were saying, It doesn't make that much difference in terms of the actual energy use. I pointed out that we have a company in New Hampshire called Stoneyfield Farm that makes yogurt—great yogurt. If my colleagues haven't had it, they should try it. But they have been very interested in being more energy efficient. They have looked at all of their processes and they have figured out how they can do the best possible job at saving on energy. What they discovered is their biggest problem isn't how they produce the yogurt, it is the cows they depend upon for the milk to produce the yogurt because the cows release so much

methane. That was the problem in terms of their supply chain and with the amount of energy they were using. So helping companies take a look at their supply chain and figure out how to reduce the energy use through that supply chain is very important and it is an important piece of this bill.

Then the third section in the legislation deals with the Federal Government. I know all of us know this because we are here and we are working hard on energy. The Federal Government is the biggest user of energy in this country. Most of that energy is used by the military. About 93 percent is used by the military. The military understands it is important for them to figure out how to be more energy efficient. They have been real leaders in government—the Navy in particular, but all branches in the military have looked at how they can be more efficient in using energy. Our legislation tries to incentivize the rest of the government to catch up with the military. So we would ask agencies to look at data centers—and we have some very good amendments from Senators RISCH and UDALL and Senator COBURN to take a look at data centers because they are a big waster of energy in the Federal Government. It would allow Federal agencies to use existing funds to update plans when they are constructing new buildings so they can make them more energy efficient. We have a number of amendments which would also address how we can make the Federal Government more energy efficient and be a leader as we look at what is happening in the private sector to save on energy, so this bill is a very good start for how to address energy efficiency. Senators MURKOWSKI and WYDEN have said we have over a dozen agreed to, bipartisan amendments that would make the bill even better. I hope we can get to those amendments. I think it is really important for us to do this.

But to answer those people who say that this is just a little bill, that it is not going to make much difference, I would point to a new study that just came out from the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy. They looked at this legislation without the amendments—and the amendments are going to make it better—and they said that if we can pass this legislation, by 2025 the legislation will encourage the creation of 136,000 new jobs, not just in businesses that are going to be more efficient and so they can create more jobs but in businesses that are producing the energy-efficient technologies that are going to allow us to be more energy efficient. By 2030 the bill would net an annual savings of over $13 billion to consumers, and it would lower carbon dioxide emissions and other air pollutants by the equivalent of taking 22 million cars off the road. That is a pretty good savings and solution.

So, as we have all said, this is a win-win-win. It makes sense for us to move on this legislation. It makes sense for what we can accomplish with the legislation itself. It makes sense in terms of other energy issues that are pending and what we need to do to make sure we position the United States and our businesses and our families to be more energy efficient to be able to compete in the new energy world we are entering.

We need to start now to address energy, and I hope we are going to be able to get by the impediments that currently face us so we can begin to vote, so we can adopt the great amendments that have been proposed, and so we can actually act on this bill.

Thank you very much, Madam President.

I am pleased to see my partner on this legislation on the floor to talk about why we need to pass this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from New Hampshire on the important benefits of this legislation. I will start by saying I think we are pretty close to figuring out a way to move forward if we can get both the majority and the minority party leadership teams to look at the list. We have about a dozen bipartisan amendments ready to go on. In fact, more than half of those amendments have already been discussed at some length on the floor, so I think the time agreement could be relatively narrow, and we could move quickly. Some of them could be voice-voted. And then we have some amendments that are not directly related to energy efficiency but related to energy. I would hope we could take those up as well.

My understanding is that there has been a general agreement to have a vote on the Vitter amendment. That is something I have heard on the floor from leadership. And then we also have a Keystone amendment that I think there is an agreement to move forward on that relates to energy more broadly and one where I think this body has a strong interest in expressing itself.

I hope we could figure out how to move forward on this and do it quickly. We are wasting time right now. We have spent the last couple days on the floor, again, talking about all these amendments. So if there are concerns about time, let's get going because we can process these amendments quickly. I appreciate the fact that the majority leader is working with us. He is keeping the door open. So we are going back and forth.

I really do believe this is a seminal moment in the sense that if we cannot even do a bipartisan bill like this on energy efficiency that came out of the committee with a 19-to-3 vote, what can we do? It is an important piece of legislation. It is not a major piece of legislation like the continuing resolution or the debt limit or tax reform or entitlement reform—things this body knows it has to address—but it is a step forward, and I think it would provide a model for how we can move forward on other issues.

We have spent 2½ years working on this legislation. We have been able to garner the support of over 260 businesses and trade associations that believe this is good legislation for our country. That is one reason we got a 19-to-3 vote out of committee. That is one reason there is a lot of support on the floor for this underlying bill. It is ultimately about having a smart energy strategy.

I believe we should produce more energy here in this country, particularly in the ground, in America, right now. I think that is good for our economy and our country. We should also use it more efficiently. This is an opportunity to have a true ''all of the above'' strategy—in this case, energy efficiency, going along with production and other important elements of an energy strategy that makes sense. I hope we will be able to make progress on this today and move forward and start to have some votes on these good amendments that actually improve the legislation, in my view.

The jobs issue is also one that is paramount. Think about it. There is a report out that my colleague from New Hampshire talked about that says there will be 136,000 additional jobs created by this legislation by 2030. I think that is a low-ball estimate because there will be jobs created in energy efficiency. In other words, by encouraging—not through mandates because there are no mandates in this legislation except on the Federal Government to get them to practice what they preach, as we talked about yesterday—by encouragement and incentives, there will be more jobs created in the energy efficiency field. That is good for our economy.

More significantly to me, there will be jobs created because American businesses will be more competitive. They will be able to spend less on energy and more on expanding plant and equipment and people, and they will be hiring more people as they level the playing field, in essence, on one of the essential costs of doing business, which is the cost of energy. We need that right now. Our economy is weak. We have not had the recovery all of us hoped for. They say it is the weakest economic recovery we have lived through since the Great Depression. We simply need to have that shot in the arm. This is one way to do it. It is not the only way to do it, but it would certainly help.

Finally, it is going to help our economy in ways that are important. Right now we have a trade deficit, and it is driven by a couple factors. One is China and the other is energy. Taking those two out would be almost an even balance of payments. That trade deficit is driven in part by the fact that we still have this demand for a lot of foreign energy. By making these relatively small important steps in energy efficiency, it will actually reduce our dependency on foreign sources of energy.

As I said earlier, I think we should produce more energy in this country. That is part of the answer, but part of it is also using it more efficiently, using it more wisely, which I believe is a conservative value, and it also happens to help on the trade deficit and therefore will help our underlying economy.

These are all positive aspects of this legislation that I would think Members on both sides of the aisle acknowledge. If we cannot move forward again on something that makes so much sense, that does have that kind of support across the aisle, I worry about whether we can deal with these bigger issues that we must deal with for the American people.

It also, of course, leads to a cleaner environment. Why? Because of having to build fewer powerplants. And through efficiency you are going to have fewer emissions.

This is why you have groups from the chamber of commerce—which is key voting this legislation, by the way—to groups on the environmental side saying this is good legislation. It makes sense. Strange bedfellows when you have the National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber of commerce and other business groups with environmental groups, such as the Natural Resources Defense Council, saying this makes sense. Let's move forward with it.

I am hopeful we can move forward not just on resolving these differences on what amendments can be offered and voted on but also move forward on this underlying bill, send it to the House, where there is interest in this bill, where there is on both sides of the aisle an interest in taking up efficiency legislation, and then send it to the President for his signature and actually be able to go home and say: You know what. We did something here to help create jobs, grow the economy, have a cleaner environment, deal with our trade deficit, and again create a model for how other issues can be resolved.

For Members who are listening and who have not come to the floor yet to talk about their amendments, I hope they will do that because we may have a relatively narrow window now because of the fact that we are spending so much time trying to resolve these differences on which amendments can get a vote. I am hopeful we will have the opportunity to start voting today yet. If we do, we can move quickly and we can dispose of these issues.

By the way, some of the issues are not directly related to energy efficiency. If they do not come up on this bill, they are going to come up on another bill, so it is better, in my estimation, for us to go ahead and have some of these debates, have some of these discussions, go ahead and see the votes. Again, they should be subject to time limitations. We should have a reasonable list. We think we have a reasonable list now, going back and forth, and I am hopeful we will be able to resolve that. But in the meantime, if Members can come down and talk about their amendments, that would be very helpful for us to ensure we can get to the underlying bill and move forward.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member because they have been working very closely with us not just for the last 2½ years to put together legislation that has this broad support, but more recently they have been helping Senator SHAHEEN and me to ensure that we do have on both sides of the aisle good lines of communication and the ability to move forward with an energy bill. They care about efficiency. I will let them speak for themselves, and they have done that ably earlier today. But they also care about an energy agenda for our country, and they view this as one of the first major pieces of energy legislation that can lead then to other bills.

For those who would like to discuss broader energy topics but would not have the ability to do it on this legislation—or maybe they do not have their amendments fully formed on that—the commitment from the chairman and ranking member is that they are going to have additional energy legislation. I serve on the committee. I can tell you, I have a strong interest in moving forward on some of the fossil fuel legislation, for instance. They have made a commitment to do that.

So there will be other opportunities where we will have broader energy legislation that deals with the production side, deals with the important part of our energy strategy—in addition to energy efficiency—that lets us truly have an ''all of the above'' energy strategy. I thank them for that commitment and for their strong work on this legislation. Once we move this, it will be much easier then to see us move forward on these other bills. Success begets success.

With that, I am hopeful that Members will come to the floor and talk about their amendments—I see one of my colleagues coming to the floor now—and we can move forward with a good discussion on energy issues and move to these amendments as soon as possible and then move to final passage.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I wish to thank my two colleagues from New Hampshire and Ohio and, of course, my colleagues from Alaska and Oregon as well for their leadership on this very important piece of legislation.

I have four amendments that I would love to be considered, that I would love to be included in the legislation, and I hope we are able to move these forward. But let me just talk about two of those. I do not want to take the Senate's time. I understand other Senators may be on their way over to the floor to speak.

Let me first start with the Quadrennial Energy Review. This is something on which I have worked with the Senator from Alaska and many others in this Chamber. In fact, it is a bipartisan amendment. It is amendment No. 1881. Our cosponsors are Senators ALEXANDER, BEGICH, BOOZMAN, COONS, HEINRICH, TESTER, TOM UDALL, and WYDEN. Again, it is a bipartisan group of Senators.

Basically, one of the things we have learned from the Department of Defense is every 4 years they do a Quadrennial Defense Review, and that helps them determine what is going on within their agency as an agency. It helps them determine the strengths and weaknesses, the needs that need to be addressed. It helps them plan, and it also helps us make decisions. We want to make good defense decisions. The only way you do that is by knowing what you have on hand and what you need.

Well, this is the same for energy. We have a lot of very well-intentioned energy programs and ideas that either float around this Capitol Building or float around the various Departments or that are law right now. A lot of these programs exist, but they are not necessarily coordinated. There is no one there who is really making sure all of the dots connect and we are able to have a smart energy policy.

So I feel like a Quadrennial Energy Review, every 4 years we would go—the Federal Government—top to bottom, look at all of our energy needs, look at our capabilities, look at our shortcomings, look at where we need to focus our resources. Should we be doing research in one area and should we be focusing on manufacturing somewhere else? But this will allow us to have a good, solid review every 4 years so we can make good decisions, so the various Departments can make good decisions. Also, it will help industry know kind of what is coming down the pike. It will help bring us together and coordinate in a very positive and constructive way.

So the Quadrennial Energy Review, from my standpoint, is a very important piece and building block. It is laying the foundation for having a smart energy policy for this country. That is one thing we need to recognize, quite honestly, here in the Senate. Again, we have good intentions, but we do not always have a good, cohesive, and smart energy policy. So the QER is something I hope we would be able to get through on this legislation and get this legislation moving through the process.

Let me give you one example, Madam President, on the Quadrennial Energy Review.

We have in our country now a lot more domestic energy than we have had in years past, and it is very exciting. In my State we produce a lot of natural gas through horizontal drilling and fracking, et cetera, and that is common in many other States around

the country. I see some Senators here where they have the same thing. Sometimes it is oil, sometimes it is gas, sometimes it is both.

Let's take natural gas for one moment. We have people come into my office, and they will say: Hey, this is great that we have all of this natural gas now. Why don't we liquefy it and export it? Okay. That is an idea. We ought to talk about that and think about that.

Or another group will come in and say: Hey, we have all of this natural gas. Why don't we actually turn it into diesel fuel? Okay, apparently you can do that. The technology is there. Let's talk about that.

Then we have other folks who come to us and they say: Why don't we take this natural gas and let's convert our diesel fleet over to natural gas? Here again, okay, that all sounds good. But I do not think you can do all three of those things. We do not have any mechanism right now to coordinate that and put all of that together and get consistent with our energy policies.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PRYOR. Absolutely.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, it strikes me that the Senator's idea is practical right now. Because you look at the changes we have seen in the last 4 or 5 years—particularly in areas such as natural gas. We were talking about it with the Senators from North Dakota. This would be the point of the Senator's amendment, to get the policies of the government to start being reflective of what goes on in the marketplace. Four or five years ago in our State we were having pitched battles whether to develop import facilities for natural gas. They were pretty spirited discussions. People were getting hauled out by the gendarmes and all of that.

Now we are having the same kind of battles about whether we ought to build export facilities. Is that the Senator's desire, to make sure the government and the policies of the government sort of keep up with the times? It strikes me the Senator from Arkansas is proposing an amendment that is particularly timely right now.

Mr. PRYOR. That is exactly right. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his good question, because that is exactly right. We need some mechanism to make sure we are consistent and coherent and cohesive in our energy policy in the country. Things change. That is why you want to do this about every 4 years. You do not need to do it every year. It is too much work and too much going on. But just as with the Department of Defense, things change. What happens is you get a benchmark from 4 years ago that suddenly you have a good comparison. You have a baseline that you can look back to 4 years ago and see if you are making progress, if your policy is going in the right direction.

Maybe in this case we have a lot of energy programs that are not working very well. This will help us identify those. Maybe we have some that are working great, that we ought to be spending more money on. This will help us identify those.

I do thank the Senator for his question.

I do see we have other Senators coming to the floor.

Let me talk very quickly about one other amendment I have. It is the voluntary certification program, here again, bipartisan, working with Senator SESSIONS. It is amendment No. 1879. This is a very specific amendment for some very specific industries: heating, cooling, commercial refrigeration and water-heating products. This is not economywide. This is very specific to those industries. But right now what they do is they self-certify. They self-certify. I think they should be allowed to continue to do that, assuming their certification meets certain credible and scientific standards, which I think they do now. If they do not now, they should.

But what this will do is actually save the government money. There is no reason why the Department of Energy and others should be reviewing this and making them do extra certification and more testing, et cetera, when it has already been done right now to the standards everyone should accept.

I could talk more about this. I do see I have a couple of colleagues here on the floor. It is my understanding they would like to speak.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I hope we are moving to votes on this bill, to votes on our ''no Washington exemption'' language. I certainly continue to encourage that and continue to support that.

The reason that is important, particularly on this ''no Washington exemption'' language is because unless we act on October 1, what I think is a completely illegal rule from the Obama administration that does create a special Washington exemption will go into effect.

First of all, I think it is very unfortunate, sure is frustrating, that I and others have to be here on the floor blocking an illegal rule in the first place. Because, you see, on this point ObamaCare is clear. The actual statutory language of ObamaCare says clearly that all Members of Congress and their congressional staff go to the exchange. It is crystal clear about that. All of us. In another section, section 1512, it also says clearly any folks going to the exchange lose their employer-based subsidy. That is crystal clear.

CHUCK GRASSLEY, our distinguished colleague, authored this provision. He could not have been more clear about where he was coming from about the intent. He said at the time, ''The more that Congress experiences the laws it passes, the better.'' He is exactly right. That is what this is all about. That is what that provision is all about. Legal experts such as David Ermer, a lawyer who has represented insurers in the Federal employee program for 30 years, said clearly, ''I do not think members of Congress and their staff can get funds for coverage in the exchanges under existing law.''

That is very clear, particularly from the precise language of the ObamaCare statute. So it is pretty darn frustrating that my colleagues and I who are pushing this ''no Washington exemption'' language have to be here doing this to begin with. It is all because of an illegal rule to bail out Congress, to create out of thin air a Washington exemption that will go into effect, unless we act, October 1. So that is why we must act. That is why we must vote in a timely way.

The first thing this illegal rule says is, we do not know what staff are covered so we are going to leave it up to each individual Member of Congress to even decide which, if any, of their staff have to go to the exchange. That is a ludicrous interpretation of the clear statutory language. It is ludicrous on its face, because that language says ''all official staff.''

Secondly, and even more outrageous in my opinion, this illegal rule says: Whoever does go to the exchange from Congress, from staff, gets this very generous taxpayer-funded subsidy transferred from the Federal employees health benefits plan which we are leaving to the exchange. Where did that come from? That is not in ObamaCare. In fact, section 1512 of ObamaCare says exactly the opposite with regard to all employer-based contributions. So where did that come from? It came out of thin air. It came from intense lobbying to have President Obama create this special Washington exemption.

I urge all of my colleagues to do the right thing and say, you know what, the first most basic rule of democracy is we should be treated the same as America under the laws we pass. That should be true across the board, certainly including ObamaCare.

That is why the Heritage Foundation recently said:

> Obama's action to benefit the political class is the latest example of this administration doing whatever it wants, regardless of whether it has the authority to do so. The Office of Personnel Management overstepped its authority when it carried out the President's request to exempt Congress from the requirements of the health care law. Changing laws is the responsibility of the legislative branch, not the executive.

They also said:

> Millions of Americans are going to be losing their existing coverage and paying more for health insurance. Under the Vitter amendment, so would the Obama administration's appointees, Congress and congressional staff. They baked that cake, now they can eat it too.

Similarly, National Review said recently:

> Most employment lawyers interpreted that—

Meaning the ObamaCare language

—to mean that the taxpayer-funded federal health insurance subsidies dispensed to those on Congress's payroll—which now range from $5,000 to $11,000 a year—would have to end.

A little later in the same opinion piece they wrote:

Under behind-the-scenes pressure from members of Congress in both parties, President Obama used the quiet of the August recess to personally order the Office of Personnel Management, which supervisors Federal employment issues, to interpret the law so as to retain the generous Congressional benefits.

The Wall Street Journal has also weighed in. I think they are right.

The issue is the White House's recent ObamaCare bailout for members of Congress and their staffs. If Republicans want to show that they stand for something, this is it. If they really are willing to do whatever it takes to oppose this law, there would be no more meaningful way to prove it.

As I said, the author of this original provision of ObamaCare made it perfectly clear where he was coming from. That is our distinguished colleague CHUCK GRASSLEY. ''The more that Congress experiences the laws it passes, the better.'' The distinguished lawyer regarding this area of law, David Ermer, also said, it is clear: ''I do not think members of Congress and their staff can get funds for coverage in the exchanges under existing law.''

That is why we have to act and have to vote before October 1.

Finally, in closing, let me say, I want to be very direct and ask Members and the public to beware of another approach to defeating this ''no Washington exemption'' language. That approach is pretty clever and it is pretty cynical. That approach is to say: Oh, this is a great idea, but we actually need to expand this to all Federal employees.

There are Members promoting this approach, particularly on the Republican side. That will have one effect and one effect only: It will help ensure absolutely, no ifs, ands, or buts, that my language does not pass or that language does not pass. In fact, one of the main Republican proponents of that language said in a meeting which I attended: This will be perfect because under that scenario, under that language, all Republicans can vote yes, all Democrats can vote no, and it will be killed and we will keep the subsidy.

That is the game. That is the point. That is what is going on. We need a straight up-or-down vote on this ''no Washington exemption'' language which is filed as an amendment to this bill on the floor, which is filed as a separate bill. I very much look forward to that before October 1.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

(The remarks of Mr. HATCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 1518 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. HATCH. 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. CARDIN. 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. CARDIN. I wish to commend Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN for their hard work in bringing a bipartisan bill to the floor that will boost energy efficiency in government, in industry, and in commercial and residential buildings. This bill will help increase our economic competitiveness, enhance our national security, and combat global climate change.

Energy efficiency improvements are a smart, cost-effective way to reduce pollution, increase the competitiveness of our manufacturers, and put people back to work in the building trades.

We don't have an energy problem in this country; we have a waste problem. Last October the Department of Energy and Lawrence Livermore National Labs calculated that we waste 57 percent of all energy produced—57 percent. We are becoming more energy efficient, but we have a long way to go, which is why the Shaheen-Portman bill is so important.

I wish to speak about two changes I would like to see in the Tax Code that would help us achieve our goals of energy efficiency. I have worked on two bills in this regard and I will be speaking about them as we go through this session of Congress. I have noted amendments, but as I think the Presiding Officer is well aware, to try to put a tax provision on a bill that originates in the Senate causes what is known as the blue slip when the bill is taken to the House, since all tax bills must originate in the House of Representatives. Therefore, I will be looking for opportunities to advance these two energy-related bills but will not have the opportunity on the legislation that is before us.

Energy efficiency is as important as renewables, nuclear, and fossil fuels in an ''all of the above'' strategy to meet the Nation's energy demands. In fact, the cheapest, cleanest ''energy'' we have is the energy we don't need because of energy efficiency improvements.

Our Tax Code in turn can be an effective tool in promoting energy efficiency. Consider that buildings account for more than 40 percent of our energy consumption in the United States. So by encouraging businesses to make energy-efficient upgrades in their buildings, we can reach substantial energy savings. A recent study by McKinsey & Company backs me up. The study concluded that maximizing energy efficiency for homes and commercial buildings could help our country reduce energy consumption by 23 percent by 2020 and cut greenhouse gas emissions by 1.1 gigatons annually. This is the equivalent of taking all passenger cars and light trucks off the road for a year.

Making buildings more efficient is more cost-effective than developing new energy sources. Current building codes are already making new construction significantly more efficient, but a boost is needed for older structures.

Up to 80 percent of the buildings standing today will still be here in 2050, so encouraging the retrofitting of existing buildings needs to be a priority. Even buildings that are fairly new can benefit from retrofitting. For example, Bush Stadium, home of the St. Louis Cardinals, was built in 2006, but energy improvements in 2011 reduced energy consumption by 23 percent.

We could see more successful projects such as this proliferate across the Nation, but our current tax policies have not yet proved to be meaningful incentives for making energy-efficient upgrades to existing buildings. For example, the landmark upgrade of the Empire State Building, which is under contract to lower energy consumption by almost 40 percent, could not qualify for a 179D deduction under the law's current structure. Senator FEINSTEIN and I are working on legislation that would make commonsense reforms to the existing section 179D tax deduction.

Section 179D of the Internal Revenue Code provides a tax deduction that allows cost recovery of energy-efficient windows, roofs, lighting, and heating and cooling systems that meet certain energy savings targets. Section 179D allows for an accelerated depreciation that encourages real estate owners to make the significant front-end investments in energy-efficient upgrades. The deduction is scheduled to expire at the end of this year. By extending, modifying, and simplifying this important provision, we can encourage energy savings, create thousands of retrofitting jobs in the construction industry, and reduce energy bills for all consumers—a win-win-win situation. Our legislation would make this critical incentive more accessible and effective for existing buildings that are currently using inefficient lighting systems, antiquated heating and cooling systems, and poor insulation. Upgrading and improving the 179D deduction will make thousands of businesses more competitive and create good-paying jobs right here in the United States.

In addition to commercial properties, our bill will also help promote energy efficiency in private residences. Homes consume more than 20 percent of our Nation's energy, so we need to give American homeowners a helping hand to increase the energy efficiency of their properties. Our legislation does this by establishing a section 25E tax credit for homeowners. Homeowners would receive a 30-percent tax credit of up to $5,000 for making an investment in energy efficiency and reducing energy consumption and costs. Simply

put, it is an incentive that encourages homeowners to choose the most inexpensive option for saving energy. At a time of Federal budget constraints, we must prioritize tax policies so they promote the most cost-effective methods of bolstering our energy security. Performance-based energy efficiency improvements can transform America's homes and lower energy bills for the families who live in them.

Finally, our legislation targets the sector with the largest potential for increasing energy efficiency in our country—the industrial sector. Our bill offers focused, short-term incentives in four areas to help manufacturers make the efficiency investments necessary to innovate and compete. These critical areas include water reuse and replacing old chillers that harm the atmosphere.

I have a letter dated September 17, 2013, from a large coalition of business, labor, and environmental groups supporting the Cardin-Feinstein approach to the reform of section 179D. The Real Estate Roundtable spearheaded the letter, but 50 different organizations have signed on. I want to quote one part of that letter. This is a quote from the letter that was sent in support of the legislation:

> The Section 179D deduction is a key incentive to leverage significant amounts of private sector investment capital in buildings. It will help spur construction and manufacturing jobs through retrofits, save businesses billions of dollars in fuel bills as buildings become more energy efficient, place lower demands on the power grid, help move our country closer to energy independence, and reduce carbon emissions.

I think that is exactly what we should be doing. These are the types of incentives we should be working for. If you look at the groups that have signed on to this letter, these are groups that understand how to create jobs and that Congress can help in that regard.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Senator CRAPO and I will be introducing legislation that will fix a problem that is keeping energy-efficient roofing materials from being deployed. This is a separate bill that I think could help us create jobs, save energy, and help our environment.

The current Tax Code acts as an obstacle to retrofitting old roofs with energy-efficient ones because, generally speaking, commercial roofs are depreciated over 39 years. Our bill would shorten the depreciation schedule to 20 years for roofs that meet certain energy efficiency standards and that are put in place over the next 2 years. By shortening the depreciation schedule, we are lowering the amount of tax businesses would otherwise have to pay. They get the advantage of their savings in the early years.

This change will create more jobs by encouraging the construction of new roofs and by putting more cash into the hands of businesses. It is good tax policy because the average lifespan of a typical commercial roof is only 17 years. So this legislation corrects an inequity in the Tax Code by aligning the depreciation period closer to the lifespan of commercial roofs.

Securing America's energy and economic future requires a renewed focus on energy efficiency. I hope we can pass the legislation that is before us and send it to the House. I hope the House will send us a tax bill that can serve as the basis for using the Tax Code to promote energy efficiency.

Energy efficiency gains are a win-win for families, businesses, job seekers, taxpayers, our human health, and the environment. We can create jobs, we can help our economy, we can become more competitive, and we can have a cleaner environment if we do the right thing with the legislation before us and are able to improve our Tax Code to help achieve those goals.

I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 17, 2013.

Re: 179D Tax Deduction for Energy Efficient Buildings.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate.
Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.
Hon. SANDER LEVIN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

DEAR CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MEMBERS: Our organizations and companies represent a broad spectrum of the U.S. economy and include real estate, manufacturing, architecture, contracting, building services firms, financing sources, and environmental and energy efficiency advocates. Many of the entities we represent are small businesses that drive and sustain American job growth. We support the tax deduction at section 179D of the Internal Revenue Code, which encourages greater energy efficiency in our nation's commercial and larger multifamily buildings. As Congress continues to assess comprehensive tax reform, we support section 179D's extension and necessary reforms to spur retrofit projects in existing buildings.

The section 179D deduction is a key incentive to leverage significant amounts of private sector investment capital in buildings. It will help spur construction and manufacturing jobs through retrofits, save businesses billions of dollars in fuel bills as buildings become more energy efficient, place lower demands on the power grid, help move our country closer to energy independence, and reduce carbon emissions.

Section 179D provides a tax deduction (not a credit) that allows for cost recovery of energy efficient windows, roofs, lighting, and heating and cooling systems meeting certain energy savings performance targets. Without section 179D, the same building equipment would be depreciated over 39 years (business property) or 27.5 years (residential property). These horizons do not meaningfully encourage real estate owners to bear the immediate and expensive front-end costs associated with complex energy efficiency upgrades. Section 179D allows for accelerated depreciation of high performance equipment that achieves significant energy savings.

Current law has the perverse effect of discouraging energy improvements. Utility bills and the costs of energy consumption are part of a business's ordinary and necessary operating expenses, and are thus fully and immediately deductible. Section 179D is a critical provision because, by encouraging greater building efficiency, it aligns the code to properly incentivize energy savings. Moreover, relative to the code's incentives for energy creation, taxpayers get more ''bang for the buck'' through efficiency incentives like the section 179D deduction. Dollar for dollar, it is much cheaper to avoid using a kilowatt of energy than to create a new one (such as through deployment of fossil fuel or renewable technologies). As a matter of tax, budget, and an ''all of the above'' energy policy, section 179D checks all of the right boxes.

Regardless of the ultimate result of comprehensive tax reform, the section 179D deduction is scheduled to expire at the end of this year. While the provision should be carefully considered as part of the code's possible overhaul, Congress should also extend this important incentive with reasonable improvements that better facilitate ''deep'' energy retrofit improvements in buildings. In this regard, the Commercial Building Modernization Act (S. 3591) from last Congress—introduced by Senators Cardin and Feinstein, and former Senators Bingaman and Snowe—is a step in the right direction of a ''performance based'' and ''technology neutral'' deduction that both of your committees have emphasized must be the hallmarks of any energy tax incentive. Revisions of the sort proposed by S. 3591 would improve the section 179D deduction by providing a sliding scale of incentives that correlate to actual and verifiable improvements in a retrofitted building's energy performance. S. 3591 does not select technology ''winners or losers'' but respects the underlying contractual arrangements of building owners and their retrofit project design teams, who are best suited to decide which equipment options in a given structure may achieve high levels of cost-effective energy savings.

Furthermore, any 179D reform proposal should ensure that building owners have their own ''skin in the game'' of a retrofit project—such as S. 3591's specification that the financial benefits of the tax deduction cannot exceed more than half of project costs.

Congress should extend and improve the section 179D tax deduction before it expires at the end of 2013. We urge you to look to S. 3591 from last Congress as the starting point for further deliberations and refinements this fall.

SUPPORTING ORGANIZATIONS

ABM Industries; Air Conditioning Contractors of America; Air-Conditioning, Heating and Refrigeration Institute; American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy; American Gas Association; American Hotel & Lodging Association; American Institute of Architects; American Public Gas Association; American Society of Interior Designers; ASHRAE; Bayer MaterialScience LLC; Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) International; CCIM Institute; Concord Energy Strategies, LLC; Consolidated Edison Solutions, Inc.; Council of North American Insulation Manufacturers Association.

Danfoss; Empire State Building Company/Malkin Holdings; Energy Systems Group; First Potomac Realty Trust; Independent Electrical Contractors; Institute for Market Transformation; Institute of Real Estate Management; International Council of Shopping Centers; International Union of Painters & Allied Trades (IUPAT); Johnson Controls, Inc.; Mechanical Contractors Association of America (MCAA); Metrus Energy,

Inc.; NAIOP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association; National Apartment Association; National Association of Energy Service Companies (NAESCO); National Association of Home Builders; National Association of REALTORS®; National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts.

National Association of State Energy Officials; National Electrical Contractors Association; National Electrical Manufacturers Association; National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association; National Multi Housing Council; National Roofing Contractors Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; Owens Corning; Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors—National Association; Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturers Association (PIMA); Real Estate Board of New York; The Real Estate Roundtable; The Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation International Association; Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association; U.S. Green Building Council; Window and Door Manufacturers Association.

Mr. CARDIN. 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. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, 5 years ago, as a result of the greed and the recklessness and the illegal behavior on Wall Street, this country was plunged into the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s. As a result, millions of people lost their homes, lost their jobs, and lost their life savings. And about 5 years ago we were looking at a situation where some 700,000 Americans a month were losing their jobs—an unbelievable number. The stock market plummeted. There was panic in the financial sector.

The good news is that to a significant degree we have stabilized that situation. We are not losing hundreds of thousands of jobs a month. The stock market is, in fact, doing very well. But what is important to understand is that it is imperative we not accept the ''new normal'' for the economy as it is today because the reality is that today, while the situation is better than it was 5 years ago, for the middle class and for the working families of this country the economy is still in very bad shape. And I am not just talking about a 5-year period; I am talking about a generational situation.

Mr. President, you may have seen that just yesterday the Census Bureau came out with some new and extremely disturbing statistics, and it tells us why so many Americans are frustrated and angry with what is going on in Washington and why so many people respond to pollsters and say: Yes, we believe the country is going in the wrong direction.

What they are saying is true. They have every reason to be angry, every reason be frustrated. Of course, economically this country is moving, in a very significant way, in the wrong direction.

This is what the Census Bureau reported yesterday: They said the typical middle-class family, the family right in the middle of American society, that median family income today is less than it was 24 years ago. Median family income today for that typical American family is less than it was 24 years ago.

In 2002, typical middle-class families, that family right in the middle, made $51,017. Back in 1989, that family made $51,681. What does that mean? It means that 24 years later, after all of the effort and the hard work of people, today they are worse off than they were 24 years ago.

Let's think about what that means. It means that despite the explosion of technology and all of the robotics, all of the cell phones and everything else that has made this economy more productive, the median family income today is worse than it was 24 years ago.

I will give you an example of what that means. If during the period from 1989 through 2012 that typical American family had received just a 2-percent increase in their income—just 2 percent, a very modest increase—that family today, instead of making $51,000 a year, would be making $81,000 a year. That is a $30,000 gap.

If over that 24-year period people had seen a modest—I am not taking about a huge increase—a modest increase in their income of 2 percent, which people certainly deserve, that family would make $81,000 a year. Today that family is making $51,000 a year—less than that family was making 24 years ago.

This is what the Census Bureau also reported. They said the typical middle-class family has seen its income go down by more than $5,000 since 1999, after adjusting for inflation—$5,000.

They told us the average male worker made $283 less last year than that same worker made 44 years ago. Do you want to know why people are angry? They see an explosion of technology, they see an explosion of productivity, and yet a male worker today is making less than a male worker—the average male worker—made 44 years ago.

The average female worker earned $1,775 less than they did in 2007. A recordbreaking 46.5 million Americans lived in poverty last year. That is more people living in poverty than at any time in American history. Sixteen million children live in poverty. That is almost 22 percent of all kids in America. That is the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world. That is the future of America. Over one out of five kids in the country is living in poverty.

A higher percentage of African Americans lived in poverty last year than was the case 15 years ago, and 9.1 percent of seniors lived in poverty last year, higher than in 2009. More American seniors were living in poverty last year than in 1972. Today, 48 million Americans are uninsured, no health insurance. That will change as a result of ObamaCare. But as of today, 48 million Americans are uninsured, 3 million more than in 2008.

So when people call the Presiding Officer's office in Delaware or my office in Vermont and they say: You know what: we are hurting, they are telling the truth. What they are saying is Congress seems to deal with everything except the reality facing the middle class and working families of this country.

People worry desperately not only for themselves, they worry more for their kids. What kind of education will their kids have? Will there be enough teachers in the classroom? Will their kids be able to afford to go to college or will young working families be able to find quality, affordable child care? What kind of job will their kids have when they get out of high school or they get out of college?

Those are the questions that tens of millions of Americans are asking all over this country. Here in Washington, we are not giving them clear and straightforward answers. What makes this moment in American history unique is that while the great American middle class is disappearing and while the number of Americans living in poverty is at an alltime high, something else is going on in this society; that is, that the people on top, the top 1 percent, have never, ever had it so good. Last week we learned an astounding fact I want everybody to hear clearly; that is, between 2009 and 2012, the last years we have information on, 95 percent of all new income created in this country went to the top 1 percent—95 percent of all of the new income created in America went to the top 1 percent.

The bottom 99 percent shared in 4 percent of the new income. So what we are seeing as a nation is the disappearance of the middle class, millions of families leaving the middle class and descending into poverty, struggling desperately to feed their families, to put gas in their car, to get to work, to survive on an $8-an-hour wage.

You have that reality over here, and then you have another reality; that is, the people on top are doing better than at any time since before the Great Depression.

Today, the top 1 percent own 38 percent of the Nation's financial wealth. Meanwhile, the bottom 60 percent, the majority of the American people together, own only 2.3 percent of the wealth in this country. When I was in school we used to—and I am sure all over this country—study what we called an oligarchy. An oligarchy is a nation in which a handful of very wealthy people control the economy, control the politics of the nation. It does not matter about political parties because they own those parties as well.

Guess what. What we used to look at in Latin America and laugh about or worry about has now come home to

this country. In America today, we have the most unequal distribution of wealth and income of any major country on Earth. That gap between the very rich and everybody else is growing wider.

I do not believe the American people feel that is what this great country should be about; that the top 1 percent owns 38 percent of the wealth, while the bottom 60 percent owns barely 2 percent of the wealth. That is not the dream of what this great country is about.

Earlier this week Forbes magazine reported that the wealthiest 400 Americans in this country—400 people—are now worth a recordbreaking $2 trillion—400 people worth $2 trillion; in other words, the concentration of wealth is getting greater and greater and greater. The wealthiest 400 Americans now own more wealth than the bottom half of Americans, over 150 million Americans.

We could probably squeeze 400 people into this room. If we did and they were the wealthiest people in this country, 400 people in this room would own more wealth than the bottom 50 percent of the American people.

Just one family, one family in America, the Walton family, the owners of Walmart, are worth over $100 billion and own more wealth than the bottom 40 percent of the American people. One family owns more wealth than the bottom 40 percent of Americans.

While the middle class disappears, while children in this country go hungry, while veterans sleep out on the streets, corporate profits are now at an alltime high, while wages, as a share of the economy, are at a record low.

Wall Street—the major financial institutions in this country whose greed and recklessness drove us into this economic downturn and the group of people the American middle class bailed out 5 years ago—is now doing phenomenally well. So Wall Street drives the country into a severe economic downturn. Wall Street is bailed out by the American middle class. Wall Street now is doing phenomenally well while the middle class is disappearing.

You want to know why the American people are angry and disgusted and frustrated? That is why. In fact, the CEOs on Wall Street, the executives there, are on track to make more money this year than they did in 2009. That is the time in which Wall Street greed destroyed our economy.

The American middle class is disappearing. Poverty is increasing. The gap between the rich and everyone else is growing wider and wider. That is the economic reality facing this country. The time is long overdue for this Congress and this President to start, in a very forceful, aggressive way, to address that issue.

But where are we today? Are we having a major debate on the floor of the Senate as to how we are going to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and create millions of jobs? I do not hear that debate. Are we having a debate on the floor of the Senate that says it is an outrage that working people throughout the country are trying to survive on a minimum wage of $7.25 and we need to raise that substantially so that when people work 40 hours a week they can actually take care of themselves and their families and not go deeper into debt? Are we having that debate? I do not hear that.

Are we having a debate which says that not only should we not cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, but we should join the rest of the industrialized world and guarantee health care to all of our people as a right of citizenship? I do not hear that debate; quite the contrary, this is the debate I hear. This is what I am hearing from my colleagues over in the House and the Republican leadership over there. What I am hearing them say is that while poverty is at an alltime high, while our childcare system, early childhood education is a disaster, what they want to do is continue sequestration and push for more across-the-board spending cuts to Head Start, while elderly people throughout the country who are fragile and hurting are dependent on the Meals On Wheels Program, they want to continue cuts in that program.

They want to continue cuts in that program. While millions of families are wondering how they are going to send kids to college, they want to continue sequestration, making it harder for families to send their kids to college. They want to continue cuts to unemployment insurance and a number of other vital programs; in other words, instead of addressing the very serious problems facing the middle class and the working class of this country, what I am hearing from my Republican colleagues is let's make a bad situation even worse.

Let me conclude by saying, instead of cutting the Head Start Program, we should be expanding the Head Start Program. Study after study makes it clear that the most important years of a human being's life are 0 to 3. Giving those little kids the intellectual and emotional nourishment they need so they will do well in school is perhaps the most important work we can do.

We have to increase funding for Head Start, not cut funding for Head Start.

It is a moral outrage in this country that anybody here talks about cutting back on the Meals On Wheels Program, which provides at least one nutritious meal per day to fragile and vulnerable citizens. We should not be cutting back on that program; we should be significantly expanding that program.

I can tell you that in Vermont, if you talk to the people in my State, they will tell you we have significant problems with our bridges, significant problems with our roads, significant problems with rail, significant problems with wastewater and water plants. People want to invest in our crumbling infrastructure and make us a productive nation. When we do that, we can create jobs.

Right now on the floor—I don't know if we are going to get to vote on it—there is a very modest bill brought forth by Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN which talks about energy efficiency. In Vermont and throughout this country, people are paying higher fuel bills than they should, wasting enormous amounts of energy, and contributing to global warming through greenhouse gas emissions because we are not aggressive on energy efficiency, making our homes more efficient. We should be investing in energy efficiency and creating jobs doing this.

The bottom line is we are in a pivotal moment in American history. The rich are getting richer, the middle class is disappearing, and poverty is at an alltime high. People are demanding that we create jobs and address the problems facing this country. Yet we have folks who want to make a bad situation worse by protecting the tax breaks that have been given to the wealthy and large corporations and then cut back on the needs of ordinary Americans.

I hope the American people will stand and say enough is enough and that they will demand that, finally, Congress stands with the middle class of this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I rise to talk about the relentless assault on the poor and hungry in this country that is being waged right now in the House of Representatives and too often on the Senate floor.

The meltdown on Wall Street caused a recession in this country, as we know, that was worse than anything we have experienced since the Great Depression. Eight million people, eight million Americans lost their jobs. Trillions of dollars in the stock market were wiped out. With that money went the life savings of many middle-class families.

Many families lost their homes. Small businesses closed up shop. This was an economic disaster that hit communities across this country as hard as any natural disaster we have seen.

While Wall Street is doing well again these days, millions of families on Main Street are still waiting for their situation to improve. We are seeing new job creation, but millions of Americans are still out of work. In fact, when we look at the chart on employment rates, we see what happened in 2008 and 2009, the numbers of people who lost their jobs. While based on the population we are holding our own, we are just barely at this point keeping up with the population and beginning to grow again.

What the House Republicans are saying is get a good-paying job or your family will just have to go hungry. But there aren't enough good-paying jobs, as we all know. To add insult to injury,

they are slashing job-training money, which makes absolutely no sense, job-training money that States get to help Americans find work.

Economists point also to the irresponsible sequestration cuts as a cause for this sluggish job growth.

In the Senate we have passed a budget that will replace the sequester with a balanced solution to reduce the debt and balance the budget, but a handful of Senators on the other side of the aisle are blocking us from even being able to send negotiators to the House to finalize the budget. We are now stuck with a policy that makes absolutely no sense, that economists say is slowing down our economy and costing us jobs because of political games, pure and simple, in Washington.

This is having a very serious effect on the wallets of Americans who continue to find it difficult to put food on the table for their families. This is very real. It is not a political game for American families all across the country and certainly in my great State of Michigan. Even those people who are able to find work are working for less. In fact, wages as a percent of the economy are at 30-year lows.

When we look back, what has happened is not only is job growth not coming back as fast as it should, we are seeing people who have been in the middle class struggling by their fingertips trying to hold on or, most of the time, much of the time, losing ground because we are seeing wages going down, down, and down, even for the jobs that are available. This is a situation that millions of Americans find themselves in today. They are struggling to find work. When they do find work, the salary isn't even close to what it was before the recession.

Many people have taken pay cuts to keep their jobs or they have had their pay and benefits frozen for 4 or 5 years. Families who only 5 or 10 years ago were doing fine are now in dire straits.

Now the same Republicans who refuse to fix the sequester, who refuse to work with us to get the economy moving again for millions of middle-class families, again are trying to take temporary food assistance away from the children and families who are out of work or who are working one, two or three part-time jobs trying to make ends meet.

Let me stress as we debate the question of hunger and food assistance in America, we know that many families receiving SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, are working. They are working.

About half of those families receiving food help are working. They are people with children and whose wages are falling behind so they are no longer able to feed their families.

For those who have lost their jobs, SNAP is a short-term lifeline to keep food on the table while they search for work. We know the average new SNAP recipient only receives help for 10 months or less. Let me repeat that. A person who is coming onto this program during this recession worked before they needed help. They are getting an average of 10 months' worth of help so their family doesn't starve while they are looking for work and trying to put the pieces back together. Then after that they are going back to work.

What we also know is men, women, families on supplemental nutrition assistance are using that money to feed their children. Nearly half of the people who are getting food assistance help in this country are children. We are looking now at nearly half being children, children who are going to bed hungry at night while their parents are doing the best they can to get back on their feet.

We see senior citizens who find themselves in a situation where their only income is Social Security. That little bit of food help makes a difference of whether they can go to the grocery store and put food in the cupboard or not.

The real faces of food assistance are veterans who went to war for this country, many of whom were injured and returned home only to find they couldn't get a job or their disabilities made it impossible to work. People with disabilities are the faces of food assistance. Instead of honoring these men and women for their service, House Republicans want to take away the little bit of help they get each month to buy food.

If we add all of this, 85 percent of the faces of food assistance, of SNAP, are children with their parents, people with disabilities, including our veterans, and senior citizens—85 percent. The bill being considered in the House of Representatives would kick millions of children and their families off food assistance.

This is how majority leader ERIC CANTOR and House Republicans will cut $40 billion in food assistance. That is what they will be voting on, probably tomorrow. They do it by cutting off individuals and families who need the assistance the most.

Under the Republican plan, which ERIC CANTOR says encourages people to get back to work, benefits for a jobless adult without children would be limited to 3 months every 3 years. They better eat a lot during those 3 months.

That means if you lose your job and you are unemployed for 6 months, half of the time you will be able to have help in order to be able to put food on your table. Once you find a new job, you had better make sure your company doesn't close and doesn't go overseas within the next 2½ years or you will not be able to have any help to put food on the table as well.

It is important to note that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has said that 14 million people will stop receiving food assistance over the next 10 years the right way. As the economy improves, they will get back on their feet financially and be able to find a good-paying job. We built into our farm bill reduced costs in SNAP because the economy is beginning to improve. But the House of Representatives, the House Republican majority leader's bill, eliminates families from food assistance the wrong way—by eliminating food help to those who most need it: 1.7 million poor, unemployed adults next year, whose average income is about $2,500 a year—$2,500 a year; those are the folks who would lose help with food—2.1 million low-income working families and seniors next year alone, 210,000 children who would receive cuts and would lose their school lunches under the House Republican plan, and other unemployed parents and their children—parents who want to work but can't find a job or a training program to join—will be eliminated from help.

The Republicans say it is about getting people back to work. But this bill cuts worker training and job placement for people who are trying to get back to work, who are mortified that, probably for the first time in their lives, they have needed help with food. They are people who have paid taxes their whole lives and who got caught up in this great recession and are trying to climb out but need a little help with one of the things I think we would all consider pretty basic—the ability to eat and provide food for their families.

People on SNAP want to work. They are like any American wanting to work, but there currently are not enough jobs, which is why we should be focusing on jobs and growing the economy. Right now we have three unemployed workers for every job opening. It is better. I can remember standing on the floor a few years ago saying the number was six unemployed workers for every job, and then five, and now it is three. But it is still three for every job opening.

Does the Republican plan do anything to help people find jobs or the job training skills they need to get a good-paying job so they can care for their families? No, absolutely not. In fact, the Republican plan would offer cash-strapped States a truly perverse incentive. I had to read this several times to see whether this was actually written down this way. They are allowing States to keep half of the Federal money that would be spent on food whenever they cut somebody off the program. So the incentive is to eliminate help for people so the State can keep half the money and use it for something else. That is in the House bill.

Let me be clear: We have seen occasions of fraud and abuse in the food assistance program, and that is why the Senate farm bill includes major reforms to crack down on misuse and to make sure only people who truly need help are getting help. We heard reports of people winning the lottery, two in my home State, but who are still getting SNAP benefits. That will not happen again under our bill. We have seen liquor stores accepting food stamps

when they do not sell much food. We have reformed that to make sure that cannot happen again, as well as a number of other areas where we can bring more accountability and tighten up the program.

We want every dollar to go to the people I am talking about today—who work hard all their lives, find themselves in a bad situation and are trying to climb out but they need a little bit of help because their children are hungry, because they are hungry. Maybe they are a veteran or maybe they are a senior or maybe they are somebody with a disability who needs a little bit of help. So we have passed real reforms to crack down on abuses we have found, and we did it in a bipartisan way in the Senate. I am very proud of that.

What House Republicans are voting on is nothing more than an extremely divisive, extremely partisan political exercise that is, by the way, going nowhere, and it is jeopardizing the passage of a 5-year farm bill. We have never seen this kind of partisanship injected into agricultural policy in our country before. It is shocking what has happened in the last 2 years in the House of Representatives. And shame on the majority floor leader and his allies for doing it now.

Our farmers, our ranchers, our small towns and rural communities and our children and families do not deserve this. The 16 million people who work in this country because of agriculture do not deserve this. What is happening this week in the House of Representatives is not about reality, it is about some fiction they have made up—an idea if the stock market is doing well, if wealthy Members of Congress and others are doing well, then surely everyone in America must be doing well too. And anyone who isn't must be lazy or not trying hard enough.

The reality is most people in America are still struggling to get back on their feet from the recession. There still aren't enough jobs for every person who needs and wants one. The jobs that are there pay less than they did 5 years ago, and families getting food help are making about $500 a week. They do not have money in the stock market. They do not have investment income. In fact, the average SNAP family doesn't have more than $300 in assets—things they own. What they do have, though, because of our policy of supporting those families, is $4.53 a day to eat. That is right, $4.53 a day to eat—less than the cost of one specialty coffee at our favorite stores.

But some Members of the House of Representatives have decided that is too much, that $4.53 a day is too much for our disabled veterans, too much for our senior citizens living on Social Security, too much for our children, for families working multiple part-time jobs and trying to figure out how to get out of the hole that was created not by them but by others in the great recession.

We all want to spend less on food assistance, and the good news is, under the Senate farm bill we all voted on, we do spend less. The baseline for food assistance is going down. Why? Because the economy is improving. There is $11.5 billion in reduced spending built into our farm bill because people are finding jobs, and that is added to the $4 billion in fraud and misuse we have included.

Again, the Congressional Budget Office projects that 14 million people will leave the supplemental nutrition program as the economy improves because they will no longer need temporary help. Costs are going down the right way, because the economy is beginning to improve. And as it improves more aggressively, which is what we should be working on together, we will see those costs go down.

I should also add that SNAP recipients are already going to see an arbitrary cut, unfortunately, to their benefits on November 1 because of the expiration of the Recovery Act help that temporarily boosted assistance to families in need, which we did in 2009. So they are already going to see less available for food.

If we want to continue to cut spending the right way, we should be working together to invest in our economy, to support our businesses, large and small, to outinnovate the global competition, to get rid of the sequester and to help people get the training they need to find good-paying jobs.

The Republican approach is like saying: You know, we are so tired of spending money on wildfires—forest fires—so we will cut the budget for the fire service. That isn't going to work. The fires will rage on and they will only get worse. If we want fewer fires we have to find ways to prevent fires and contain the fires in order to reduce the cost.

The Republican approach is also like saying: We are tired of paying for the cost of drought, flooding, and other crop disasters so we will cut crop insurance. The government's cost of crop insurance went up over $5 billion—50 percent—last year because of droughts and flooding and so on. It went up 50 percent. And while we are seeing increases in crop insurance, it is projected that food assistance is actually going down $11.5 billion over the next 10 years.

Are the House Republicans proposing we eliminate help for farmers in a disaster or just low-income families—children, seniors, disabled veterans—when they have a disaster?

What is happening in the House right now is a complete reversal of 50 years of great American values. Today, in the United States of America, one in six people say they do not know where their next meal will come from—one in six Americans in the greatest, the wealthiest country in the world. We have a long history in this country of making sure that poverty and hunger are kept in check. In fact, Presidents on both sides have understood this. President Ronald Reagan said:

> As long as there is one person in this country who is hungry, that's one person too many.

That is one person too many. I wish our House Republicans could hear that and understand what he was saying. What would he have to say about this effort now in the House of Representatives to blame the victims of poverty and unemployment, to blame the children, to blame the seniors, to blame the veterans, who only want enough food to be able to eat and, for those who are able, to work and to get back on their feet and get a job?

The House Republicans who are proposing these drastic cuts all have enough to eat. We in the Senate are not living on $4.53 a day for food. We have enough to eat. None of us wonder where our next meal is going to come from, like the one out of six Americans. None of us have to worry about whether our children will go to bed hungry tonight. None of us have to skip meals so our children don't have to.

We in America are better than the debate that is being waged in the House of Representatives. The good news for children, families, seniors, the disabled and veterans across America is that the House bill will never see the light of day in the Senate. It is time to stop the political games around hunger in America. It is time to work together and pass a 5-year farm and food bill, to grow the economy and reduce the need for food assistance the right way—by making sure every American has the ability to have a good-paying job so they can feed their families and achieve their part of the American dream.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Just to make sure, because Senator ROBERTS—I had a question. He has gotten some time from Senator CRUZ; is that correct? Senator HEITKAMP wanted to make comments for a couple of minutes following Senator STABENOW.

So this is what I would ask: After Senator HEITKAMP is recognized, I would be recognized. If Senator CRUZ comes, I will stop at that time and yield the time to Senator CRUZ and then continue after he has finished. That would be a consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBERTS. Reserving the right to object, my remarks will only take 4 minutes to identify myself with Senator CRUZ's effort on Benghazi. I know Senator INHOFE would like to say a few words.

So perhaps I could start?

Mrs. BOXER. Well, if I could just say that I am happy to allow that to go forward, but there needs to be a definite time. How much time will all three Senators—my understanding was that Senator CRUZ—for how many minutes?

Mr. ROBERTS. I think it was 15 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. So if the Senator is asking that he take Senator CRUZ's 15 minutes, I have no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am not going to take all of the 15 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Well, if the Senator is asking that he take part of the Senator's 15 minutes and count against Senator CRUZ's time, I have no problem with that whatsoever. So I would revise that to say that Senator HEITKAMP would be going for 3 minutes, Senator ROBERTS would be going for 5 minutes, and then I would be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBERTS. Reserving the right to object, it is a 15-minute slot that we had intended, and I am sure the Senators will arrive.

Mrs. BOXER. When Senator CRUZ arrives to take the additional 15 minutes, that is fine. So in other words, the Senator takes 5 minutes, Senator CRUZ comes, and I would yield to him for the rest of the 15 minutes. He is not here.

Mr. ROBERTS. I withdraw any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I will be very brief, recognizing the other urgent business the Senate needs to address, but I did want to associate myself with the remarks of the very able and capable chairwoman of the agriculture committee, Senator STABENOW.

We have a disaster in the making. It is called the farm bill. Months ago this body passed a comprehensive farm bill recognizing a 50-year compromise, a 50-year association of nutrition assistance with the ability to provide disaster assistance to our farmers in this country. For 50 years that effort has served us very well.

Today and this week in the House of Representatives, they will do something that is unprecedented in 50 years: They will segregate, pass separate bills, and do a disservice to struggling, unemployed, underemployed American families; that is, dramatically reduce the food stamp allocation.

Food stamps are there when people need them in the same way that farm disaster payments are there when farmers need them. Anyone who thinks someone is living high on the hog, so to speak, on food stamps needs to spend time with people who are trying to make it work and feed their families on $1.40 per meal.

We know that with a recovering economy we are going to see a dwindling number of those folks move on. Yet we see this move almost in a way that is going to challenge this long-term relationship that has basically enabled a great partnership between many of our urban and rural legislators, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives, but also something that speaks to a very important value we have, which is that kids ought not to go hungry in this country. That is not who we are. We are not a country that allows children and families who are working, in many cases, to go hungry. And when they need that help, that temporary help they have been receiving, they ought to get it because it makes sense. It makes them better citizens, and it makes them better students. It tells us that, yes, when times are very tough—as they have been for so many American families—we will be there.

Let's not let this happen. Let's fight back. Let's continue to have this conversation, and let's pass a comprehensive farm bill that recognizes the need to feed people as well as provide disaster assistance for farmers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, Senator CRUZ is now on the floor, and he will be speaking right after me.

I thank Senator CRUZ for his efforts to keep the focus on the Benghazi terrorist attacks.

It seems to me to be a great shame that 1 year after the heinous attacks on our consulate in Benghazi and four Americans being murdered and—this is tremendously important—shaking the confidence of our men and women deployed in service to this Nation that the United States would never leave one of their own behind—I was told that when I joined the Marine Corps a long time ago—it is a great shame that we are still in the same place.

Justice has yet to be seen or done. The families of those killed at the consulate in Benghazi are waiting for answers about what happened that night, and they simply want to know that this President and this administration are working to seek justice for what actually happened. Yet it appears that what is happening is that the administration is doing everything but seek justice. Quite frankly, I think Americans—and I share their concern and frustration and anger—are sick and tired of hearing excuses, delays, and even silence. The President and his administration have stonewalled us on this case, in my personal view.

This should have been called a terrorist attack a long time ago. The Intelligence Committee should be handling this, but that is not the case. Today the FBI continues to seek tips from Libyans. The FBI has even posted an entire page on their Web site dedicated to finding suspects. There are photos of 29 suspects on that page. Twenty-nine. No arrests have been made. CNN and The New York Times have even had access to one of the chief suspects, Ahmed Abu Khattala, to interview him while he mocks the U.S. investigation. This is unbelievable.

The administration refuses to answer simple questions:

Who told the military to stand down?

Who is responsible for misleading the American public and the victims' families?

What actionable intelligence did our government have?

I know that there was actionable intelligence. People asked for that security. Why was it ignored? This is why we need a joint select committee.

At the very least, this deserves a vote. So I urge my colleagues, please drop your hold. Let us at least have a vote. If you want to defeat it, defeat it. But at least allow the Senator from Texas to have an opportunity to debate this bill.

I thank Senator CRUZ for introducing this legislation. I believe this should be a top priority for our government.

I yield back any remaining time I have to the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Kansas for his leadership and for his reasonable call that we ascertain the truth on this very important matter.

As we do every year, last week as a nation we marked the somber anniversary of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. For the first time this year we also remembered the victims of Benghazi: Foreign Service officer Sean Smith, former Navy SEALs Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods, and Ambassador Christopher Stevens, who was our first Ambassador murdered while serving since Adolph Dubs in 1979.

The anniversary of the Benghazi attacks, however, should not simply be an act of remembrance; it should serve as a wake-up call. An entire year has gone by since these American heroes lost their lives in the service of our Nation, and we still have far too many unanswered questions:

Why was the State Department unwilling to provide the requested level of security in Benghazi?

Why were no military assets mobilized while the attacks were going on even if they might not arrive before the attacks were over?

If then-Secretary Panetta had ''no question'' in his mind that this was a coordinated terrorist attack while it was going on, why did Ambassador Rice, Secretary Clinton, and President Obama all tell the American people that the cause was a spontaneous demonstration about an Internet video in the days after September 11, 2012?

Why did the State Department edit the intelligence talking points to delete the references to ''Islamic extremists'' and ''Al Qaeda''?

Why did the FBI not release pictures of militants taken the day of the attack and released them only 8 months after the fact? Why not immediately, as proved so effective in the Boston bombing last April?

What role, if any, did the State Department's own counterterrorism office play during the attack and in its immediate aftermath?

Why have none of the survivors testified to Congress?

Why do the Benghazi whistleblowers still fear retaliation and retribution?

To get the answers to these questions, we need to hear from the survivors of the attack to gain firsthand understanding of what happened that night. We need to ensure that the whistleblowers on Benghazi can tell their stories without fear of reprisal. We need the President to make good on his promise of September 12, 2012, ''to bring justice to the killers who attacked our people.'' That still has yet to happen.

Over the past year it has become evident that we need a joint select committee to get these answers because we have an administration that is actively trying to avoid learning more about Benghazi. We have a former Secretary of State who responds to congressional inquiries about why we were attacked in Benghazi with ''what difference at this point does it make?'' We have a current Secretary of State who responds to congressional inquiries about why the administration deliberately misidentified the nature of the attack by saying that he does not want to spend a whole year ''coming up here talking about Benghazi'' to Congress. We have a White House Press Secretary who responds to press inquiries about difficulties in interviewing the survivors by simply dismissing Benghazi as something that ''happened a long time ago.'' And we have a President who complains that ''phony scandals'' are distracting him from his domestic agenda, by which, his Press Secretary clarified the next day, he meant the IRS targeting and Benghazi.

In addition, we have seen in recent weeks an escalating pattern of obstruction by the administration into any investigation into Benghazi and a reluctance to take any action to retaliate against the attack or to prevent a future episode.

On August 14 there were press reports that the team of special operators who were in Libya to track down those responsible for the Benghazi attack were being pulled out despite repeated recommendations for action, some as recent as August 7.

On August 20 we learned that the only disciplinary action taken after Benghazi would be reversed as the four State Department employees who had been placed on administrative leave after the attacks were reinstated.

On August 23 the State Department said it was ''not prepared'' to allow the Benghazi survivors to testify to Congress—a denial that was reportedly reiterated by Secretary of State John Kerry on September 10.

On September 11 we learned from the State Department's own internal review that the Department is ''lagging behind'' in implementing the new security measures recommended after the Benghazi attack, with, for example, only 100 of the recommended 1,000 marines being deployed for potential hotspots.

On September 15 we learned of serious allegations in a draft House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform report that the Accountability Review Board report requested by Secretary Clinton whitewashed the responsibility of senior State Department officials for the decisions that resulted in the lack of proper security at the Benghazi facilities.

Just today at a House Foreign Affairs Committee hearing, Under Secretary of State for Management Patrick Kennedy admitted that the FBI investigation in Benghazi has ground to an indefinite halt because of the security situation in Libya. Mr. Kennedy also asserted in this hearing that the reassignment of four State Department employees represented ''serious accountability'' for the four Americans who died in Benghazi.

This state of affairs is, in a word, unacceptable. Truth is not partisan, and every Member of this body should want to ascertain what happened. Given the yearlong collective failure of our government either to gain clarity on what happened in Benghazi on September 11 or to extract any retribution for the terrorist attacks, Congress should now form a joint select committee to launch a proper investigation.

The attacks on our diplomatic facilities in Benghazi are part of a larger threat we have faced for the last 12 years from radical Islamic terrorists. We cannot let this anniversary pass with just ''a thought, a hope, a prayer or a wish'' as Secretary Kerry recommended in an all-staff e-mail to the State Department regarding the Benghazi attack. We need a chief counsel who can systematically ascertain the truth and can follow the actual facts of what happened that night to their full and logical conclusion, wherever that may lie, so that we can honor these American heroes and we can ensure that we are doing everything we can to prevent this sort of attack from ever happening again. If we refuse to seek the answers to these questions, then we are inviting future tragedies.

We have four dead Americans. It has been a full year. My cosponsors on this resolution and I have had enough without answers and without the truth.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 225

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 225, that the Senate proceed to its consideration, that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. I object and I would like to explain why, if that would be appropriate for the next 2 minutes—if I could?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator may proceed.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am proud be a longtime member of the Foreign Relations Committee for many years. When this Benghazi tragedy occurred, the Foreign Relations Committee held hours of hearings. I sat through those hearings.

I want to say to my friends, I share their dismay that we have not caught the perpetrators. But I want to remind them that the President who caught Osama bin Laden—who killed so many of our people—was President Obama, and when he says he is going to do something he will not rest until he does it.

Secretary Clinton immediately called for an Accountability Review Board. That Accountability Review Board was not partisan. What my colleague wants to do is set up some kind of committee filled with politicians—of which I happen to be proud that I am one—but I put more faith, frankly, in the professionalism and the nonpartisanship of the Accountability Review Board.

Who headed that Accountability Review Board? Ambassador Thomas Pickering, who was first picked for public service by George H.W. Bush; and Admiral Michael Mullen, former head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There are many other reasons why I oppose this. Secretary Kerry has addressed this and continues to address it. We had two classified briefings. The Select Committee on Intelligence is preparing to release a bipartisan report on the events that occurred in Benghazi and, last December, the Senate Homeland Security Committee released a bipartisan report on the security deficiencies, and the good news is: Of course as a result of this tragedy, changes have been made all over the world.

I sense there is politics here. I sense there is politics here. I do not think it is right to inject politics into such a tragedy. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I can't disagree there is politics here. This is the Senate. But let me say one thing. I strongly support this amendment. Let me ask in the order of things right now, does the Senator from Texas still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Very good. I appreciate that.

One thing, as I read this resolution that my good friend Senator CRUZ has, I thought it really does not go far enough. I think all that people are talking about now is how can we preclude this from happening again, what happened and all that. To me that is not even the issue. The issue is the coverup.

I sat there as the ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee. I watched the day that this happened, 9/11, then of course the annex came after that, 9/12, the next day. When that happened there was never any doubt but that it was an organized terrorist attack—never any doubt.

I happened to know Chris Stevens. He happened to be in my office right before he was deployed there. He was telling me in my office how dangerous it was over there. He said, you know, there are threats, there are terrorist threats. Al Qaeda has a presence over there and we do not have a lot of security, and he started requesting security. This is a long time before this happened. I have all the dates. I did not bring them down with me because it would be redundant. It has been in the RECORD so many times, that he knew this was happening. We knew there was this kind of activity in that part of the world and he wanted to do something about it, offer more security.

He is dead now, and he knew what he was getting into at that time. When the threats came for what happened on 9/11, people were aware of that. Remember the Brits, they left and several others just up and left because they knew what kind of threat was out there.

Anyway, what we did right after 9/11—and it is just a matter of hours after that they attacked the annex. They cannot say for certain that the original attack was organized. I think it was; it was an organized terrorist attack. But they can say with certainty, and I will not use my words, I will use their words, it was ''unequivocal,'' unequivocal that we knew at that time it was an organized terrorist attack.

I remember when Secretary Panetta came forward and he used the same word ''unequivocal.'' Then the CIA Chief Brennan, at that time—that was his job—said, sitting in my office and then again before a hearing, it was unequivocal that we knew it was an organized terrorist, Al Qaeda-related attack. We knew it.

The coverup is this. I have studied coverups for a long time. Iran-Contra, I went all the way through that. I remember that well. The Pentagon Papers, Watergate, all of these things were coverups. But this one, where 5 days after all of our people and the top security people knew it was an organized attack, to send Ambassador Rice to the talk shows to say, for purely political reasons and cover up the reality of it, that this was due to some video—I will only say this. I would like to pursue this in terms of the coverup, which is not covered in the resolution we are discussing right now. I think it should be—it should have been. I was not part of drafting it. I strongly support it. I know where we are coming from, and I think we need to get to the bottom of it. All the questions need to be answered. But the big issue that needs to be discussed, that nobody likes to talk about, is the coverup.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from the Foreign Relations Committee having already objected, but I wish to make a few remarks because there are those—regardless of what is reviewed, regardless of who comes forth, regardless of all the information—who want to keep this alive for what are ultimately election purposes. I know the next Presidential election is a few years away, but it seems it is very alive in the Senate.

Look, I am always for getting to the truth, particularly when the lives of American diplomats have been lost. That is an honorable pursuit. But by the same token, from my perspective—and let me say why I am going to have this perspective. My perspective is we have two of the most outstanding individuals in Ambassador Pickering and Admiral Mullen. Certainly, no one questions their integrity. At least I have not heard their integrity questioned on the Senate floor. They conducted the Accountability Review Board. In the process, they yielded 29 recommendations that are, in fact, being implemented, that our committee has continued to pursue oversight in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We have held two hearings. We have had multiple level—high-level briefings, including intelligence briefings, bringing all the respective parties who are responsible together.

In fact, we had the former Secretary of State before the committee at a hearing I chaired at the time who addressed all of these issues. We had before that, former Chairman Kerry, now Secretary Kerry. He held a hearing of the committee on the events that transpired with Deputy Secretary Burns and Deputy Under Secretary Nyes. We had two classified briefings on December 13 and 19, specifically on the circumstances surrounding the attack.

In those classified briefings, we had the key individuals who could get us to the truth. I understand the Select Committee on Intelligence is presenting a bipartisan report on the events that occurred in Benghazi. Last December, the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs chairman at the time, Senator Lieberman, and Ranking Member COLLINS released a bipartisan report on the security deficiencies at the temporary U.S. mission in Benghazi that led to the deaths of those four Americans, including our Ambassador Chris Stevens. The House has conducted its own hearings and investigations. Yet we have those who want to continue to pursue this, despite all of these different efforts, independent of the Senate, between the House, the Accountability Review Board.

There is a lot of culpability, and maybe there is coverup in a different sense. The coverup is a Congress that doesn't want to put the money where it is necessary, to ultimately take the high-risk, high-threat posts of this country and ultimately protect them. It is nice to talk about who is responsible. Let's talk about who is also responsible in terms of obligations. We have over 30 high-risk, high-threat posts in the world right now—right now as we speak on the Senate floor—that are at risk and that do not meet the present security standards. Yet Congress seems to move ever so slowly toward getting to the resources that would accelerate the pace on which we create the physical and other protections for those high-threat, high-risk posts.

Those, of course, are the 30 that exist today. We know from history that in fact what exists today as a high-risk, high-threat post, tomorrow there could be another one on the list. So we have diplomats who are at institutions that do not meet the present standards. Yet at the pace we are going, based upon the appropriations of this Senate, we would find ourselves a decade from now dealing with just those 30 posts. I would like to see the Members who do not seem to be willing to vote for the security of diplomats abroad, before the next attack comes—and inevitability, unfortunately, in the world in which we live that is very possible—put their resources to work to accelerate the pace to where we would succeed in preventing injuries or death.

Let's be honest about this process. Yes, there was a process that ultimately led to a series of recommendations. The legislation that the committee has ultimately reported out in a bipartisan basis—working with Senator CORKER, the ranking Republican on the committee—would deal with these challenges. It would deal with language issues. It would deal with the funding issue. It would deal with diplomatic security preparation, which we have scattered across a whole bunch of institutions that do not meet the goal. It would deal with all of these elements. It would create greater accountability.

Do you know what else it would do? It would let the Secretary of State have the ability to ultimately fire those individuals who might be found derelict in their duty, which is not presently in the law—the ability for the Secretary to pursue that.

So let's move that legislation. I hope my colleagues are going to support that as we move forward, to try to find the success that we want in making sure that our diplomats across the globe are as safe as humanly possible as they advocate America's national economic interests, its national interests, its national security interests, still always facing a risk but minimizing those risks to the greatest extent. If not, then I certainly believe the garish light of attention should be placed upon the institution of the Congress, which is not meeting its responsibility as it relates to our diplomats abroad.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be acknowledged as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we have had a carefully constructed list of who would speak. I wonder how long the Senator wishes to speak.

Mr. INHOFE. I do want to accommodate the Senator from California. I have three different subjects I want to talk about——

Mrs. BOXER. How much time does my friend need to talk about his first subject?

Mr. INHOFE. I need 9½ minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. What was supposed to happen was that I was going to speak next. I will give up my place so Senator MURRAY can speak, followed by Senator COONS, followed by Senator INHOFE for 9½ minutes.

I don't know how many minutes my friend needs—5 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I will need about 12 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I would follow Senator INHOFE's 9½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Is that a unanimous consent request?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

Mr. INHOFE. The Senator from California would follow the Senator from Washington?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the consent I made was that we would go to Senator MURRAY for 12 minutes, followed by Senator COONS for 5 minutes, Senator INHOFE would be next for 9½ minutes, and then I would get to go for about 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, point of inquiry: Is this after I speak now or is that starting now? In other words, we would have four Democrats before I speak?

Mrs. BOXER. No, two.

Mr. INHOFE. The Senator already had one and then Senator COONS.

Mrs. BOXER. The Republicans had quite a few on their side speak. The Republicans had three speakers—one right after the other—so now we are going to have three speakers, and then it goes back to Senator INHOFE.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if two of them speak now and then let me speak and then the Senator can speak after that, that is still 2 to 1.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, that is what I said. I said Senator MURRAY, Senator COONS, Senator INHOFE, and then Senator BOXER. That is what I said. Is that all right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from California for accommodating all of us.

I wish to join my colleagues who have spoken on the floor and express my deepest condolences to the families of those who lost someone in Monday's tragic shooting. I know the thoughts and prayers of the Nation are with those who are still recovering.

I know I speak for my constituents in Washington State in thanking the law enforcement community here in Washington, DC. They put their lives on the line every day to protect our families and workers in the Nation's capital. We don't have all the answers to the many questions a tragedy such as this raises, but those questions will continue to be asked, and I am hopeful the answers will help our Nation heal and guide our continued work to prevent these kinds of tragedies in the future.

I am here today because, like many of my colleagues, I spent this past August traveling around my home State and meeting with my constituents. I heard from Washington State families about a wide range of issues facing our Nation, but the one sentiment I heard over and over from every part of my State was they were sick and tired of the constant lurching from crisis to crisis.

They told me how disappointed and disgusted they were that every time they turned on their televisions over the past few years they would see another story about Congress hurtling toward another official deadline, hurting our economy and causing more uncertainty for our businesses. They told me they want Congress to work together; they want us to focus on the economy; they want us to put our country and the families we represent before partisanship and political gains.

I couldn't agree more. Like them, I am frustrated that we seem to be once again headed toward another completely avoidable, completely unnecessary, self-inflicted crisis.

It has now been 179 days since this Senate and the House passed our budgets. When the Senate budget passed, I was optimistic that because both Republicans and Democrats said they wanted to return to regular order, we might be able to get back to a responsible process. At that time we had 192 days to reach a bipartisan budget agreement and I thought the next step would be a budget conference where the two sides would get in a room, hash out our differences, and work together toward a deal. But as we all know, some of our Republican colleagues had other ideas. They immediately seemed to regret their push for a Senate budget and started running away from a debate as quickly as they could.

I came to the Senate floor with my colleagues a total of 18 times to ask for consent to start a budget conference with the House, but every time we tried a member of the tea party here in the Senate, backed by Republican leaders, stood up and blocked us. Instead of using the months we had to work out a compromise, Republicans seemed to think it was in their best interest somehow to stall as long as possible under some misguided theory that a crisis would give them more leverage.

I had hoped my Republican colleagues spent their time back home talking to their constituents and would be ready to come back to DC so we could get to work on a balanced and bipartisan budget deal, but, sadly, the opposite has happened. While I believe the majority of Republicans are interested in working with us as Democrats to get to a fair budget deal, a few of my Republican colleagues spent the summer riling up the tea party and making them promises they could not keep.

Since Republican leaders know they need to find a way to avoid another crisis that would be blamed on them, a full-scale civil war has broken out within the Republican Party. They are in disarray. They are having trouble figuring out how to pull themselves out of the hole they have climbed into. And while we wait for Republicans to join us at the table, the tea party is pushing our country closer and closer to a government shutdown and closer to what would be a catastrophic default on our laws.

Why are they doing this? It is not because they are concerned about the budget, not because they are interested in jobs or economic growth. To them it seems it is all about ObamaCare. Everything they are doing now they are doing in order to cut off health care coverage for 25 million people, to end access to free preventive health care, to cause seniors to pay more for their prescriptions, to cut off young adults from their coverage, to bring back lifetime coverage caps and let patients with preexisting conditions be denied care, put the insurance companies back in charge of our health care system, and so much more.

These political games might play well with the tea party base, but here is the reality: ObamaCare is the law of the land. It passed through this Senate with a supermajority. It passed through the House. The President signed it into law. This Supreme Court upheld it. It is already helping millions of Americans stay healthy and financially secure, and it is on track to help millions more.

When I see some of my colleagues working so hard to defund ObamaCare, I have to wonder whether they have taken the time to meet some of their own constituents who are already benefiting from this law.

This last month I was home in Washington State, and I met an incredible woman named Nikki Mackey who lives in Seattle. On September 16 of 2010, Nikki was diagnosed with an extremely aggressive form of breast cancer. She was 36 years old and terrified of what this disease would do to her. To make matters worse, instead of focusing on her treatment, she had to worry about her coverage, and that is because a few months before her diagnosis, in the midst of the recession, Nikki had been laid off from her job. So there she was, with her coverage at risk and years of treatment ahead of her. But thanks to ObamaCare, a law some of my colleagues want to undermine at any cost,

Nikki will never have to worry about reaching a lifetime cap. She will never have to worry about not getting coverage due to her now preexisting condition. That is why we have worked so hard to pass this law because it says now in America: You shouldn't go broke because you get sick, and you shouldn't be denied care simply because you cannot afford it.

Let's be clear about what is happening here and the political calculation some of my colleagues have made. They have decided they are willing to play politics with Americans' health care, they have decided it is better for them to sabotage this law rather than improve it, and they have decided that beyond all that, they are also willing to devastate our Nation's economy to kill this law. Well, we are not going to let that happen.

Nikki told me when she turns on her TV and sees Members of Congress using every trick in the book to kill this law, she feels her ''own well-being is under attack.''

I want to be clear: Democrats are not going to defund or delay health care reform. It is not going to happen. We should all be working together right now to make sure it is implemented in the best possible way for our families, our businesses, and our communities. We are certainly very interested in hearing from anyone, Democrat or Republican, who has good ideas about how the law could be improved. We are not going to allow the health care of Nikki or millions of other Americans to be used as a pawn in a political game. We are not going to let this law get sabotaged as it continues to benefit millions of families and small business owners. The sooner Republicans realize this, the sooner we can get to work diffusing this latest artificial crisis.

We know the families we represent don't support the Republicans' sabotage tactics. Recent polls show that fewer than 1 in 4 people supports efforts to make health care reform fail. A majority of people believe we in Congress should be trying to make the law work. It is also clear that Americans would rightly blame Republicans if the law shuts down—especially over an issue such as this—and a lot of Republicans know that.

My colleague Senator JOHANNS said these defunding and delaying efforts have ''zero chance of being successful.'' Senator BURR said ''the dumbest idea I've ever heard of.'' House Republicans know this too. That is why they introduced a bill last week that would allow a government funding bill to pass while giving House Republicans a vote to defund health care that has no chance of becoming law. As we now know, the tea party is not interested in that. They don't want a showboat, they want a shutdown, and they are going to keep fighting until they get it.

We now have less than 2 weeks before the end of this fiscal year and a potential government shutdown. It is a shame that we have gotten to this point, but we are here. We owe it to the American people to come together and find a solution and a path forward that is good for our economy and fair for our middle class.

My goal has been and will continue to be a long-term budget agreement that replaces sequestration, tackles our debt and deficit responsibly, and invests in our workers and our economy. But since it seems clear that the House won't be able to get its act together in the next few weeks, the least they should be able to do is send us a clean, short-term extension of the current budget levels so the government doesn't shut down while we continue to negotiate on this longer term budget deal.

I want to be clear: Democrats are not going to negotiate over whether Congress should allow the Federal Government to pay its bills. As Speaker BOEHNER said in the past, default would be ''a financial disaster, not just for us, but for the worldwide economy.'' Republicans need to take those words to heart and stop threatening the economic recovery with their saber rattling and brinkmanship.

We went through this earlier in the year. Back then—after spending months saying they wouldn't raise the debt limit unless they got dollar-for-dollar spending cuts, Republicans dropped their demands, dropped the so-called Boehner rule, and allowed the debt ceiling to be increased. Going back now to that reckless approach of 2011 and drumming up this uncertainty again is nothing but a huge and harmful waste of time.

It is ridiculous that we find ourselves on the brink of an artificial crisis again. We should be doing everything possible to support the economic recovery and help our workers get back on the job. We should be spending time finding common ground to tackle our long-term fiscal challenges responsibly, and we should be working together to build on the Affordable Care Act to continue improving our health care system for all of our families and small business owners. As we know, we are now mired in the muck of perpetual partisanship and constant crises. The American people deserve better. Nikki and the millions of families such as hers deserve better.

I am hopeful that the Republican leadership stops focusing so much on their extreme party minority and comes to the table with us to work on a balanced and bipartisan deal the vast majority of Americans want. I hope they don't make us reach a crisis to get to that point.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Budget Committee chair. As a member of the Budget Committee, I join her in expressing her strong view that this country does not need another shutdown or another pointless fiscal cliff but needs us to listen and to work together in this Chamber and with the House of Representatives and move forward on the agenda on which all of our constituents want us to proceed.

I rise today specifically to speak to the bill that is on the floor that has been the subject of debate and discussion, S. 1392, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013.

This is a broadly bipartisan bill. Its two primary authors, my colleagues from New Hampshire and Ohio, Senators Shaheen and Portman, have worked tirelessly to make sure it respects the priorities of Members of both parties. Its passage by a vote of 19 to 3 out of the energy committee on which I serve speaks to its support across partisan lines. Yet, sadly, now that it is on the floor, a few Republicans have decided they want to use it to carry out their own narrow or partisan political agenda rather than showing our constituents and the American people that we can come together across our differences of region and party to pass this commonsense, bipartisan legislation. They would rather confirm the frustration and even disgust so many of our constituents feel about this body.

We were all home last month. We all heard from our constituents. I don't know about my colleagues but what I heard from Delawareans about what they want and deserve is not more displays of selfish partisanship that frustrates them but, rather, that we can listen to each other and work together on bipartisan bills that move this country forward.

Energy efficiency—the topic of this bill and the topic we should be moving forward on today—its only agenda is creating a stable, dynamic, and prosperous future. The Shaheen-Portman bill has been written with only that goal as its north star. It is not about who is right or who is wrong, about whether climate change is real, about whose science we are going to choose to believe today; energy efficiency is fundamentally something that makes sense. It allows us to bridge competing interests and concerns because it promotes energy independence, it helps our environment, and it promotes American jobs—jobs today and jobs tomorrow.

When we need to purchase new equipment to promote the efficiency of our buildings, whether it is DuPont's Tyvek wrapping or Dow's foam spray insulation—both made here in America—we create good manufacturing jobs in our country. When we install new energy-efficient equipment in homes and buildings, we hire Americans to do that work—sheet metal workers, electricians, laborers. And when we set voluntary new goals for efficiency, as this bill does, we incentivize the kind of research and innovation that will create jobs well into the future. It is simple. There is no reason we shouldn't be able to get this done.

I come to this debate today as someone who has seen the power of energy efficiency up close in the private sector and public sector in my work in Delaware. When I was in the private sector more than 15 years ago, I came to understand that power when our then-Governor Ruth Ann Minner appointed me to chair the Conservation and Efficiency Working Group of her Energy Task Force. In over 2 years of meetings I grew to appreciate how powerful energy efficiency can be for the commercial and industrial balance sheet of our country. It later translated into my work as county executive of New Castle County, DE, where I led a countywide effort to make our buildings more energy efficient. We had old and energy wasteful buildings and we knew that by investing in energy efficiency upgrades, we could save taxpayer money and put Delawareans to work.

We started with our old City/County Headquarters, a building constructed in the 1970s, almost designed to be monumentally energy inefficient. As we audited it, the auditor was stunned at how energy inefficient it was—high ceilings, bad insulation, poorly sealed windows—so we overhauled. We upgraded the lights and put in new management energy systems, replaced the boilers and chillers and cooling towers and got that building up to ENERGY STAR standards. We did a host of other things on a constrained budget and it was a resounding and lasting success. With the improvements just to that one small building, the county saved $350,000 a year, and it will pay for itself over 15 years. Because of that success, the county has gone on to do retrofits to 20 more buildings in total, providing work for more than 150 Delawareans and reducing emissions by 12 million pounds of carbon dioxide per year, the equivalent of taking 1,000 cars off the road. Those jobs can't be offshored. These are jobs for electricians, laborers, and sheet metal workers. These are good-quality building trades jobs. They are also sustainable because as each contractor learns how to do an energy efficiency retrofit in one building, they can go on and do it for more.

What I found is that once folks understood the impact, once they saw the difference we could make in that county, it became an issue that transcended partisanship or political loyalties. That should be the case here, if we had a healthy and functioning Senate, because this issue is no more partisan across the United States than it was in our county. It saved us money, it helped our environment, it put Delawareans to work, and the same is true for the Shaheen-Portman bill that should be moving forward today.

Earlier this year I had the chance to visit Dover Air Force Base, our largest military facility in Delaware, and see what the U.S. military is doing to use less energy and employ alternative energy solutions. They are making dramatic progress, looking across every corner of that base to reduce their energy use and to be more efficient in how they transport materiel in the U.S. Air Force.

These are real ideas and technology-based solutions that could be applied nationally. There are companies up and down our State in the private sector which have applied the same approach, the same initiative this bill would take and seen real savings. Businesses such as Hirsh Industries, PPG, Kraft, and AstraZeneca all have realized savings of hundreds of thousands of dollars that add to their balance sheet and their bottom line.

This bill has been scored as creating 136,000 new jobs by 2025, saving consumers $13 billion and nearly 3 billion megawatt hours by 2030. In total, this is exactly the sort of bill we should be coming together to pass. Instead, sadly, what I am hearing is that it is likely the partisanship of this Chamber is going to defeat our opportunity to take up and consider this important balanced and bipartisan bill.

Americans are looking to us to take action to create jobs, save them money, and build a better future for our country. This bill genuinely gives us a chance to do all of those things. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill. I had hoped to have a chance to debate, discuss, and vote on many amendments directly relevant to this bill that deal with energy efficiency and would strengthen it. Instead it seems we are again mired in partisanship as folks here seek to add to this bill amendments utterly irrelevant to the core of what should be the focus today: helping to create high-quality jobs for Americans, improving our environment, and adding to our Nation's bottom line on this commonsense matter.

It is my hope we can get past the partisanship and back to the real work our constituents expect and demand of us in the weeks ahead.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, when we were establishing our time, I would say to my good friend and colleague from California, I was joking around a little bit about using 9½ minutes. Is it all right if I make that 19½ minutes, maximum?

Mrs. BOXER. No. I say to my friend, I was promised to be able to speak at 3:30 so I am already giving up so much time, so if the Senator from Oklahoma could just take 9½ minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. OK. I will do that. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from California I be recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. All right. I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, I wasn't going to do this, but since my good friend from California is on the floor and it is our favorite subject to talk about, I thought I would. I wish to take the opportunity to talk about the first round of the major global warming regulations the President is set to release this week. These rules will govern the amount of carbon dioxide that can be emitted from powerplants and they are the first round of rules following the President's major speech on global warming in June.

The rules represent the most aggressive representation of the war on fossil fuels we have seen in this administration, and we have seen a lot of them. We know the rules will require any coal-fired plant to have carbon-capture and sequestration technology; that is, CSS technology. While the Clean Air Act only allows feasible technology to be mandated, the CSS technology is not feasible. It is really not there yet. No powerplant has ever been built with the technology unless it has been supported by massive taxpayer subsidies. The rule would kill the coal powerplant industry.

While the rules may be constructed in a way that allows natural gas-fired powerplants to meet the mandate, we have to know that is coming next. After all, natural gas is a fossil fuel as well. There have been several statements of people saying, Well, wait around until fossil fuel, which is going to be next. The only thing these new rules will do is cause energy prices to skyrocket. I expect the rules to be one of the key issues covered by the media this week.

While the exact details of the rule will not be known until it is published later this week, there are a few things that we know right now. First, the science behind global warming is now more uncertain than ever. I spoke about this this morning in our hearing. Just last week it was reported all over the media—the Telegraph—this is in London, one of their largest publications—the Guardian, also in London, the Wall Street Journal, and others, that this year there has been 60 percent more ice coverage in the Arctic than there was this time last year.

My colleagues might remember the hysterical people were saying at one time that there would be no more icecaps by 2013. Instead, we find out it has actually increased by 60 percent. This is the equivalent of almost 1 million square miles, and this is being observed before the winter refreeze has even set in.

What makes it more interesting is that in 2007, the BBC reported that global warming would leave the entire Arctic ice-free in the summers by 2013. The scientist who made this claim, Professor Wineslaw Maslowski, said, in the typical bravado we have come to expect from climate scientists, that ''This is not a cycle; not just a fluctuation. In the end, it will all just melt away quite suddenly.'' That is in 2013. Well, here we are in 2013 and guess what. They are wrong again. There is 60 percent more ice than there was at

this time last year. A lot of the yachts and the ships that expected to use the Northwest Passage can't use the Northwest Passage; it is closed, closed because the ice is there.

This follows reports earlier this year, notably from The Economist, showing that global warming has been on a pause for the last 15 years. The Economist wrote: ''Over the past 15 years, air temperatures and the Earth's surface have been flat while greenhouse-gas emissions have continued to soar.''

The U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change did not expect this development to occur, nor did its models predict that there would be a 15-year stall in global warming.

Professor Anastasios Tsonis, at the University of Wisconsin, recently concluded that:

> We are already in a cooling trend, which I think will continue for the next fifteen years at least. There is no doubt the warming of the 1980s and 1990s has stopped.

This reminds me of all the hysteria in the 1970s that a global warming trend is coming. I can't tell my colleagues how many times on the Senate floor I have talked about how these cycles come and go about every 25 years, and here it is, right on schedule, going into a cooling period. Starting back in 1895, every 15 to 20 years, they start out with the new Ice Age is coming, everyone is hysterical, and then in 2007—1970—1919, they went into a period of warming, and then in 1995—or 1945—they went into another cooling spell and that happened to coincide with the year they had the greatest surge in CO_2 on our planet.

I only want to say this finally has come to our attention that we are looking at a situation that is quite different than we have seen in the past. I mentioned that later in this month the long-awaited event is going to happen. It comes up every 5, 6, or 7 years. That is when the IPCC comes out with its assessment. This just came up—I saw that it is dated today in the Wall Street Journal, and I will read this:

> Later this month, a long-awaited event that last happened in 2007 will recur. Like a returning comet, it will be taken to portend ominous happenings. I refer to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's fifth assessment report.

That is what we are talking about. They go on to say they have learned from some leaks what is in that assessment. ''There have already been leaks''—I am reading now—''from this 31-page document which summarizes 1,914 pages of scientific discussion, but thanks to a senior climate scientist, I have had a glimpse of the key prediction at the heart of the document.

Keep in mind, this is IPCC, United Nations. The big news is that for the first time since these reports started coming out in 1990, the new one dials back the alarm. It states that the temperature rise we can expect as a result of manmade emissions from carbon dioxide is lower than the IPCC expected.

This is something we did not anticipate would happen just as recently as a few days ago.

Real quickly, it is my hope we get to some of these amendments, and I am going to mention one that is a very significant amendment.

A few months ago, when we were debating the continuing resolution, the Senate adopted amendment No. 29, which prohibited the EPA from enforcing this Spill Prevention, Containment, and Countermeasure Rule. That is the SPCC rule.

As we all remember, they were going to enforce this against farmers. The reason we did this is clear: EPA first threatened to enforce this rule against farmers at the beginning of the Obama administration, but they did very little outreach. Most farmers do not even know today about this rule or what they would have to do to comply. The only reason other Members know about this rule is because of the work Senator PRYOR and I have done to highlight the problem for what it is.

This rule was originally drafted for compliance by major handlers of oil—refineries, pipelines—players such as the ones that are shown on this chart I have in the Chamber.

This chart actually shows part of Cushing, OK, which is a major hub of oil pipelines. Millions of barrels of oil are transported through and stored in this small town each day, and it is incredibly important that the handlers of the oil follow appropriate regulations to make sure accidents do not cause significant environmental damage. They understand why the regulations are in place, and they follow the rules with precision. And we are talking about the people in the adjoining towns.

These refineries and tank operators are who the rule was designed for in the first place, and that makes sense. But now EPA wants to enforce that rule against farmers.

What would it look like if we did this?

First, take a look at this second chart. This is a diesel fuel container on a farm. It is small. It does not hold that much fuel. But right now it is subject to the same regulations you would have for oil companies and refineries.

I asked a friend of mine, Keith Kisling, a wheat farmer in western Oklahoma, what it would take for him to comply with this rule that was designed for refiners.

He said: First I have to purchase a new double-wall container that would cost thousands of dollars. EPA justifies this by saying it would prevent leaks. Keith, like all other farmers I know in Oklahoma, thinks diesel is expensive. So Keith is not going to let his tanks leak, whatever kind it is. You would sit on a farm and realize that is leaking money. Obviously, they do not want to do that.

The next thing he would have to do is build a berm all the way around his tank to contain a spill if all of the diesel fuel came out of it. This would be expensive and difficult to operate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 more minutes and conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Finally, Keith would have to hire and pay a professional engineer to certify his spill plan, if he can find one. In Oklahoma, farmers cannot find professional engineers because they are all working for oil and gas companies, which makes compliance with this particular requirement virtually impossible. All told, Keith would have to pay somewhere between $10 and $30,000 to comply with the rule, and the environment is not any better for it.

After we secured the amendment prohibiting the EPA from enforcing the rule back in March, Senator PRYOR and I worked to secure a permanent exemption, and we did this. We put it in, as the Senator from California will remember, the WRDA bill, and, of course, it is not final law yet. This is the amendment that we have right now.

Last month, during the August recess, I received word from the National Cattlemen's Beef Association that producers in Kansas and other areas out West were hearing from EPA enforcement officers that they were at risk of having the SPCC rule retroactively enforced against them once the prohibition on enforcement expires on September 23. This comes despite the clear actions Congress has been taking to provide relief to farmers. I honestly do not know of anyone who wants to subject our farmers in the United States of America to the same requirements that refineries and oil companies and these operations have.

So I do have an amendment that would go on. It is my hope we will be able to get to the amendments on the bill, the underlying bill that is under consideration today, and I think this is one of two amendments I have that should be accepted unanimously.

With that, I thank the Senator from California for giving me that additional time, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, first I want to add my voice of condolence to that of Senator MURRAY's and say to the Navy family how heavy our hearts are and that I stand ready, any minute, any hour, any second, to work with my colleagues to make sure mentally ill people do not get their hands on weapons. As soon as we can get a breakthrough on that—and maybe on background checks—maybe we can finally do something for 90 percent of the American people who want us to.

I also want to note that Senator INHOFE and I have an ongoing dispute, though it is quite friendly, on climate change. We went through this this morning. He sees evidence that climate change is probably still a hoax, and he talks about the great news that we do not have climate change. I think you should tell that to the people in Colorado. But notwithstanding that—forget

that—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD four articles that appeared in the recent days about how the consensus on climate change is growing, and there is 95-percent certainty that the cause is human activity.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Reuters, Aug. 16, 2013]

EXPERTS SURER OF MANMADE GLOBAL WARMING BUT LOCAL PREDICTIONS ELUSIVE

(By Environment Correspondent Alister Doyle)

OSLO (Reuters).—Climate scientists are surer than ever that human activity is causing global warming, according to leaked drafts of a major U.N. report, but they are finding it harder than expected to predict the impact in specific regions in coming decades.

The uncertainty is frustrating for government planners: the report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is the main guide for states weighing multi-billion-dollar shifts to renewable energy from fossil fuels, for coastal regions considering extra sea defenses or crop breeders developing heat-resistant strains.

Drafts seen by Reuters of the study by the U.N. panel of experts, due to be published next month, say it is at least 95 percent likely that human activities—chiefly the burning of fossil fuels—are the main cause of warming since the 1950s.

That is up from at least 90 percent in the last report in 2007, 66 percent in 2001, and just over 50 in 1995, steadily squeezing out the arguments by a small minority of scientists that natural variations in the climate might be to blame.

That shifts the debate onto the extent of temperature rises and the likely impacts, from manageable to catastrophic. Governments have agreed to work out an international deal by the end of 2015 to rein in rising emissions.

''We have got quite a bit more certain that climate change . . . is largely manmade,'' said Reto Knutti, a professor at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich. ''We're less certain than many would hope about the local impacts.''

And gauging how warming would affect nature, from crops to fish stocks, was also proving hard since it goes far beyond physics. ''You can't write an equation for a tree,'' he said.

The IPCC report, the first of three to be released in 2013 and 2014, will face intense scrutiny, particularly after the panel admitted a mistake in the 2007 study which wrongly predicted that all Himalayan glaciers could melt by 2035. Experts say the error far overestimated the melt and might have been based on a misreading of 2350.

The new study will state with greater confidence than in 2007 that rising manmade greenhouse gas emissions have already meant more heatwaves. But it is likely to play down some tentative findings from 2007, such as that human activities have contributed to more droughts.

Almost 200 governments have agreed to try to limit global warming to below 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 Fahrenheit) above pre-industrial times, seen as a threshold for dangerous changes including more droughts, extinctions, floods and rising seas that could swamp coastal regions and entire island nations.

The report will flag a high risk that global temperatures will increase this century by more than that level, and will say that evidence of rising sea levels is now ''unequivocal''.

For all that, scientists say it is proving harder to pinpoint local impacts in coming decades in a way that would help planners.

Drew Shindell, a NASA climate scientist, said the relative lack of progress in regional predictions was the main disappointment of climate science since 2007.

''I talk to people in regional power planning. They ask: 'What's the temperature going to be in this region in the next 20–30 years, because that's where our power grid is?''' he said.

''We can't really tell. It's a shame,'' said Shindell. Like the other scientists interviewed, he was speaking about climate science in general since the last IPCC report, not about the details of the latest drafts.

WARMING SLOWING

The panel will try to explain why global temperatures, while still increasing, have risen more slowly since about 1998 even though greenhouse gas concentrations have hit repeated record highs in that time, led by industrial emissions by China and other emerging nations.

An IPCC draft says there is ''medium confidence'' that the slowing of the rise is ''due in roughly equal measure'' to natural variations in the weather and to other factors affecting energy reaching the Earth's surface.

Scientists believe causes could include: greater-than-expected quantities of ash from volcanoes, which dims sunlight; a decline in heat from the sun during a current 11–year solar cycle; more heat being absorbed by the deep oceans; or the possibility that the climate may be less sensitive than expected to a build-up of carbon dioxide.

''It might be down to minor contributions that all add up,'' said Gabriele Hegerl, a professor at Edinburgh University. Or maybe, scientists say, the latest decade is just a blip.

The main scenarios in the draft, using more complex computer models than in 2007 and taking account of more factors, show that temperatures could rise anywhere from a fraction of 1 degree Celsius (1.8 Fahrenheit) to almost 5C (9F) this century, a wider range at both ends than in 2007.

The low end, however, is because the IPCC has added what diplomats say is an improbable scenario for radical government action—not considered in 2007—that would require cuts in global greenhouse gases to zero by about 2070.

Temperatures have already risen by 0.8C (1.4F) since the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century.

Experts say that the big advance in the report, due for a final edit by governments and scientists in Stockholm from September 23–26, is simply greater confidence about the science of global warming, rather than revolutionary new findings.

SEA LEVELS

''Overall our understanding has strengthened,'' said Michael Oppenheimer, a professor at Princeton University, pointing to areas including sea level rise.

An IPCC draft projects seas will rise by between 29 and 82 cm (11.4 to 32.3 inches) by the late 21st century—above the estimates of 18 to 59 cm in the last report, which did not fully account for changes in Antarctica and Greenland.

The report slightly tones down past tentative findings that more intense tropical cyclones are linked to human activities. Warmer air can contain more moisture, however, making downpours more likely in the future.

''There is widespread agreement among hurricane scientists that rainfall associated with hurricanes will increase noticeably with global warming,'' said Kerry Emanuel, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

''But measuring rainfall is very tricky,'' he said.

[From The Guardian, July 22, 2013]

CLIMATE CHANGE SLOWDOWN IS DUE TO WARMING OF DEEP OCEANS, SAY SCIENTISTS

Climate sceptics have seized on a pause in warming over the past five years, but the long-term trend is still upwards.

(By Fiona Harvey)

A recent slowdown in the upward march of global temperatures is likely to be the result of the slow warming of the deep oceans, British scientists said on Monday.

Oceans are some of the Earth's biggest absorbers of heat, which can be seen in effects such as sea level rises, caused by the expansion of large bodies of water as they warm. The absorption goes on over long periods, as heat from the surface is gradually circulated to the lower reaches of the seas.

Temperatures around the world have been broadly static over the past five years, though they were still significantly above historic norms, and the years from 2000 to 2012 comprise most of the 14 hottest years ever recorded. The scientists said the evidence still clearly pointed to a continuation of global warming in the coming decades as greenhouse gases in the atmosphere contribute to climate change.

This summer's heatwave, the most prolonged period of hot weather in the UK for years, has not yet been taken into account in their measurements.

Peter Stott of the Met Office said computer-generated climate models all showed that periods of slower warming were to be expected as part of the natural variation of the climate cycle, and did not contradict predictions. Given that variation, current temperatures are within expectations.

As well as the heating of the deep oceans, other factors have played a significant part in slowing temperature rises. These have included the solar minimum—when the sun is less active and generating slightly less heat, as occurred in 2008/2009—and a series of small volcanic eruptions, including that of Iceland's Eyjafjallajökull volcano in 2010. Ash from volcanoes reflects light back into space, and major eruptions in the past have had a severe, albeit temporary, cooling effect.

Despite the slowdown in warming, by 2060 the world is still likely to have experienced average temperatures of more than 2C above pre-industrial levels—a threshold that scientists regard as the limit of safety, beyond which climate change impacts are likely to become catastrophic. Prof Rowan Sutton, director of climate research at the National Centre for Atmospheric Research at Reading University, said the current pause would only delay reaching this point by five to 10 years.

The ''pause'' in the rise of global temperatures has been seized on by climate sceptics, however, who have interpreted it as proof that the science of climate change is mistaken. But despite the slowdown in warming, the warmest years on record were 1998, 2005 and 2010, according to the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Prof Sutton said more research was needed on the effects of warming on the deep oceans, as observations of deep ocean temperatures have only been carried out in detail over the past decade and more are needed. Higher temperatures could not only have a devastating effect on marine life, he said, but could also contribute to increases in sea levels as sea water expands.

The Met Office warned early in the summer that the UK could be in for a decade of

''washout'' summers, like those of the past six years, because of the effect of climate change on global weather systems, partly as a result of changes in wind patterns caused by the melting Arctic.

But no sooner had the meteorologists made their prediction than the weather bucked this trend, with a shift in the Atlantic's jet stream air circulation system giving rise to high-pressure weather fronts and a long period of settled sunny weather.

[From NOAA, May 10, 2013]

CO_2 AT NOAA'S MAUNA LOA OBSERVATORY REACHES NEW MILESTONE: TOPS 400 PPM

On May 9, the daily mean concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere of Mauna Loa, Hawaii, surpassed 400 parts per million (ppm) for the first time since measurements began in 1958. Independent measurements made by both NOAA and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography have been approaching this level during the past week. It marks an important milestone because Mauna Loa, as the oldest continuous carbon dioxide (CO_2.) measurement station in the world, is the primary global benchmark site for monitoring the increase of this potent heat-trapping gas.

Carbon dioxide pumped into the atmosphere by fossil fuel burning and other human activities is the most significant greenhouse gas (GHG) contributing to climate change. Its concentration has increased every year since scientists started making measurements on the slopes of the Mauna Loa volcano more than five decades ago. The rate of increase has accelerated since the measurements started, from about 0.7 ppm per year in the late 1950s to 2.1 ppm per year during the last 10 years.

''That increase is not a surprise to scientists,'' said NOAA senior scientist Pieter Tans, with the Global Monitoring Division of NOAA's Earth System Research Laboratory in Boulder, Cob. ''The evidence is conclusive that the strong growth of global CO_2 emissions from the burning of coal, oil, and natural gas is driving the acceleration.''

Before the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century, global average CO_2 was about 280 ppm. During the last 800,000 years, CO_2 fluctuated between about 180 ppm during ice ages and 280 ppm during interglacial warm periods. Today's rate of increase is more than 100 times faster than the increase that occurred when the last ice age ended.

It was researcher Charles David Keeling of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, UC San Diego, who began measuring carbon dioxide at Mauna Loa in 1958, initiating now what is known as the ''Keeling Curve.'' His son, Ralph Keeling, also a geochemist at Scripps, has continued the Scripps measurement record since his father's death in 2005.

''There's no stopping CO_2 from reaching 400 ppm,'' said Ralph Keeling. ''That's now a done deal. But what happens from here on still matters to climate, and it's still under our control. It mainly comes down to how much we continue to rely on fossil fuels for energy.''

NOAA scientists with the Global Monitoring Division have made around-the-clock measurements there since 1974. Having two programs independently measure the greenhouse gas provides confidence that the measurements are correct. Moreover, similar increases of CO_2 are seen all over the world by many international scientists. NOAA, for example, which runs a global, cooperative air sampling network, reported last year that all Arctic sites in its network reached 400 ppm for the first time. These high values were a prelude to what is now being observed at Mauna Loa, a site in the subtropics, this year. Sites in the Southern Hemisphere will follow during the next few years. The increase in the Northern Hemisphere is always a little ahead of the Southern Hemisphere because most of the emissions driving the CO_2 increase take place in the north. Once emitted, CO_2 added to the atmosphere and oceans remains for thousands of years. Thus, climate changes forced by CO_2 depend primarily on cumulative emissions, making it progressively more and more difficult to avoid further substantial climate change.

[From the New York Times, May 10, 2013]

HEAT-TRAPPING GAS PASSES MILESTONE, RAISING FEARS

(By Justin Gillis)

The level of the most important heat-trapping gas in the atmosphere, carbon dioxide, has passed a long-feared milestone, scientists reported Friday, reaching a concentration not seen on the earth for millions of years.

Scientific instruments showed that the gas had reached an average daily level above 400 parts per million—just an odometer moment in one sense, but also a sobering reminder that decades of efforts to bring human-produced emissions under control are faltering.

The best available evidence suggests the amount of the gas in the air has not been this high for at least three million years, before humans evolved, and scientists believe the rise portends large changes in the climate and the level of the sea.

''It symbolizes that so far we have failed miserably in tackling this problem,'' said Pieter P. Tans, who runs the monitoring program at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that reported the new reading.

Ralph Keeling, who runs another monitoring program at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in San Diego, said a continuing rise could be catastrophic. ''It means we are quickly losing the possibility of keeping the climate below what people thought were possibly tolerable thresholds,'' he said.

Virtually every automobile ride, every plane trip and, in most places, every flip of a light switch adds carbon dioxide to the air, and relatively little money is being spent to find and deploy alternative technologies.

China is now the largest emitter, but Americans have been consuming fossil fuels extensively for far longer, and experts say the United States is more responsible than any other nation for the high level.

The new measurement came from analyzers atop Mauna Loa, the volcano on the big island of Hawaii that has long been ground zero for monitoring the worldwide trend on carbon dioxide, or CO_2. Devices there sample clean, crisp air that has blown thousands of miles across the Pacific Ocean, producing a record of rising carbon dioxide levels that has been closely tracked for half a century.

Carbon dioxide above 400 parts per million was first seen in the Arctic last year, and had also spiked above that level in hourly readings at Mauna Loa.

But the average reading for an entire day surpassed that level at Mauna Loa for the first time in the 24 hours that ended at 8 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time on Thursday. The two monitoring programs use slightly different protocols; NOAA reported an average for the period of 400.03 parts per million, while Scripps reported 400.08.

Carbon dioxide rises and falls on a seasonal cycle, and the level will dip below 400 this summer as leaf growth in the Northern Hemisphere pulls about 10 billion tons of carbon out of the air. But experts say that will be a brief reprieve—the moment is approaching when no measurement of the ambient air anywhere on earth, in any season, will produce a reading below 400.

''It feels like the inevitable march toward disaster,'' said Maureen E. Raymo, a scientist at the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, a unit of Columbia University.

From studying air bubbles trapped in Antarctic ice, scientists know that going back 800,000 years, the carbon dioxide level oscillated in a tight band, from about 180 parts per million in the depths of ice ages to about 280 during the warm periods between. The evidence shows that global temperatures and CO_2 levels are tightly linked.

For the entire period of human civilization, roughly 8,000 years, the carbon dioxide level was relatively stable near that upper bound. But the burning of fossil fuels has caused a 41 percent increase in the heat-trapping gas since the Industrial Revolution, a mere geological instant, and scientists say the climate is beginning to react, though they expect far larger changes in the future.

Indirect measurements suggest that the last time the carbon dioxide level was this high was at least three million years ago, during an epoch called the Pliocene. Geological research shows that the climate then was far warmer than today, the world's ice caps were smaller, and the sea level might have been as much as 60 or 80 feet higher.

Experts fear that humanity may be precipitating a return to such conditions—except this time, billions of people are in harm's way.

''It takes a long time to melt ice, but we're doing it,'' Dr. Keeling said. ''It's scary.''

Dr. Keeling's father, Charles David Keeling, began carbon dioxide measurements on Mauna Loa and at other locations in the late 1950s. The elder Dr. Keeling found a level in the air then of about 315 parts per million—meaning that if a person had filled a million quart jars with air, about 315 quart jars of carbon dioxide would have been mixed in.

His analysis revealed a relentless, long-term increase superimposed on the seasonal cycle, a trend that was dubbed the Keeling Curve.

Countries have adopted an official target to limit the damage from global warming, with 450 parts per million seen as the maximum level compatible with that goal. ''Unless things slow down, we'll probably get there in well under 25 years,'' Ralph Keeling said.

Yet many countries, including China and the United States, have refused to adopt binding national targets. Scientists say that unless far greater efforts are made soon, the goal of limiting the warming will become impossible without severe economic disruption.

''If you start turning the Titanic long before you hit the iceberg, you can go clear without even spilling a drink of a passenger on deck,'' said Richard B. Alley, a climate scientist at Pennsylvania State University. ''If you wait until you're really close, spilling a lot of drinks is the best you can hope for.''

Climate-change contrarians, who have little scientific credibility but are politically influential in Washington, point out that carbon dioxide represents only a tiny fraction of the air—as of Thursday's reading, exactly 0.04 percent. ''The CO_2 levels in the atmosphere are rather undramatic,'' a Republican congressman from California, Dana Rohrabacher, said in a Congressional hearing several years ago.

But climate scientists reject that argument, saying it is like claiming that a tiny bit of arsenic or cobra venom cannot have much effect. Research shows that even at such low levels, carbon dioxide is potent at trapping heat near the surface of the earth.

''If you're looking to stave off climate perturbations that I don't believe our culture is

ready to adapt to, then significant reductions in CO_2 emissions have to occur right away,'' said Mark Pagani, a Yale geochemist who studies climates of the past. ''I feel like the time to do something was yesterday.''

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to ask Senator DURBIN how much time he needs, and I will make a request that he be recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the gentle lady from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I am not the gentle lady anymore.

Mr. DURBIN. Pardon me?

Mrs. BOXER. I remember 10 years of being a gentle lady.

Mr. DURBIN. Well, I still think she is a gentle lady.

Mrs. BOXER. Well, that is so nice of the Senator to say.

Mr. DURBIN. In addition to being the Senator from California.

I see on the floor the Senator from Wisconsin. I do not want to step in front of him.

All right. Then I ask unanimous consent to be given 5 minutes to speak after the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to talk about what is happening in this Congress or, better yet, what is not happening. We have to pass a continuing resolution so we can fund this government. That means all the functions—whether it is air traffic controllers, whether it is building our highways, whether it is FBI agents, whether it is paying Social Security. All the things we do—Medicare—we have to pass a continuing resolution to keep this government going—sending meat inspectors out to make sure we do not get poisoned, and the rest; you name it.

And where is the House? All spending bills have to start over there. The Republicans control it. They have not sent us a continuing resolution. We also have to make sure we pay our debts—just like all Americans—debts we voted for. Whether it is military spending, domestic spending, spending to help our farmers, spending to help recover from Hurricane Sandy, we have to pay our debts. To do that, we have to increase the debt ceiling.

October 15; it is coming. If we do not do it, if the Republicans play games, we will see a crash in the stock market. I am sure every American looks forward to that. They are not doing their work because they are obsessed—they are obsessed—with repealing a law they have tried to repeal 41 times. They are obsessed.

They tried to get it overturned in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court said it is constitutional. They are trying to take away a law that is helping every American, and I am going to talk about it. They are obsessed.

They refuse to understand that raising the debt ceiling is not about future spending, it is about past spending. So their reason is, they are very upset about the Affordable Care Act—or ObamaCare, however you want to call it—and they are very upset about the deficit, which has come down by half from its height with this President's leadership.

Here is the thing: I do a lot of speaking to youngsters in school. When I explain to them what the role of a Senator is, I say, in essence, it is to make life better for the people—that is what I think it is—and to do it in a smart way, and to work with your colleagues to make sure you can compromise and get things done. Whether it is building highways or making sure our ports are dredged or funding the military, we must work together. No one gets everything he or she wants. That is life. You have to compromise. You cannot be an ideologue and say: My way or the highway.

To go after a law that was passed years ago—that you tried to repeal 41 times and failed, that you tried to overturn in the Court and failed—and then not to do your most fundamental responsibility of keeping the government open? There is something really wrong about this.

Let's take a look at this economy. Why are they so upset at what the President has been able to achieve?

President Clinton left office with a surplus—over $200 billion. Remember that.

Eight years later, President Bush left office with a $1.3 trillion deficit. I will not go into why because I do not have the time, but that is the fact, and no one can erase it from the books.

Since President Obama took office, the projected annual deficit has been cut in half. It is less than $650 billion. Yet they are willing to shut the government down by making believe no progress has been made, when we have cut the deficit in half and we are trying to get out of a disastrous recession.

Under the Clinton administration, the economy created more than 20 million private sector jobs. Under George W. Bush, we lost 665,000 jobs.

Remember, Clinton, millions of jobs created; George Bush, the Republican, hundreds of thousands of private sector jobs lost.

Under President Obama, we have added 3.9 million private sector jobs—coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression. You can say what you want, but President Obama and the Democrats here—even though it has been a bear to do it—we have managed to wrap our arms around this recession and get us on a course.

How about housing? Home prices are up more than 12 percent over the last year. Home sales have increased 47 percent since their crisis low. Recent housing starts are up 75 percent from April 2009.

Housing was the cause of this recession. People sliced and diced mortgages and sold them on Wall Street and brought everything down. Deregulation; that was the Republican mantra. It went too far, and we lost our way, and people suffered through the worst recession since the Great Depression.

The Republicans, instead of working with us to keep the progress up, want to shut the government down, want to say we are not going to pay our bills, even though they voted to rack up those bills.

Look at the auto industry. In 2009, the auto industry lost more than 100,000 jobs. Rescuing the auto industry saved more than 1 million jobs, and the news is great coming out of Detroit. People are buying cars.

The Republicans put it all at risk by shutting down the government and not paying the bills.

There are going to be no more bailouts. I was so proud. I offered the first amendment. I think my friend remembers: No more government bailouts to the big banks. So we are on our way to saying, once and for all, we are not going to let this crisis happen again.

The stock market. Do you know the Dow fell to 6,500, Mr. President? Since then, it has rebounded to 15,000—almost 2,000 points above its precrisis record. But yet they will put it all at risk because they are saying they are going to play games, shut down the government, not pay the debt.

The last time they played these games—the Republicans—GAO found that threatening to breach the debt limit cost the Treasury $1.3 billion just in 2011, and $18 billion over the next 10 years.

The next time a Republican tells you how fiscally conservative they are, ask them why it is they added $18 billion to the debt by playing games with the debt ceiling.

I want to quote Republican President Ronald Reagan, one of the heroes of my friends' party. He said:

> The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar.

That is Ronald Reagan. In 1983 he said that even talking about a default had terrible consequences. They are not even talking about a default, they are planning for a default.

My friend, who is such a great leader in the Senate, Senator DURBIN, informed us and Senator REID informed us that the Republicans in the House have a bill they love. We call it Pay China First. If there is a default, they will keep paying China the interest we owe them, but they will default on all of the Americans here and all of the contractors, the highway contractors, the people who dredge our ports. They will default on what they owe the American people, but they will pay China.

Douglas Holtz-Eakin, the CBO Director under George W. Bush, said:

> It's a bad idea. Little defaults, big defaults; default's a bad idea period and there should be no one who believes otherwise.

He said that in 2011. There is no such thing as a good default.

I have shown how far we have come with this economy. If we do not have the far right of the Republican Party taking America's country hostage, we will continue to grow this economy. But if they play games and try to shut down this government, it could all turn around. If they play games and they try to default on the debt, they could turn it all around in a bad way, and we will see the results as Social Security recipients start to worry, as Medicare receipts start to worry, as contractors start to worry, as Federal FBI agents can no longer get paid—it goes on and on and on.

One of the reasons they are so crazed is they are obsessed over the Affordable Care Act, which they call ObamaCare. In my time, I want to tell you what the Affordable Care Act does and see whether you think it is worth shutting down the government over this bill. They tried it 41 times, but they hope 42 will be their winner. Over 1 million Californians—this is just in my State—are already newly insured. Three million young adults are now insured on their parents' plans—3 million are now insured, 400,000 in my State. Now 71 million Americans are getting free preventive care, such as checkups and birth control and immunizations. They do not like that, I guess. They are willing to shut the government down over it. Now 17 million kids with preexisting conditions, such as asthma, can no longer be denied coverage. Insurance companies cannot cancel your health insurance because you get sick. There are no more lifetime limits on coverage. Anyone who has had a catastrophic disease knows it is pretty easy to hit that cap. No more caps in a year. No more lifetime caps. This is what they are so obsessed about. So they are willing to shut down the government to take away these benefits.

They said: Oh, health care costs are going to go up because of the Affordable Care Act. Well, guess what, health care costs are growing at the slowest rate in over 50 years. Insurance companies now have to justify their premium hikes. Before, they just hiked your rates and they could do it with impunity. Now, insurers have to spend at least 80 percent of your premiums on your medical care, not on overhead. They cannot pocket the money; they have to spend it on health care. Also, 8.5 million Americans have received rebate checks from their insurance company because they were overcharged. Is that what the Republicans are so upset about? They are willing to shut down the government to take away these benefits from the people.

Insurance companies cannot deny coverage or charge more for preexisting conditions. They cannot charge women more than men. There is no more discrimination. Again, in a single year, they cannot impose dollar limits on you.

The Republicans are upset about the deficit. The deficit has been cut in half.

I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. The House has voted 41 times to defund the Affordable Care Act. They took it all the way to the Supreme Court, the Republican attorneys general. They lost. They made it a centerpiece of the 2012 election. They lost the Presidential election. Now they are willing to shut down the government unless they get their way.

So I would conclude by asking some rhetorical questions.

Why are the Republicans obsessed with kicking young people off their parents' insurance?

Why are the Republicans so obsessed with stopping preventive care, such as checkups and birth control and immunizations?

Why are Republicans so obsessed with repealing benefits that guarantee insurance coverage for children and adults with preexisting conditions?

Why are they so obsessed with stopping 13 million people from getting insurance who never had the chance before?

Why are they so obsessed with stopping 24 million people from getting insurance under the new State health exchanges?

Why are they so obsessed with repealing a law that prevents insurance companies from canceling an insurance policy when someone gets sick? Why are they obsessed that we are stopping that practice?

Why are they so obsessed when we say you can no longer have an annual dollar limit on benefits?

Why are they so obsessed with repealing a law that says to an insurance company: You cannot have a lifetime limit on benefits.

Why are they so obsessed with repealing a law that finally stops discrimination against women? You know, being a woman was considered a preexisting condition. Honestly. You would have to pay twice as much as a man for your health care. If you were a victim of some kind of spousal abuse, that was considered a preexisting condition and your payments went up or maybe you never even got insurance.

I have to that say finally, why are they so obsessed with doing away with the Affordable Care Act when CBO—the Congressional Budget Office—says it will save $109 billion over 10 years and over $1 trillion the following decade?

I cannot answer these questions. All I can think is that it is politics. It is politics. I have been here a long time. I am proud of it. I thank my people in California for allowing me to have this honor. There were many laws I did not like, believe me. I have served with five Presidents. I did not agree with quite a few of them—two or three—but when I lost a battle, I did not try to shut down the government. When I lost a battle, I did not say: We cannot pay our debts. Oh, maybe I voted once or twice as a symbolic vote, but I knew the votes were there.

So I would say to my friends, get over your obsession and proceed with your responsibilities to keep this government open. Forget about repealing a health care law that is about to kick in that is good for the people and pay your debts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO TOM LAMONT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to thank a good friend for his service to our Nation, America's soldiers, and their families. Tom Lamont of Springfield, IL, is retiring this week as Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, the Army's top personnel officer. It is a post Tom has held for more than 4 years. These were not 4 ordinary years; they were 4 of the most challenging in the Army's modern history. The list of challenges Tom Lamont faced from day one was daunting. At the top of his list, he had to help coordinate the drawdown of U.S. troops from Iraq. At the same time he had to support a surge of troops in Afghanistan and then help the return home of those same troops. He also had to address many of the most important issues facing the military and our Army today, including post-traumatic stress, traumatic brain injuries, sexual assault in the military, and the disturbingly high incidence of suicide among Active-Duty soldiers and veterans.

I was proud to introduce Tom Lamont at his confirmation hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee 4 years ago. I said then that with the tremendous strain the war in Iraq and Afghanistan had created for soldiers and their families, the Army needed a leader like Tom Lamont.

As he prepares to complete his mission in the Pentagon, I am proud but not at all surprised that Tom was every bit the leader our Army needed. In the time of this historic challenge for the Army, Assistant Secretary Thomas Lamont has consistently risen to the challenge. He made clear from the start that his No. 1 priority was the well-being of America's soldiers and their families, especially those coping with multiple deployments.

He also supervised the development of the Army's first Total Force Policy—a new policy that integrates the Active Duty, Guard, and Reserve components of the Army into a single, effective, unified force. It was signed by Secretary of the Army John McHugh just last September. The new Total Force Policy reflects a fundamental fact that, as decades of war in Iraq and Afghanistan have demonstrated, our Army Guard, and Reserve are now as integral to the fight as the Active-

Duty component and we are not going back. Very few people could bring to that task the experience and personal commitment that Tom Lamont did.

Assistant Secretary Lamont also oversaw a review of the Army's Integrated Disability Evaluation System. The IDES system is a partnership between the Defense Department and the Department of Veterans Affairs. It is used to evaluate the wounded, ill or injured servicemembers, to determine whether they are fit for duty, and if not, what disability rating or benefits they receive. Thanks to Tom's focus, the Army's IDES wait times are down more than 40 percent, and the process is more consistent and less adversarial. We need to cut back on that backlog even further, and we will. Tom Lamont's leadership over the last 4 years has made a real difference in reducing the so-called benefits gap for servicemembers transitioning to civilian life.

One reason Tom has been such an effective Assistant Secretary of the Army is the respect he brought to this position for the sacrifices made by all soldiers, whether they are Active Duty, Guard, or Reserve. That respect is something Tom learned during his 25 years as a judge advocate general in the Illinois National Guard. He retired from the Guard with the rank of colonel in 2007. His years of experience in the Illinois Army National Guard gave Tom Lamont a deep understanding of the needs of the Army.

Tom is also a respected attorney in our hometown of Springfield, IL, and a former partner in two distinguished law firms. One of those firms, the Springfield firm of Brown, Hay & Stephens, is the oldest law practice in Illinois. From 1837 to 1841, it employed a young lawyer by the name of Abraham Lincoln. Later, in his second inaugural address, President Lincoln spoke of the solemn obligation of any nation that has been through a war. He said we have a moral responsibility ''to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.'' Tom Lamont has kept faith with that moral responsibility Abraham Lincoln spoke to.

Tom Lamont has also served the people of Illinois in many important positions: executive Director of the Office of the State Attorney Appellate Prosecutor, director of civil litigation in the Office of the Illinois Attorney General, executive director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, special counsel to the University of Illinois, and member of the Senate Judicial Nomination Commission.

A while back, GEN Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, gave a speech in which he described the historic challenges facing the U.S. Armed Forces. He said in those remarks that ''if we don't get the people right, the rest of it won't matter.'' He went on to say, ''We might get the equipment right, the organizational design right, modernization right, but if we don't get the people right, we're going to put the country at risk.''

When President Obama nominated Tom Lamont to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, he got the people right. His service these last 4 years leaves our Army stronger and better prepared for what lies ahead.

In closing, I wish to thank Tom for his extraordinary record of public service.

Tom and his wife Bridget are good friends of Loretta's and mine. I know better than most the personal sacrifices both have made so Tom could serve this President in the U.S. Army and the Nation he loves. I wish Tom and Bridget the best in life's next challenge.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to salute my colleague from California Senator BOXER. The statement she made before I spoke summarized what we face: People say to me are we really going to shut down the Federal Government? Is that what we were elected to come here to do, to reach an agreement between the parties, between the House and the Senate, to shut down the government and cut off the basic services of the Government of the United States of America, the leading Nation in the world when it comes to striving for social justice as well as peace? Are you going to shut down the government? Is that the best you can do in this Congress?

The answer is it is not worthy of this great institution or this great Nation for us to entertain the thought of shutting down this government or, even worse, to default on America's debt for the first time in our history.

People don't understand this term ''debt ceiling.'' Let me explain it. Do you have a mortgage on your home? What would happen if you didn't make a payment next month? Oh, you might get by with it, but by the second month there would be a knock on the door, a call, or an e-mail. They would be saying to you: You missed your payment, and if you want to stay in this house you better make it.

Even if you made that payment, the next time you negotiate a mortgage, someone will remember you defaulted, you failed to pay your mortgage, and you are likely to pay a higher mortgage rate.

Translate that into the United States of America. If we don't pay our mortgage, if we don't lift the debt ceiling to reflect spending that this Congress has already engaged in by both political parties, we will have defaulted on America's debt for the first time in history. We may get through it. I am sure we will. But at the end of the day what will happen is the interest rate paid by Americans to borrow money will go up. It means that $1 sent to Washington in taxes will no longer buy $1 worth of goods and services. No. It will buy less because more of that is to be paid in interest to someone loaning money to the United States. Golly, it is an awful outcome. I wish we could avoid it.

The answer is we can avoid it. The default on America's debt, the failure to extend the debt ceiling, is a self-imposed crisis generated, sadly, by the majority in the House of Representatives who happen to believe this is good politics. The American people will rally to the notion that we are going to default on our debt for the first time and we are going to stop funding the government.

What a glorious day for this great Nation, closing the doors of our government in every single agency, virtually every single agency, and defaulting on our debt for the first time in history.

If that is what the tea party Republicans think is leadership, God save the United States of America. We need leadership where Democrats and Republicans sit down and act as adults, not as squealing political pigs trying to get attention. We need to basically sit down, both political parties, and solve this problem.

I have been waiting patiently, watching. We have asked for a budget conference committee to work out our differences. Time and again we have come to the floor over the last 6 months and said Senator MURRAY's budget which passed the Senate is ready to be negotiated with the House. Consistently, four Senators on the Republican side of the aisle have taken turns standing up and objecting to working out our differences and coming up with an agreement on how much we will spend. That is not how you should govern this Nation. I don't believe that is how you should serve in the Senate.

The latest excuse—and I won't go into detail—is, of course, Republicans have said: Of course, we have to shut down the government and we have to default on our debt for the first time in history to stop ObamaCare.

Senator BOXER went through the details of what ObamaCare means to millions of families and the opportunity for health insurance for the first time for many of them in their entire lives. It is working, and I think that is what infuriates many Republicans the most.

We can fix it, it can be better, and we should do it. But to bring this government to a halt and to default on our debt over this question of a bill that passed over 3 years ago and is the law of the land, found constitutional by the Supreme Court, is the height of irresponsibility.

The American people have a right to be angry with Congress, but please take a moment and realize that this desperate, awful strategy is inspired by one political party, which thinks that

somehow this is going to appeal to the American people. I don't believe it will. The American people are too smart to fall for that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I sat through the speech given by the junior Senator of California. I have a long list of things with which I disagree and I am going to get to as many of those as I can in a minute. I feel an obligation to make a statement about some important policy issues that nobody talks about, certainly not partisan in any way. I wish to get that out of the way first and then I will have time, on the time that I have been given, to go back and cover as many of the issues that were misrepresented by my good friend, the junior Senator from California.

SRI LANKA

I wish to encourage the Obama administration to review its current policies regarding the country of Sri Lanka and seek further engagement to assist them as they continue their progress toward reconciliation and reconstruction after 30 years of a bloody civil war against the Tamil Tiger terrorists.

Just 4 years ago Sri Lanka defeated the Tamil terrorists and is currently recovering from economic, political, and social upheaval caused by this destructive civil war. I think there are a lot of people who didn't expect this to happen with this new administration, but it is. Good things have happened. Peace has brought historic postconflict recovery and Sri Lanka is bringing the dividends of peace in an exclusive manner, particularly to those in the north and to the east of the country, from where Tamil suicide bombers and other terrorist attacks were once launched.

Specifically, since the war ended, those two areas have seen an economic growth of 22 percent compared to an average of 7.5 percent for the rest of the country.

Sri Lanka has removed half a million antipersonnel mines, resettled 300,000 internally displaced people, and reestablished vital social services in the areas of health and education.

It is also conducting local elections in the formerly Tamil-controlled north on the 21st of September. I see this as an important step toward political reconciliation. Such processes take time, as we learned from our own Civil War.

It seems to me that Sri Lanka is developing into a key economy, both in its own right and as a gateway to India. A lot of people don't know where Sri Lanka is. It is that little island at the bottom of India and that part of the world.

Sri Lanka's geostrategic location, the deepwater ports, could be vital to the long-term financial and national security interests of the United States. We want them on our side. Some 50 percent of all container traffic, for example, and 70 percent of the world's energy supplies pass within sight of Sri Lanka's coast.

U.S. diplomatic efforts there, however, have lagged. As a result, I believe our long-term economic and national security interests are suffering. At a time when the United States is pivoting or rebalancing toward Asia, we may be giving this island nation reason not to consider the United States a friend and strategic partner.

Understandably, the policies of the United States toward Sri Lanka have focused on accountability for what happened during the last phases of the civil war, as well as on steps toward political reconciliation and respect for human rights. While these aspects are very important and deserving of support, I also believe there is the opportunity to engage in a wider simultaneous approach that also takes into account economic and national security consideration. Maybe this wider, dual-track approach would have a positive influence overall and make up for lost ground.

I have expressed these views in letters to both Secretary Kerry and Secretary Hagel in recent months. While both of them agree with me about Sri Lanka and its economic and geostrategic importance to the United States, both still point to the lack of political transparency and poor human rights record to reject a review of the administration's position, which restricts military-to-military relations and foreign assistance funding.

I take Secretary Kerry and Secretary Hagel at their word and believe the upcoming September 21 provincial council elections in the north can be a meaningful act of political reconciliation that would be between the Sinhala majority and the Tamil minorities. If they are conducted in a free and fair manner, free of human rights violations, I will strongly renew my request to the administration to reassess our current policies toward Sri Lanka.

I know it is a little bit controversial, but we have watched what has happened over the years. We have watched the civil war. Then when you consider the very strategic location of Sri Lanka, it is very important, in my view, that we establish these relationships and recognize them.

Let me mention a few things I took issue with. Some of them I had a hard time understanding what the junior Senator from California was talking about when she was singing the praises of this administration.

First, I agreed with her on the tragedy at the Navy Yard. I have been down there many times. I was envisioning as I was coming from Tulsa up here on Monday—at that time they said Ronald Reagan Airport was going to be closed. They thought it was going to be closed down because of the proximity to the Navy Yard. It didn't turn out that way and we ended up landing there.

When I went down and I saw the scene, which I have seen many times before, and I looked at it, it was gut-wrenching to think that one deranged person could do this. We saw it before in Waco. We have seen it in Boston. We have seen it in other places. It is something that I assume is going to be with us. I don't know how it can be precluded.

I will say this, though. I fully expected several of my liberal friends would use that to try to come up with an excuse for more stringent gun regulations. I would only suggest that the District of Columbia has the most stringent anti-Second Amendment gun control laws anywhere in the country, and that is where this took place. You can't say this has anything to do with it, but I knew it was going to happen.

Another thing my friend talked about was the debt, all of this, talking about the other administrations. I would only remind you, this is something that is incontrovertible, the amount of debt this President has had up to today. He has increased our deficit by $6.1 trillion, which is more than all of the other Presidents from George Washington on up through recent administrations combined. You wonder where is all of that money, where did it all go? It went to his social programs.

My major concern—the Presiding Officer may have heard I was making quite an issue out of the fact the President wanted to send cruise missiles into Syria. I don't think there is anyone naive enough to believe you can do that and not have repercussions.

We have heard from Iran, which I consider to be the greatest threat to the United States, in that our intelligence has told us since 2007 Iran would have the nuclear weapon and the delivery system in place by 2015. That is a year and a half from now. Yes, it is something where we would be going in.

However, in the disarming of America, as I have referred to, I remember going to Afghanistan 4½ years ago. It was after the President's first budget. I went there because I knew what was going to happen to the military in spite of all this spending that has given us new debt, $6.1 trillion. Where did it go? I can tell you a lot of places where it didn't go. It didn't go to defending America.

I went over there. In that very first budget the President had, the first thing he did was do away with our only fifth-generation fighter, the F–22. He did away with our lift capability, the C–17. He did away with our future combat system, the only advancement of ground capability in some 60 years. He did away with the ground-based interceptor in Poland, which now puts us in a position where we are hustling all over trying to figure out where we can get a third site to protect the United States of America against a missile coming in from the East. We have 33 of them out there but they are all on the west coast. That doesn't help us here.

On top of that, this administration, in its extended budget, has taken now already $487 billion out of our defense

budget and is talking about another $½ trillion through his sequestration.

I know nobody believes this, and that is why none of the Members on this floor will talk about it, but this disarming of America puts us in a very serious situation.

The junior Senator from California was praising this President and all of the things she felt he has been doing, but it is time to hear the truth. She was praising him on ObamaCare and how wonderful this is and how thankful everyone is. Why is it the most recent polling showed 88 percent of the people in America want to do away with the individual mandate, and the vast majority of them say it is a bad idea? Those are the words they use. So it is not working.

I can remember back when we were going to have Hillary health care, back during the Clinton administration, and we asked the question—and you can ask any liberal who wants to get to a single-payer system or ultimately have socialized medicine, which I think will be down the road in the vision of this administration—if this hasn't worked in Great Britain, it hasn't worked in Denmark and it hasn't worked in Canada, why would it work here? They will never tell you this, but they were saying if they were running it, it would work here.

Anyway, this is something that is not popular, as was misrepresented by the junior Senator from California. Then she said: ''The news is great coming out of Detroit.'' That is fine, except they filed bankruptcy last week.

So when we hear all the things that are stated, just keep in mind this is still America, we still have certain values that have been completely reversed by this administration, and it is time to keep that in mind and to move on ahead.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to talk about two overarching issues that are confronting the Senate and the House at the same time. Both, unfortunately in this circumstance, are directly related. Normally, we would talk about these two issues separate and apart.

First of all, the Affordable Care Act and what that means for the country, what it means for families, the impact it is having now in a very positive way but also what it means for those families in the future and also the concerns I have about what a small group, but a very powerful group in the Congress, want to do that I would argue would adversely impact the economy.

Let me talk first about the Affordable Care Act. I was a strong supporter, worked hard for its passage, and will continue to work hard on the implementation. We have seen in the last couple of years, since implementation began in 2010, continued in 2011, 2012, and 2013, the benefits the Affordable Care Act have brought to this country. We have also seen where we have had to make changes, where we have had to come together, often in a bipartisan manner, to make changes to the legislation to make it work. There will be plenty of other changes in the future, but the worst thing we could do right now is to pretend, as some in this body and in the other body do as well, that nothing has changed for the better for families.

Let me give a couple of examples. I will use Pennsylvania examples, but of course in every one of these there is a national number that corresponds to the State-by-State numbers.

Consider this: In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 222,703 Pennsylvania seniors saved money on prescription drugs directly as a result of the Affordable Care Act. Health care reform provides seniors who hit the so-called doughnut hole with more than a 50-percent discount on brand name drugs. Already, just in Pennsylvania, that many seniors have had some measure of support when they got into that doughnut hole. That is a very nice way of saying a coverage gap, where they have to come up with the dollars for prescription drugs. I mentioned the number of 222,000 seniors in Pennsylvania who have already saved $168 million on prescription drugs directly as a result of this legislation. So if you are for repealing this, you have to tell us how you are going to help those 222,703 Pennsylvanians with their prescription drug coverage if you want to take away that benefit.

Two more examples. I will not go through all of these. There are 5,489,162 Pennsylvanians with preexisting conditions who will no longer have to worry about being denied coverage. That part of the legislation, as the Presiding Officer knows so well, is an enlargement of what we had before. What we had in the first couple years of implementation was a legal prohibition that a child who had a preexisting condition would not be denied coverage. Imagine where we were before this legislation. The Federal Government and the Nation were saying to those families: We know your child has coverage, we know you are paying the premium for that child, we know that technically your child has some kind of health insurance coverage, but if that child has a preexisting condition, he or she does not get covered.

That was the prevailing policy before the Affordable Care Act was passed. What we said in the act was that is unacceptable. The United States is not going to say any longer to a family: If your child has a preexisting condition he or she will be denied coverage and treatment. We wiped that out by virtue of passage of the act and then implementation.

Now we are saying, as implementation proceeds in 2014, that same kind of coverage for preexisting conditions will apply to adults as well. We couldn't afford to do it right away, but now we are able to move in that direction. Imagine what happens upon repeal, if we repeal the Affordable Care Act, if we go back to the old and, I would argue, very dark days, where children and adults with preexisting conditions don't get the coverage they need and surely deserve.

What kind of a country are we if we say a child whose parents have health insurance and have been paying premiums should not be covered or treated because an insurance company says they are not entitled to coverage? If we repeal the bill, we are going back to those days. Whether it is a child or an adult, the least we can do is say we will have a health insurance system in the United States where if you are paying your premiums, you will be given the coverage you are paying for and that you are entitled to. We couldn't say that before the passage of this act.

So repeal of the Affordable Care Act means preexisting conditions are no longer covered.

I haven't heard a lot from the other side about how they would achieve that. Maybe they will. Maybe they will come up with a plan to do that.

Finally, this is the third example. There are 91,000 young Pennsylvanians who have been able to find health care coverage. Under the act, young adults, ages 19 to 25, are able to stay on their parents' plan in order to maintain coverage.

A lot of families out there had a lot of worry and, frankly, a lot of financial burden but especially the anxiety of knowing a young person who may have been in college for years—maybe they had a 2-year college or 4-year education, but somewhere in that time period of being in college, roughly that age and after college up through age 25—had no coverage. This has solved that problem. Imagine the numbers across the country.

In both of these instances—young people having coverage on their parents' plans and children being covered for preexisting conditions—we are talking in the tens of millions of Americans, children and young adults.

Those are just three examples—seniors getting help with their prescription drug coverage, which they never got before at this level of protection and help; children with preexisting conditions, now adults; and then, thirdly, young people across the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary entitled ''The Affordable Care Act Is Providing Stability and Security for Middle-Class Pennsylvanians.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IS PROVIDING STABILITY AND SECURITY FOR MIDDLE-CLASS PENNSYLVANIANS

The Affordable Care Act is providing middle-class families with stability and security. Instead of refighting old political battles over health care, Republicans should work with us to improve the law, help make sure people are aware of and take advantage of its benefits, and strengthen the economy.

Republicans want to go back to the days when insurance companies were in charge and could deny coverage to children with pre-existing conditions, charge women more than men, and run up premiums.

PROVIDING BENEFITS FOR PENNSYLVANIA SENIORS

222,703 Pennsylvania seniors saved money on prescription drugs. Health reform provides seniors who hit the so-called ''donut hole'' with a more than 50% discount on brand name drugs. Seniors will receive larger discounts each year until the ''donut hole'' closes completely in 2020. 222,703 Pennsylvania seniors have saved $168 million on prescription drugs under health reform, for an average savings of $753.

1,034,635 Pennsylvania seniors have received free preventive health services. As a result of health reform, seniors have access to free preventive health services such as cancer screening, diabetes screening, and annual wellness visits.

PROVIDING STABLE AND SECURE COVERAGE FOR MIDDLE-CLASS PENNSYLVANIANS

5,489,162 Pennsylvanians with pre-existing conditions will no longer have to worry about being denied coverage. Under the Affordable Care Act (ACA), insurance companies are already barred from denying coverage to children with pre-existing conditions. Starting in 2014, that protection will be afforded to all Americans, ensuring that those with conditions like cancer, diabetes, asthma, or heart disease will not be denied coverage or charged higher premiums. 5,489,162 non-elderly Pennsylvanians have been diagnosed with a preexisting condition.

91,000 young Pennsylvanians have been able to find health coverage. Under the ACA, young adults aged 19–25 are able to stay on their parents' plan in order to maintain coverage.

3,151,000 Pennsylvanians have received free preventive health services. The Affordable Care Act ensures that most insurance plans provide recommended health services like colonoscopies, Pap smears, mammograms, and well-child visits without cost-sharing or out of pocket costs. 3,151,000 Pennsylvanians have benefited from these services, including 1,218,000 women and 761,000 children.

4,582,000 Pennsylvanians no longer have to worry about lifetime or annual limits on coverage. Under the ACA, insurance companies can no longer deny coverage to those who need it most by imposing arbitrary lifetime or annual dollar limits on coverage.

MAKING PENNSYLVANIANS HEALTH CARE MORE AFFORDABLE

123,581 Pennsylvanians have received rebates and greater value from their health insurance. Under the ACA, Americans get greater value from their health insurance. Insurance companies are required to spend at least 80 cents of every dollar paid in premiums on health care as opposed to administrative expenses, executive salaries, or padding their profits. For every dollar spent above that limit, they are required to give rebates back to the American people. Last year, 123,581 Pennsylvanians received an average rebate of $77 for a total of $6,875,277.

Pennsylvania has received $5,312,084 in lower premium increases. Because of the ACA, for the first time, insurance companies are required to publicly justify their actions if they want to raise rates by 10% or more. As a result of this effort to fight unreasonable premium hikes, Pennsylvania has received $5,312,084.

Mr. CASEY. There is a lot more we could talk about, but we don't have time. I will not go into the national numbers because I know others have done that, but these are just some of the examples of what this legislation has meant.

The act is not perfect. No act that has been passed by this Senate has ever been perfect, especially something as challenging as health care, and we will make changes to make it work. But the worst thing we could do is for the Senate to turn its back on children and say: You don't deserve to have coverage if you have a preexisting condition or turn our back on older citizens who fought our wars, worked in our factories, taught our children, gave us a middle class, and gave us and younger generations life and love and helped us in so many ways and say to them: You know what. You can be on your own when it comes to prescription drug coverage.

That is the Affordable Care Act. But unfortunately this isn't just a debate about the act. Now we are getting into a debate about some people in Washington wanting to use the Affordable Care Act as a political weapon in other contexts. They say if they do not have a repeal of or a defunding of the Affordable Care Act, that somehow they think a government shutdown would be the right way to go or that we would default on our obligations.

Of course, I and many others don't believe that is the right way to go; in essence, in the case of the debt limit, holding the debt limit hostage to a relitigation of the Affordable Care Act. That is dangerous for the economy, but I think it is also very bad for those families I just mentioned.

This debt limit crisis that is ahead of us, just as the end of the fiscal year crisis is ahead of us, is manufactured. We don't need to have a crisis on the debt ceiling, but it is being manufactured to make a political point by some in Washington. Not all Republicans agree with this, certainly not around the country but even here in Washington. But some seem to believe this is the right way to go.

This is the kind of edge-of-the-cliff brinkmanship we saw in 2011, which had a substantial—and I think this is irrefutable—adverse impact on the economy. The Dow dropped 2,000 points because of the last debt ceiling debate, a debate which resulted in us getting an agreement at the very last minute, not going over the deadline. But some apparently think it is a good idea to default on our obligations for the first time since 1789.

What does that mean for most Americans? If we have the Dow drop 2,000 points or maybe lower, if we actually go over the deadline, it means a loss of savings for Americans. It may not affect people in the Senate who are wealthy or people in the Senate who have job security and health care security and everything else, but it will hurt a lot of Americans, and it will crater the savings of Americans if that happens.

An adverse credit rating, another adverse consequence, means more expensive credit for everyone. It translates into higher costs for housing, education, and other critical household expenses. Local governments would also bear the burden of a lower credit rating—a drop in the credit rating of the United States—which makes every project that much more difficult and expensive.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Wall Street Journal op-ed entitled ''Uncertainty Is the Enemy of Recovery,'' dated April 28, 2013, and written by Bill McNabb, the CEO of Vanguard.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 28, 2013]

UNCERTAINTY IS THE ENEMY OF RECOVERY

(By Bill McNabb)

Anyone hoping for signs of a healthy economic recovery was disappointed by lower-than-expected GDP growth for the first quarter of 2013—a mere 2.5%, far short of the forecast 3.2%. Meanwhile, the stock market continues to soar, hitting record levels in recent weeks. It's a striking disconnect, and one that is discouraging and confusing for Americans as they seek to earn a living and save for the future.

Companies and small businesses are also dealing with the same paradox. Many are in good shape and have money to spend. So why aren't they pumping more capital back into the economy, creating jobs and fueling the country's economic engine?

Quite simply, if firms can't see a clear road to economic recovery ahead, they're not going to hire and they're not going to spend. It's what economists call a ''deadweight loss''—loss caused by inefficiency.''

Today, there is uncertainty about regulatory policy, uncertainty about monetary policy, uncertainty about foreign policy and, most significantly, uncertainty about U.S. fiscal policy and the national debt. Until a sensible plan is created to address the debt, America will not fulfill its economic potential.

Uncertainty comes with a very real and quantifiable price tag—an uncertainty tax, so to speak. Over the past two years, amid stalled debates in Washington and missed opportunities to tackle the debt, the magnitude of this uncertainty tax has gotten short shrift.

Three economists, Stanford University's Nicholas Bloom and Scott Baker and the University of Chicago's Steven Davis, have done invaluable work measuring the level of policy uncertainty over the past few decades. Their research (available at policyuncertainty.com) shows that, on average, U.S. economic policy uncertainty has been 50% higher in the past two years than it has been since 1985.

Based on that research, our economists at Vanguard isolated changes in the U.S. economy that we determined were specifically due to increases in policy uncertainty, such as the debt-ceiling debacle in August 2011, the congressional supercommittee failure in November 2011, and the fiscal-cliff crisis at the end of 2012. This gave us a picture of what the economy might look like if the shocks from policy uncertainty had not occurred.

We estimate that since 2011 the rise in overall policy uncertainty has created a $261 billion cumulative drag on the economy (the equivalent of more than $800 per person in the country). Without this uncertainty tax, real U.S. GDP could have grown an average 3% per year since 2011, instead of the recorded 2% average in fiscal years 2011–12. In

addition, the U.S. labor market would have added roughly 45,000 more jobs per month over the past two years. That adds up to more than one million jobs that we could have had by now, but don't.

At Vanguard we estimate that the spike in policy uncertainty surrounding the debt-ceiling debate alone has resulted in a cumulative economic loss of $112 billion over the past two years. To put that figure in perspective, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that sequestration may reduce total funding by $85 billion in 2013. Clearly, the U.S. debt situation is the economic issue of our generation.

But it's not just about the numbers. Every time lawmakers seemingly get close to a deal that will restore fiscal responsibility but instead fail, we at Vanguard hear the concerns of investors. They ask: How does this affect my retirement fund? What about my college savings account? How does this affect my taxes? Would I be better off putting my savings under the mattress?

Investor anxiety is a critical component in all of this. We'd be foolish to take comfort in the strength of recent stock-market performance. Until the U.S. debt issue is resolved for the long term, market gains and losses will be built on an unstable foundation of promises that cannot be kept.

Developing a credible, long-term solution to the country's staggering debt is the biggest collective challenge right now. It should be America's biggest collective priority, too. Any comprehensive deficit reduction must take on the imbalance between revenues and expenditures as a share of GDP. That means entitlement reforms, spending reductions and additional tax revenues.

This does not have to be about European-style ''instant austerity.'' Because the U.S. dollar is the world's reserve currency, America doesn't have to balance the budget tomorrow.

The key is to provide clarity to businesses, financial markets and everyday savers and investors. Make no mistake: A comprehensive, long-term, binding plan that brings the budget into balance over a reasonable time frame is essential. If Washington fails to achieve one, the consequences will be harsh.

The good news is that if reform is enacted, and the costly pall of uncertainty is lifted, the U.S. economy has the potential to bounce back, creating the growth and jobs that are so badly needed. I am confident that our leaders in Washington can make it happen.

Mr. CASEY. I will not read the article, but I was certainly struck by it. Obviously, the author talks about this problem of uncertainty and what it causes. In support of his op-ed he mentioned the work done by two economists in measuring and calculating the cost of this uncertainty.

Here is what they concluded just as it relates to the uncertainty that results from a debt ceiling battle:

At Vanguard we estimate that the spike in policy uncertainty surrounding the debt-ceiling debate alone has resulted in a cumulative economic loss of $112 billion over the past two years.

This is what Bill McNabb, who is someone who knows something about markets and related issues, said in April of this year.

So there is a 2-year impact of $112 billion because of a politically motivated and manufactured crisis, because some people want to make a political statement about the debt ceiling, which puts the economy at risk. I hope that some folks come to their senses because we can have and should have debates about reducing spending in a bipartisan fashion, how to reduce spending the way a business does, how to reduce spending the way a family does. But does it make any sense to do this kind of high-wire act? This is very dangerous for the economy.

This isn't theoretical. We had a dry run, unfortunately. We had a rehearsal of this in 2011. We didn't go over the line, we didn't default, but we came very close. We came within days of defaulting. Getting close to that alone had an adverse impact on the economy.

So to say this is fiscally reckless is a vast understatement. I don't know how to express it beyond saying that. To say that it is dangerous for the economy, for jobs, for families, for the middle class, for companies all over the country; to say that to default on our obligations or coming close to that—playing with fire, in a sense—to say that is dangerous is an understatement.

Here is what we should do: We should stop the games and the fiscal high-wire act, and we should focus on what middle-class families want.

When I go home to Pennsylvania, they say to me in a couple of short words what they want me to do: Work together to create jobs. Work together to create the conditions for growth, whether that is tax credits or tax policy, whether it is efforts to jump-start the economy.

One of the more depressing charts I have seen in 6 months or maybe even 6 years is a chart that was in the New York Times called ''A Shifting Economic Tide,'' dated July 25, 2013. It depicts the change in income from 1995. There is a long line going up and down with spikes and then the line going down. But the two most relevant numbers here are the comparison between the top 1 percent during the recession and then in the recovery. The top 1 percent got hit pretty hard, as a lot of people did. Even the very wealthy got hit. They lost a little more than 36 percent of their real income. But in the recovery, even though they lost 36 percent, they are up plus-11 in the recovery. So they went down by 36, but they are up plus-11. So they are still not back yet.

But what happened to the bottom 90 percent—not the top 1 percent, but what happened to the bottom 90 percent in the recession and recovery? According to this chart, the bottom 90 percent lost 12 percent of their real income, but they are still at minus 1.5. They haven't even gotten to zero. They haven't even gotten to positive territory yet when you compare their real income in the recession and the hit they took and where they are today.

So what does that mean for us? It means that both parties have a lot of work to do. It means that both parties should be working together to create more jobs and create more economic certainty instead of playing this game, which is dangerous, fiscally reckless for sure, and very damaging to the economy and even the morale of the country. They want us to work together. They don't want us to play a games like some want to play here.

I appreciate the fact that we are having a debate about the Affordable Care Act. It is very important to have that debate and make sure we get the implementation right. But we should not be using the Affordable Care Act as a political weapon in these debates about our fiscal policy. I believe we can do that in a rational way as long as people are willing to set aside their political ideology for a short period of time so we can resolve some of these issues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, what is the pending parliamentary business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 1392 is pending.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Are there any amendments that need to be set aside?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, there are not.

NAVY YARD TRAGEDY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am going to speak from the heart—a heavy heart—because six Marylanders died at the Navy Yard on Monday.

I join with all Americans in expressing my deepest condolences to all of the families of those killed and injured in the Navy Yard shooting, and I particularly express my condolences to the Maryland families.

I also thank our first responders, including the local and Federal law enforcement officers who were first to arrive at the scene and took control of this terrible, horrific situation. I thank the doctors and all the support staff at MedStar trauma center who worked so hard to help the injured and saved lives that day and every one of those who played such an important role in responding to that emergency.

My heart goes out to the victims and the families and to everyone who is mourning the loss of the men and women who died there. This has deeply affected those of us in Maryland, as it has those in nearby Virginia and the District of Columbia. But for us in Maryland, this is whom we mourn, a cluster of people, the dead, the shooting victims. This is Maryland and Virginia—hands across the Potomac—and we just can't believe it.

We think of Kenneth Bernard Proctor. He was 46 years old. He was a civilian utilities foreman at the Navy Yard. He worked for the Federal Government for 20 years. He lived in Charles County and married his high school sweetheart in 1994. They have two boys, now teenagers. He loved his sons and the Redskins.

Then there was Sylvia Frasier, who was 52 years old. She was a resident of Maryland and one of seven children. She studied computer information systems at Strayer College. She received

an undergraduate and her master's degree in computer information systems. She worked hard to get her education, and she wanted her education to work hard for America. She had worked at the Navy Sea Systems Command since 2000, and she worked a few nights a week at Walmart as a customer service manager, helping her family, paying off student debt. Sylvia really was a remarkable person.

Then there is Frank Kohler. He was 50 years old. He lived in a community called Tall Timbers, MD. And we certainly say that Frank was a tall timber when it came to working for his country. He too was a computer specialist. He worked as a contractor for Lockheed Martin. He was a graduate of Pennsylvania's Slippery Rock College, where he met his wife Michelle. He was president of the Rotary Club and was honored for his Rotary Club work. Down in southern Maryland, in St. Mary's County, they have an oyster festival that is coming up. He held the title ''King Oyster'' for his community service and organizing the Rotary Club's annual festival to raise money for the much needed Rotary Club Challengers. He was a great family man and loved by many.

There is John Roger Johnson, who was a civilian employee for the Navy who lived in Derwood, MD, for more than 30 years. He was the father of four daughters and a loving grandfather. His 11th grandchild is due in November. Like so many who live in our community, he loved the Redskins. His neighbors described him as smart, always had a smile, and was always there for his neighbors.

Then there is Vishnu Pandit, who was 61 years old. He came from India in his early twenties. He lived with his wife Anjali in North Potomac, MD. He was the father of two sons. He was well liked in his community and was known for helping people and particularly those who are part of the Indian heritage community in Maryland. He was known for talking about job opportunities, educational opportunities, and was a strong advocate for them. He was proud of his heritage from his mother country, but he was proud of being a citizen of the United States of America.

Richard Michael Ridgell, 52 years old, was a father of three. This guy, though, was a Ravens fan. When the Ravens came into Baltimore at No. 1, he bought season tickets and has owned them for the last 17 years. He grew up in a community called Brooklyn, MD, but settled in Carroll County in Westminster. He was a Maryland State trooper before he came to work in Federal service, a brave guy, and someone who really liked to protect and defend people in many ways.

Those are six of the 13 who died, and there are those who are recovering. It is just a heavy heart we have. In the wake of yet another senseless tragedy and mass casualties, I hope we do take action to end this kind of senseless act of violence that takes innocent lives in our communities. I hope we do something about it.

There are those who are calling for renewed background checks, and I support that, and renewed efforts to get guns out of the hands of dangerous people, and I support that. But there are also people who suffer from mental illness. This case is currently under investigation, so I am not going to comment on the person we know did this horrific act and the struggles he had with the demons inside of him. I just know we have to come to grips with problems. Yes, background checks are one thing, but really—and this is where I truly agree with the NRA—we have to do something about mental illness and early detection and early treatment.

We mourn for those whose lives were lost on Monday. We mourn for their families. And we hope now that out of this something positive grows. But I want to say to their families that today is not really the day to talk about public policy. The men and women who were at that Navy Yard were Federal employees. They worked hard every single day. They were proud to work for the U.S. Government. They were proud to do everything from IT service to security service. Some had master's degrees, some had a high school education. Whatever their education, whatever ZIP Code they came from, they really served one Nation and one flag.

I acknowledge their tremendous service to this country. I also acknowledge the wonderful way they were involved with their families and their communities. And on behalf of all of Maryland, I know Senator CARDIN and I express our deepest gratitude to them for their lives and express our heartfelt sympathy and condolences.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her beautiful remarks on behalf of her constituents and their families. Our thoughts and prayers are with the families. I also thank her for her thoughts on some of the policy ramifications that come out of the terrible tragedy. I know the Senator stands by those families as she has stood by so many military families in the State of Maryland.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator BROWN follow me after my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013. I believe the beneficial role that energy efficiency improvements can have for consumers and also for industrial competitiveness often gets overlooked in today's debate about energy policy. When I travel around my State I am always hearing from businesses and manufacturers about the importance of keeping energy affordable. That is why it is so important we are having this debate and that we are looking at taking real steps on meaningful energy legislation.

This legislation will help consumers save money on their utility bills and help our businesses be more competitive. Minnesota has long been an example of leadership in energy policy, with the 25 by 25 renewable energy standard. Our largest energy provider, Xcel Energy, agreed to a 30-percent standard by 2020. So we have been one of the leading States in a bipartisan way. This bill was signed by Governor Pawlenty, then-Governor Pawlenty, with strong bipartisan support in our State legislature. I would say it was also as a result of other things, but I would say it certainly has not hurt our economy. We have one of the lowest unemployment rates. We are at 5.2 percent. It came out today the Twin Cities had its biggest year in the last year of any year in terms of economic gain.

Minnesota is also leading the way with a 1.5-percent energy efficiency standard. Each year our utilities work with consumers and businesses to find ways to save energy and reduce waste from energy efficiency improvements, much like those contained in the Shaheen-Portman bill.

I believe we need an ''all of the above'' plan to get serious about building a new energy agenda for Minnesota, a plan that helps businesses compete in the global economy, preserves our environment, and restarts the engine that has always kept our economy going forward; that is the energy of innovation.

Although Senators may differ on the specific details of an ''all of the above'' energy plan, I believe we can find broad agreement that energy efficiency, as we see in this bill, must be a part of any plan. Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN have produced a very good bill that I strongly support, but I also know there are many good ideas, many of them bipartisan, that promote energy efficiency, and I thank them for the opportunity to build on their legislation to boost energy efficiency.

One goal that I share with my friend and colleague from North Dakota Senator HOEVEN was to find new opportunities to engage the nonprofit community in making energy efficiency improvements.

I spoke briefly on the Senate floor earlier in the week about this important issue. When faced with the choice, nonprofits including hospitals, schools, faith based organizations and youth centers often make the decision to delay or forgo improvements in energy efficiency to help stretch budgets and serve more people.

But we know investing in energy efficiency improvements today can lead to savings over time that go beyond the cost of the initial investment. So it is a difficult question. Should we do a little less for a year or two so that upgrades can be made to our heating system so that we can use the long term

savings to protect our ability to serve well into the future?

That is why I introduced the Nonprofit Energy Efficiency Act as an amendment with Senator HOEVEN, and we have the support of Senators BLUNT, PRYOR, RISCH, SCHATZ, and STABENOW.

Our amendment, which is fully offset, would provide $10 million each year for the next 5 years to create a pilot grant program so that non-profits can save through energy efficiency. We worked with stakeholders to ensure that grants will achieve significant amounts of energy savings and are done in a cost effective manner. The grants would require a 50 percent match so that there is complete buy in from the nonprofits, and grants would also be capped at $200,000.

Our amendment has the support of National Council of Churches, the YMCA of the USA, and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations.

I ask unanimous consent that these letters of support for the Nonprofit Energy Efficiency Act be included in the RECORD.

I again thank Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI as well as Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN for their tireless efforts to move this important legislation forward.

I urge my colleagues to support the Klobuchar-Hoeven amendment, the Nonprofit Energy Efficiency Act, and also support the underlying Shaheen-Portman legislation.

I want to raise another important energy issue that I have worked on this year that impacts nearly every family, business, and industry in America—and that is the price of gasoline.

This past May in Minnesota in just one week we saw gas prices spike 40 cents higher per gallon and over 80 cents higher over the course of one month.

We know that this sharp spike in prices was caused when a number of refineries that serve Minnesota and the region went offline for both scheduled and unscheduled maintenance, in part to prepare for summer fuel blends.

I understand the need to adjust for seasonal gasoline blends and perform upgrades to protect worker safety and make necessary repairs. But scheduled, routine maintenance should not be an excuse for major gasoline shortages and steep price spikes.

Gas prices in Minnesota have subsided after setting records this spring of over $4.25 a gallon, but we know refinery outages will continue to have significant impacts, disrupting commerce and hurting consumers, small businesses and farmers if we do not act.

That is why I introduced the Gas Price and Refine Capacity Relief Act of 2013 with Senators HOEVEN, FRANKEN, and DURBIN. Our bill requires refineries give advance warning of any planned outage and immediate notification for any unplanned outage.

This information would serve as an early warning system and protect consumers from paying the price at the pump when there are production problems within the refining industry. With more transparency—and more lead time—fuel retailers will have the opportunity to purchase fuel at prices that better reflect the underlying costs of crude oil and better reflect supply and demand across the country.

When we had this recent increase you couldn't explain it by supply and demand. We had ample supplies. Demand was down. The only reason we could find, besides perhaps speculation, was these refineries that had planned closures. What we are trying to do is create an early warning system and I appreciate the bipartisan support for this bill.

The bill would also require the Secretary of Energy look at the potential for additional refined fuel storage capacity in our region. Minnesota has less storage capacity for refined products than other parts of the country and that makes us more vulnerable to the kinds of refinery outages we've experienced this year—both planned and unplanned—that led to dramatic spikes in the price of gas.

I thank Chairman WYDEN for holding a hearing on this issue in July. Although this amendment will not come up for a vote as a part of the bill being considered by the Senate, I look forward to continue working on this issue so we can prevent another unnecessary spike in gas prices like we saw in Minnesota this spring.

Most people wouldn't tie the last issue I wish to discuss today to energy policy. But just ask any power company or construction crew across the country, or even operators of ice skating rinks in Minnesota and you would quickly learn about the growing national problem of metal theft and it must be addressed.

I have filed my bipartisan bill, the Metal Theft Prevention Act, to the energy efficiency bill to bring attention to metal theft. I introduced it last February with Senators HOEVEN, SCHUMER, GRAHAM, and COONS.

The bill is the much-needed Federal response to the increasingly pervasive and damaging crime of metal theft.

Metal theft has jumped more than 80 percent in recent years, hurting businesses and threatening public safety in communities throughout the country. Metal theft is a major threat to American businesses, especially to power companies. In a recent study, the U.S. Department of Energy found that the total value of damages to industries affected by the theft of copper wire is approximately $1 billion each year.

Across the country, copper thieves have targeted construction sites, power and phone lines, retail stores, and vacant houses. They've caused explosions in vacant buildings by stealing metal from gas lines, and they've caused blackouts by stealing copper wiring from streetlights and electrical substations. Thieves are even taking brass stars from our veterans' graves. On Memorial Day in 2012, thieves stole more than 200 bronze star markers from veterans' graves in Minnesota.

In another case that shows just how dangerous metal theft can be, Georgia Power was having a huge problem with thieves targeting a substation that feeds the entire Atlanta-Hartsfield International Airport, one of the busiest airports in the world. The airport was getting hit 2 to 3 times a week and surveillance didn't lead to any arrests.

Last winter, at a recreation center in St. Paul thieves stole $20,000 worth of pipe from the outdoor ice rink, causing the center to close until local businesses donated labor and materials to make the repairs.

This rise in incidents of metal theft across the country underscores the critical need for Federal action to crack down on metal thieves, put them behind bars and make it more difficult for them to sell their stolen goods.

Our Metal Theft Prevention Act will help combat this growing problem by putting modest record-keeping requirements onto the recyclers who buy scrap metal . . . limiting the value of cash transactions . . . and requiring sellers in certain cases prove they actually own the metal . . . The amendment also makes it a Federal crime to steal metal from critical infrastructure and directs the U.S. Sentencing Commission to review relevant penalties.

This amendment respects State law. Our intention is not to preempt State laws, so if a State already has laws on the books regarding metal theft, they would not apply the Federal law.

I realize that the majority of cases will likely continue to be handled by State and local law authorities, but the Federal government needs to be a strong partner, and the Metal Theft Prevention Act will send the clear message that metal theft is a serious crime.

The Metal Theft Prevention Act has been endorsed by the National Rural Electrical Cooperatives, American Public Power Association, APPA, American Supply, Edison Electric Institute, National Electrical Contractors Association, National Association of Home Builders, National Retail Federation, U.S. Telecom Association, and about a dozen other businesses and organizations.

It also has the support of the major law enforcement organizations—Major Cities Police Chiefs, Major County Sheriffs, National Sheriffs, Fraternal Order of Police and the National Association of Police Organizations. I would love to just bring this bill to the Senate after I have gotten it through the committee already in Judiciary, unanimously, but there are people still holding it up.

The Metal Theft Prevention Act will not come to a vote in relation to the bill currently pending before the Senate, but it must be a priority. We need to do everything we can to protect our critical energy industry infrastructure from unscrupulous metal thieves. And,

I hope my colleagues will support the Metal Theft Prevention Act as well when it does come before the full Senate.

Again, I commend Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN on their legislation to encourage energy efficiency. The bill would save consumers and taxpayers money through reduced energy consumption, help create jobs, make our country more energy independent, and reduce harmful emissions.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 17, 2013.

Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR,
Senator JOHN HOEVEN,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS, We write to you on behalf of our organizations, to express our strong support for a bipartisan amendment (#1940) you have sponsored toward the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act (S.1392; sponsored by Senators Shaheen and Portman and supported by ENR Committee Chairman Wyden and Ranking Member Murkowski.

Amendment 1940 will create a pilot grants program in the Department of Energy to award limited, but impactful, matching grants to nonprofit organizations to make their buildings more energy efficient. It authorizes $10 million per year for the next 5 fiscal years (importantly the funding is fully offset by reallocating other DoE spending). The pilot program will provide grants of up to 50% of a nonprofit's building energy efficiency project, with a maximum grant of $200,000.

Such a program is much needed. According to the U.S. E.P.A., nonresidential buildings in the U.S. consume more than $200 billion annually in energy costs. The United States is also home to 4000 Boys & Girls Clubs, 2700 YMCAs, 2900 nonprofit hospitals and more than 17,000 museums. These buildings also account for a significant portion of annual greenhouse gas emissions. Many of the energy efficiency incentive or support programs that have been in place the past several years have been structured in the form of tax credits and rebates. Nonprofits—being tax exempt entities—have not been able to take advantage of these programs. Moreover, nonprofit entities are often least able to surmount the ''front end'' investment cost of efficiency retrofits.

The Klobuchar-Hoeven amendment, based upon S.717, received consideration in the Senate Energy Subcommittee earlier this year. It is good public policy that enjoys bipartisan support and the support of a broad coalition of nonprofit organizations. We urge you to support Amdt. 1940's inclusion in the Shaheen Portman legislation.

Thank you,

Association of American Museum Directors, The Baha'is of the United States, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Friends Cmte. on Nat'l Legislation (Quakers), Gen'l Conf. of Seventh Day Adventists, Jewish Federations of North America, National Council of Churches, Sojourners, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, YMCA of the U.S.A.

SEPTEMBER 12, 2013.

DEAR SENATOR: The YMCA of the USA is the national resource office for the 2,700 YMCAs in the U.S. The nation's YMCAs engage 21 million men, women and children—of all ages, incomes and backgrounds—with a focus on strengthening communities in youth development, healthy living, and social responsibility. YMCAs are led by volunteer boards and depend upon the dedication of their 550,000 volunteers for support and strategic guidance in meeting the needs of their communities.

We are writing to express our support for an amendment, #1856, sponsored by Senators Klobuchar and Hoeven, to the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, S. 1392.

The amendment creates a pilot grants program in the Department of Energy that awards limited, but important, matching grants to nonprofit organizations to make their buildings more energy efficient. It authorizes $10 million per year for the next five fiscal years and is fully offset by reallocating other DOE spending.

The U.S. EPA has found that nonresidential buildings consume more than $200 billion in energy costs. Many of the energy efficiency programs are structured as tax credits and rebates. Because nonprofits are tax exempt organizations they have not been able to take advantage of these programs. In addition, many nonprofits don't have the financial resources to invest in energy efficient retrofits. This amendment would help nonprofits significantly cut energy costs.

The Klobuchar-Hoeven amendment is sound public policy and has both bipartisan support and broad support among nonprofit organizations. Please support including this amendment in S. 1392, the Shaheen, Portman legislation.

Thank you,

NEAL DENTON,
Senior Vice President and Chief Government Affairs Officer, YMCA of the USA.

THE JEWISH FEDERATIONS OF NORTH AMERICA,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2013.

DEAR SENATOR: It is our understanding that the Senate will commence consideration this afternoon of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013 (S. 1392). In this regard, we wanted to share with you our strong support for Amendment Number 1856 filed by Senators Klobuchar and Hoeven.

This amendment would establish an energy efficiency pilot program for nonprofit institutions. The Jewish Federations of North America, one of North America's oldest, largest and longest-serving health and social services network supports this amendment for the following reasons:

—JFNA has a long history of public private partnerships and working with Congress to promote innovations and efficiencies in nonprofit human services delivery. As such, we endorse the Klobuchar-Hoeven amendment as a timely and necessary pilot program to assist nonprofits to become more energy efficient and environmentally responsible.

—JFNA is comprised of 153 Jewish Federations and 300 independent Jewish communities. Within our umbrella, we support and operate thousands of agencies (i.e., schools, community centers, hospitals, health centers, day care facilities, museums, and more) that serve millions of individuals and families within most major population centers across the country. Many of our institutions are several decades old—some were built more than a century ago. The need for these institutions to upgrade and retrofit antiquated and unreliable operating systems is great.

—As nonprofits, we know only too well the importance of creating energy efficiencies to our bottom line—to ensure that we maximize the use of philanthropic dollars to best serve the most vulnerable populations and to maintain healthy and vibrant communities across the country. We also know the power and opportunity that is created through congressionally-derived pilot projects. They help to shed needed light on issues of importance to the country. They help to galvanize support for needed public policy shifts. They help to bolster and promote positive change within the nonprofit sector. In this regard, Amendment Number 1856 would provide an important catalyst for energy improvements and modernization within the nonprofit sector.

Comprehensive energy efficiency reform cannot succeed without Congress also addressing the issues facing the nonprofit sector. With your support, Senate adoption of Klobuchar-Hoeven Amendment 1856 would be a needed bi-partisan improvement to S. 1392.

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. GOLDBERG,
Senior Director, Legislative Affairs.

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2013.

Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Senator JOHN HOEVEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KLOBUCHAR AND SENATOR HOEVEN: I write in support for your amendment (#1856) to the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act (S. 1392). This amendment reflects the policy of your bill, S. 717, The Nonprofit Energy Efficiency Act, which was endorsed by our Committee on Domestic Justice and Human Development.

As our committee chair noted back in June, this amendment would ''establish a pilot program at the U.S. Department of Energy to provide grants to non-profit organizations to help make the buildings they own and operate more energy efficient.''

I would like to thank both of you for championing innovation in energy policy and ask that your colleagues support your amendment.

Sincerely,

JAYD HENRICKS,
Executive Director.

ASSOCIATION OF ART MUSEUM DIRECTORS,
Washington, DC, September 13, 2013.

Hon. AMY KLOBUCHAR,
Hon. JOHN HOEVEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS KLOBUCHAR AND HOEVEN, On behalf of the Association of Art Museum Directors, its members and board of trustees, I write to express our strong support for the bipartisan amendment (#1856) that you have sponsored to the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act (S.1392), which would create a pilot grants program in the Department of Energy to award limited, but impactful, matching grants to nonprofit organizations to make their buildings more energy-efficient.

Many of the energy efficiency incentive or support programs that have been in place the past several years have been structured in the form of tax credits and rebates. As nonprofits we have not been able to take advantage of these programs. Your amendment would give museums, schools, houses of worship and other nonprofit institutions the opportunity to make our systems more energy-efficient and thereby allow us to reduce our energy costs. In our case, the cost savings will go into programs that museums offer to the public.

The grants program would be particularly useful to the museum field, because many of our institutions are in large buildings that are many decades old and were not designed to modern efficiency standards.

Thank you for your leadership on this important piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE ANAGNOS,
Executive Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH POLICY

Mr. BROWN. I thank the senior Senator from Minnesota for her words and especially work on this bill and the consumer issues. She has made a real name in this body for her work.

I rise today to discuss the most significant reform of our Nation's health policy in decades. The Affordable Care Act is a result of extensive policy discussions, late-night deliberations, 400 amendments that we considered in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pension Committee, more than 100 of those amendments that we adopted coming from Republican ideas and Republican Senators. There is a reason that people across the country, mothers and fathers and students and faith leaders and business owners and workers, are paying attention. It is because the law benefits all Americans, a wide range of Americans and especially in my home State, which I will discuss.

More than 900,000 people in Ohio will be eligible for financial assistance to buy insurance that provides good coverage at a price they can afford. Ohioans suffering from preexisting conditions will no longer be denied coverage or charged higher premiums. Young Ohioans stay on their parents' plan until the age of 26, giving them a chance to finish school and secure a job that provides coverage.

Those with the greatest need will get the greatest help. For years we have heard countless stories, story after story of Americans frustrated by and failed by our health system. Last fall my wife Connie was waiting in line at the local drugstore in an affluent community outside of Cleveland. The woman in front of her was, for all intents and purposes, negotiating price with the pharmacist to save money. ''What if I cut my pill in half and then take it twice a day,'' she asked. The very understanding pharmacist wanted her to take her full medication twice a day.

''But isn't it better, since I can't afford this, to take half a pill twice a day than the whole pill just once,'' she asked.

After the woman left my wife asked how often does this happen? The pharmacist answered, ''Every day, every day all day.''

The tide is turning. I hear from constituents at roundtables, in restaurants, in letters and tweets and e-mails about their concerns for their family's health. A woman in Cuyahoga Falls, a community near Akron, explained to me she recently graduated law school. She is a type 1 diabetic. Without the health care law she would have been paying out of pocket for extremely costly lifesaving medication because she could not afford it on her own.

I can imagine, she said, there are many Ohioans like me, working hard for my future but finding myself in a tough demanding spot while still needing to care for my health needs. Health care enrollment marks a milestone for millions of Ohioans, including myself. Twenty years ago I was running for Congress and made a promise in 1992 that I would not accept congressional health care; I would pay my own health insurance, until similar coverage was available to all Americans. I did that for well over a decade. I can now say I will be enrolling in the health care marketplace, alongside hundreds of thousands of people from Ohio. While millions will be able to enroll in benefits beginning in less than 2 weeks, the health care law has already provided measurable benefits.

I wish to share how Ohioans are already helped by provisions in this law signed by the President 3 years ago. There are 97,000 young adults who are now able to stay on their parents' health insurance until their 26th birthday. We are closing the doughnut hole. The Senator from Pennsylvania mentioned what that means for his State. There are similar numbers in Ohio. Closing the doughnut hole for seniors' prescription drugs saves Ohioans an average of $774 a year on medication benefits.

There are 6,300 Ohioans who receive rebates from their insurance companies because those companies failed to follow the new Federal law that required them to spend at least 80 to 85 percent—depending on the kind of insurance—of their premium dollars on health care. In other words, if these companies spend more than 15 percent of your dollar that you pay to these insurance companies on marketing, executive salaries, and various kinds of administrative expenses, they owe you money back because not a high enough percent—85 percent—of your health care dollar was spent on health care itself.

There are 900,000 Ohioans who have received free preventive care, with no copays and no deductibles. Seniors have been tested for osteoporosis, diabetes, and all the other kinds of screenings that seniors should get.

Children are no longer denied coverage for preexisting conditions. My wife was diagnosed with asthma at a young age—way before I knew her. She might have been denied coverage today. She, and young people like her at that stage in their life, cannot be denied coverage for preexisting conditions such as asthma, diabetes, cancer or whatever they might have.

Soon all Ohioans will have access to quality, affordable health care. In 2014, we will see all aspects of this health care law fully implemented, which will make a huge difference for business—especially small businesses—families, and communities.

From Ashtabula to Athens, from Bryan to Bellaire, from Mansfield to Middletown, middle-class families across Ohio have been in the horrible position of paying monthly premiums only to find they were stripped of coverage or that the coverage was so minimal as to be useless when they became sick. That worry will no longer exist.

For students at Ohio State or Wooster, Youngstown State or Xavier, the choice between paying for another semester at school or health insurance will not be the concern it has been for so many years. For Ohioans from Cleveland to Cincinnati already covered, they can keep their current plan without lifting a finger. The only change they will see are new benefits, better protections, and more bang for their buck. For millions in my State, the new law will mean less worry, less anxiety, and more money in their wallets.

For some Americans, the health insurance marketplace will lower premiums at least 10 percent more than previously expected. Work needs to be done. The system is not perfect, but this law is already bringing our health care into the future. It is a forward-looking law. I have been proud to support it.

On October 1, frustrations, worry, and failed health care protections will soon become a thing of the past for millions in my State and tens of millions around the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes in support of the bill currently before the Senate, S. 1392, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013.

It has taken a long time for this bipartisan legislation to make it to the floor of the Senate, and I commend Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, as well as Senators WYDEN and MURKOWSKI, and all of their staffs for their hard work.

Energy efficiency doesn't grab headlines in the same way as fracking or nuclear reactors or even renewable energy policies for wind and solar, but this bill is good, solid policy that will shrink energy bills for families and businesses. It is exactly the kind of legislation the Senate should be working on, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

This bill strengthens and updates the voluntary building codes States and tribes can adopt in order to determine and meet targets for energy efficiency and continues to strengthen the Federal Government's efforts to reduce energy use.

As the Nation's largest energy consumer, the Federal Government can play a significant role in helping to provide a market for innovation in energy-efficient technologies and in turn

reduce our Nation's CO_2 emissions while also saving taxpayers money. This is the kind of policy everyone should be able to agree to. The bill also provides resources to train workers on energy-efficient building design and operation, a crucial component of making sure advances in energy efficiency translate into real, well-paying jobs. In addition, the bill provides incentives for more energy-efficient manufacturing and the development and deployment of new technologies.

Finally, the bill would establish a Supply Star Program which will help provide support to companies looking to improve the efficiency of their supply chains. This program could be particularly helpful to Hawaii, where transportation of goods from the mainland and other places can be very costly.

While individually these provisions may sound like modest proposals or changes, when taken together, the policies in this bill make significant progress toward reducing energy costs. That is good for consumers and businesses, driving innovation, reducing environmental harm, and positioning the United States as a leader in clean energy technology and jobs.

It goes without saying that the cost of energy is an important consideration for families and businesses across our country. When energy costs go up, they can be a drag on the economy. We see this very clearly in Hawaii, where we are uniquely impacted by the price of oil.

In 2011, Hawaii's energy expenditures totaled $7.6 billion—almost equal to 11 percent of our entire State economy. In addition, no other State uses oil to generate electricity to the extent we do in Hawaii. As a result, we have electricity prices that average 34 cents per kilowatt hour. That is over three times the price on the mainland.

Moreover, 96 percent of the money we spend on energy leaves our islands to buy oil from places outside of Hawaii. That is money that could be better used to create jobs, bolster paychecks or to make investments in Hawaii's future.

Obviously, our State's energy security and economic potential is severely undermined by a reliance on fossil fuels. While breaking that reliance is a challenge, it is also an opportunity. Hawaii has set some of the Nation's most aggressive goals for generating renewable energy and improving energy efficiency. We are working to show that renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies are not just good for the environment, they can be an engine for economic growth and innovation. That is what makes the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act such an important bill. At its core, this legislation is about updating Federal energy efficiency policies to better meet the needs of today's marketplace.

For example, updating voluntary building codes will give States and tribes the opportunity to reduce their energy use while also giving the private sector signals that there will be demand for innovation. The use of energy savings performance contracts is an example. Energy savings performance contracts are private agreements that make energy and water efficiency retrofits more affordable. A third-party company covers the cost of the upgrade, and it is repaid over time from the resulting savings in energy costs.

Thanks to the State of Hawaii's commitment to improving energy efficiency, Hawaii is the Nation's No. 1 user of energy savings performance contracts. In fact, just a few weeks ago the State of Hawaii was awarded the Energy Services Coalition's Race to the Top Award which recognizes the State's commitment to pursuing energy savings through performance contracting. This is the second year in a row that Hawaii has won this award.

These are the types of innovative financing models and partnerships that can happen when there is clear, sustained demand for improving energy efficiency.

Another aspect to keep in mind is that even something as unglamorous sounding as improving building codes or advancing energy-efficient construction techniques can have a profound impact on the lives of families across the country.

In 2011, Hawaii's first net-zero affordable housing community of Kaupuni Village opened on Oahu. The 19 single-family homes and community center at Kaupuni Village were constructed to maximize energy efficiency and use renewables to achieve net-zero energy performance. The development has earned a LEED Platinum status. Each home in the community was designed with optimal building envelope design, high-efficiency lighting, natural ventilation, solar water heating, and ENERGY STAR appliances.

Kaupuni Village also provides affordable homes to Native Hawaiians—a population that has faced many challenges in achieving independence, home ownership, and economic success. These homes were completed at an average cost of less than half the median sales price of homes on Oahu, which are some of the Nation's highest home costs.

Thanks to technical assistance from the National Renewable Energy Lab, or NREL, this partisanship between the Department of Hawaiian Homelands, Hawaiian Electric Company, the State of Hawaii, and private and Federal partners is a model for other communities.

Homeowners in Kaupuni Village are able to conserve energy and save money by optimizing their high-tech homes while also maintaining a lifestyle firmly rooted in traditions that go back thousands of years.

Homeowner Keala Young described her new life at Kaupuni Village by saying:

> We grow our own vegetables. We raise our own fresh-water tilapia.
>
> We are passionate about net-zero living. There is so much pride in our home and our community. We feel we can be an example to others.

These are the types of stories I imagine every Member of the Senate wants to tell in order to help bring about stories of strong communities, happy, vibrant families, and new opportunities that create a bright future.

The Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act is bipartisan legislation that can help to make those stories real for more people in Hawaii and across the country.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

I yield the floor 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.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MCC COMPACT FOR EL SALVADOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on September 12 I made a statement in this Chamber about the vote earlier that day by the board of directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation to approve a second compact for El Salvador.

As I said then, that vote was expected, and it began the final phase of discussions between the United States and El Salvador on a compact which, if funded, could result in investments totaling $277 million from the United States and $85 million from El Salvador.

I share the view of the MCC board that the compact, if implemented fully, would improve the lives of the Salvadoran people, but I also noted that when the MCC was established a decade ago it was not intended to be just another foreign aid program. Rather, an MCC compact provides a kind of stamp of approval by the United States indicating that the government of the compact country has demonstrated a commitment to integrity, to good governance and respect for the rule of law, and to addressing the needs of its people. I said this should be doubly so for a second compact.

While El Salvador can point to some success in these areas, it remains a country of weak democratic institutions where the independence of the judiciary has been attacked, corruption

is widespread, and transnational criminal organizations and money laundering have flourished. Nobody knows this better than the Salvadoran people.

I urged the MCC, the Department of State, and the Government of El Salvador, prior to a final decision to provide the funds for a second compact, to do more to address these problems which is necessary for the rule of law and economic growth in that country. Regrettably, rather than acknowledge the need to address these problems more convincingly, the reaction of top Salvadoran officials was to accuse me of being ''misinformed'' about their country and of meddling in their affairs. They reacted similarly when U.S. Ambassador Aponte expressed some of the same concerns.

For over 20 years, I have been a friend of El Salvador. I actively supported the negotiations that ended the civil war. I worked to help El Salvador recover from that war, and I supported the first MCC compact which was financed with $461 million from the Appropriations subcommittee that I chair. I obtained emergency funding to help that country rebuild after devastating floods. And over the past decade I have watched as the Salvadoran people were victimized by increasing levels of crime and violence, a corrupt police force, and some individuals in positions of authority who cared more about enriching themselves or protecting their privileges than improving the lives of the people. So it is disappointing that Salvadoran officials reacted as they did to my remarks last week.

As I said then, I appreciate that MCC CEO Yohannes, U.S. Ambassador Aponte, and other State Department officials have echoed some of the concerns I have raised.

The budget of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, which I have long supported, and the funds for a second compact for El Salvador—for those who may not be aware or have forgotten—comes from the Congress. It should not be taken for granted.

I hope President Funes and his government will reconsider their response to these concerns—for the good of the Salvadoran people and if they want a second MCC compact to be funded.

REMEMBERING BRIGADIER GENERAL DOUGLAS KINNARD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to retired BG Douglas Kinnard, a former University of Vermont professor and retired general officer who passed away on July 29 of this year at the age of 91.

Long before I came to know General Kinnard, he had built a reputation as a wise and thoughtful soldier. Respected for his leadership and integrity on and off the battlefield, he honorably served our country in three wars, including two tours in Vietnam, despite his misgivings about American strategy and involvement in the conflict. Having graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point on D-day during World War II, Douglas Kinnard rose to the rank of brigadier general before retiring from the Army to pursue his doctor of philosophy at Princeton University.

It is no surprise given his intellect and objectivity that when he went searching for his first faculty job, he found a home at the University of Vermont. Those who have worked with General Kinnard have praised him as an imposing figure that was ''always open and fair'' and an ''enjoyable colleague'' who taught his students about real patriotism from his own experience.

I am grateful that the University of Vermont was able to benefit from the many gifts General Kinnard brought with him to his work in Burlington and throughout the country. Marcelle and I send our condolences to his wife Wade and son Frederick. I will miss his steady counsel, which he provided me throughout my Senate career. The many soldiers, students, and colleagues who were fortunate to have known him throughout his long and industrious life will not soon forget his impact.

The Burlington Free Press recently paid tribute to General Kinnard and his many contributions. I ask unanimous consent that a recent Free Press article entitled ''Remembering UVM prof., ex-Army general Douglas Kinnard'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, Aug. 7, 2013]

THE TWO ACCOMPLISHED CAREERS OF DOUGLAS KINNARD, 1921–2013

(By Tim Johnson)

In 1977, midway through his faculty career at the University of Vermont, ex-Army man Douglas Kinnard was invited to appear on ''Good Morning America'' to talk about the Vietnam War with his former commanding officer, William Westmoreland.

The appearance preceded the publication of Kinnard's book, ''The War Managers,'' which drew on a detailed survey Kinnard had sent to all the American generals in Vietnam in 1974, a year before U.S. forces finally withdrew. The survey revealed, among other things, that about 70 percent of the generals thought the war's objectives were unclear, and that more than half thought the war shouldn't have been fought with American troops.

Mark Stoler, a UVM historian who knew Kinnard, recalls watching the show and thinking that Westmoreland looked uncomfortable while Kinnard remained unruffled. ''He just sat there, smiling,'' said Stoler, who recalled that Kinnard had ''an incredibly sharp mind'' and was eminently clearheaded about that controversial episode in American military history.

Kinnard, who died of pneumonia last week in Pennsylvania at age 91, spent about a decade in UVM's Political Science Department during the 70s and 80s, in what for him was a second career following 26 years as an Army officer and service in three wars. He won the respect of his UVM peers partly because of his intellect: He did, after all, complete his Ph.D. work at Princeton in just three years, following his retirement in 1970 as a brigadier general.

''Very capable, very serious,'' said Garrison Nelson, professor of political science. ''A remarkably well-organized guy. A good teacher and a relatively high grader, as I recall. I have very fond memories of Doug.''

Kinnard was also prolific. His first book on President Eisenhower, an adaptation of his doctoral thesis, was also published in 1977. ''The Secretary of Defense'' also came out during his UVM tenure, in 1980, and he wrote about Vietnam again later in ''The Certain Trumpet: Maxwell Taylor and the American Experience in Vietnam.''

Among Kinnard's eight books were two memoirs, the first of which details his life's remarkably humble beginnings. ''Abandoned'' by a broken family at age 4 and placed in an orphanage in Paterson, N.J., he was moved into a boarding house after several months and raised by an extended Catholic family.

''He had to take care of himself,'' said his son, Frederick Kinnard, in a phone interview. ''He was an adult before age 5. He lived with an old Irish spinster above a saloon.''

Kinnard made his way through Paterson's St. Joseph Grammar School and Eastside High, became an Eagle Scout, and eventually won an appointment to West Point. He didn't aspire to be a soldier, he told an interviewer in 1977, but chose West Point partly because it was close to home.

''It was a good way to go to college,'' he said. ''I really wasn't thinking about a military career.'' The Army became his career, however, with a series of promotions. He graduated on June 6, 1944—D Day—and was dispatched to Europe where, as an artillery lieutenant and forward observer, he was awarded the Bronze Star for Heroic Achievement. During the Korean War, he served in an artillery unit, and later was assigned to the Pentagon and to NATO headquarters in France.

Kinnard did two tours in Vietnam. The first, beginning in 1966, was as chief of operations analysis under Gen. Westmoreland. When he returned to the United States he was promoted to brigadier general, but he was having doubts about the war and mulling a career in academia. Of the war, he told an interviewer for the Princeton Independent in 2004:

''The more I dealt with [the war and U.S. strategy], the more skeptical I became, especially about the assumption underpinning [General] Westmoreland's and American strategy: that if we punished the enemy enough, he would negotiate an end favorable to us. I was convinced that we really did not understand the enemy or his motivations, or even his strategy. The premise that our punishment would bring us victory was to build a strategy on a house of cards.''

Kinnard wanted to retire but the Army refused and sent him to Vietnam again, in 1969, this time commanding artillerymen. The Independent interviewer asked him how he felt about being sent back to Vietnam, given his doubts about the war.

''You must understand that I had already applied for retirement, and that was turned down,'' he said. ''So when the decision was made that I would definitely go back, then I had to concern myself with my job and not worry about my personal feelings. As Commanding General of Force Artillery, I commanded eight thousand troops in sixty firebases from the Cambodian border to the South China Sea. I had to visit those people daily and get involved in the planning, so I had to toss my personal feelings—gone! Nothing can stand in the way of the welfare of your troops. Your job is to defeat the enemy; your job is to take care of your

troops and keep your casualties down. And that's what I did.''

Later in that tour he served as chief of staff of the Second Field Force and aided in planning of the Cambodian incursion of 1970, which incited fierce protests in the United States. The U.S. bombing of Cambodia that had preceded that operation was unknown to him, he said, as it was to the American public.

After he returned home he retired and headed to Princeton as a 48-year-old graduate student. He didn't conceal his military background but didn't advertise it either. When he started looking for a faculty job, he impressed his interviewers at the University of Vermont.

''He was an imposing presence,'' said Stoler, who shared with Kinnard a scholarly interest in military history.

''I remember Professor Kinnard as a very professional and enjoyable colleague,'' said Frank Bryan, who retired from UVM recently as a political science professor. ''Our areas of expertise were different, of course, but I can say he was a very good 'department citizen'—always open and fair and collegial.''

Nancy Viens was Kinnard's secretary at UVM for two years. She typed ''The War Managers'' for him.

In the beginning, she said, ''I was very intimidated about working for a 6-foot general from the Army. I'd signed (anti-war) protest petitions and all that.''

He surprised her, though, telling her, ''I'm not your average run-of-the-mill general.''

''He turned out to be one of the nicest people I've ever known,'' she said, adding that he kept in touch with her for years after they both left UVM. Of the Vietnam War debates, she said, ''He had sympathy for both sides. He did his job as a general and then he got out.''

In the Independent interview, Kinnard was asked what he taught UVM students about the Vietnam War.

''I taught them that it was a war that should not have been fought,'' he said. ''It should not have gone past the advisory effort. I traced for them all the presidential decisions that were made, going from Truman all the way up through Nixon, and showed how each one led to another. But those decisions were made at political levels; the generals had no part in them.''

He acknowledged that patriotism could take many forms, and that the war opponents had done the country ''a great service.''

Following their joint appearance on ''Good Morning America,'' Kinnard told the Independent interviewer, Westmoreland gave him a ride to Laguardia Airport, and Kinnard gave Westmoreland a copy of his book.

''Well, God, he called me for a whole week, asking, 'Who said this?' and 'Who said that?'" Kinnard recalled. ''I said, I can't tell you that, General Westmoreland,' because I had promised the respondents anonymity. I went away to Maine for a week, and the book arrived in the mail with his notes written on damn near every page.''

After Kinnard left UVM, he continued lecturing and writing, holding positions at the University of Oklahoma, Naval War College, National Defense University and University of Richmond. In 1994, President Clinton appointed him to the American Battle Monuments Commission and he helped plan the World War II memorial on the National Mall.

''He wasn't a retiring type,'' Frederick Kinnard said.

''Doug Kinnard had the wonderful facility of being highly knowledgeable and impeccably honest,'' said Sen. Patrick Leahy, D–Vt., in an email. ''I've relied on his good judgment for years. Marcelle and I were sorry to learn of his passing and send condolences to his family.'' Besides his son, Douglas Kinnard is survived by his wife, Wade Tyree Kinnard. He will be buried at West Point Aug. 15.

GRAMEEN BANK

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to speak about troubling actions by the Government of Bangladesh against the Grameen Bank.

Founded in 1983 by Professor Mohammed Yunus, the Grameen Bank has been a model of the immense potential of microfinance for economic development. By providing small loans to the world's poorest people who possess the skills but not the financing needed to start a small business, microcredit institutions have shown to be successful in promoting the most effective means of poverty reduction, the empowerment of women. The Grameen Bank, about which volumes have been written, has been a leading example of these successful borrower-owned banks, and the model has spread from Bangladesh throughout Southeast Asia and beyond.

The proposal of the Government of Bangladesh to dissolve the Grameen Bank into 19 separate entities would curtail one of the best mechanisms for reducing poverty in Bangladesh. This radical restructuring would fragment Grameeen's governance structure, essentially rendering it powerless. It would move ownership of the bank from the people with a vested interest in its success to an assortment of agencies with no legal relationships with the public.

The force behind the efforts to weaken the Grameen Bank is none other than Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina, who has clashed with Professor Yunus since the latter won the Nobel Peace Prize in 2006 and expressed interest in running for public office himself. Threatened by Professor Yunus' popularity, the Prime Minister has tried for years to undermine his authority and influence.

The Grameen Bank has been targeted by the government-created Grameen Bank Commission, and Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina was instrumental in Yunus' removal from his position as Grameen's managing director through an age mandated retirement although no such mandate exists for the country's private banks. Most recently, the government has accused several microcredit companies founded by Professor Yunus of failing to pay taxes, which he has denied as baseless. The Prime Minister's vendetta against Professor Yunus seems to have no limit.

I want to echo the sentiments of my friend Senator DURBIN who has spoken about this, as well as 17 Senators, who sent a letter to Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina last year. I join them and leaders of goodwill around the world in supporting the Grameen Bank and Professor Yunus. They have been bright spots in one of the world's poorest countries whose own nationalized banks are failing.

Millions of Bangladesh's poorest people, particularly women, need access to the credit the Grameen Bank provides. Rather than continue to persecute Professor Yunus, the Prime Minister and her government should learn from his example and redirect their efforts to helping improve the lives of the people they have a responsibility to serve.

TRIBUTE TO THE LYNN FAMILY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate a notable family whose work has made a unique and meaningful contribution to the Vermont newspaper community and to our State. The Lynn family runs several Vermont newspapers, reporting local news and serving general commerce in these communities.

In 1984, Angelo Lynn bought the Addison County Independent, marking the beginning of a family newspaper operation based out of Middlebury, VT. Today, Angelo's three daughters have joined a five-generation newspaper tradition, each taking on a different Vermont town newspaper. With Elsie running the Colchester Sun and the Essex Reporter, Polly running the Mountain Times in Killington, and Christy working side by side with her father overseeing the advertising sales team of the Addison County Independent, the Lynn family reports stories Vermonters depend on.

While some of the biggest newspapers struggle, local papers are thriving, and the Lynn family has embraced the opportunity to influence the future of the newspaper industry. Focusing on local government, events, schools, sports and businesses, the Addison County Independent is a vital piece of the community it serves. It is personal and caring, and it reflects what matters to the residents of the community.

I congratulate Angelo Lynn on the success of his family-run newspaper operation. Mr. Lynn, his daughters, and his brother Emerson have harnessed local newspapers to strengthen our Vermont communities. I have included the New York Times article ''Vermont Sisters with Roots in News Embrace Small-Town Papers'' that covers each Lynn family member's individual story. I ask that the text of this article, dated August 15, 2013, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERMONT SISTERS WITH ROOTS IN NEWS EMBRACE SMALL-TOWN PAPERS

(By Christine Haughney)

MIDDLEBURY, VT.—King Lear's three daughters had their lands and loyalties to fight over. Jane Austen's Dashwood sisters had the prospect of marriage to occupy them, and Anton Chekhov's three sisters had local military officers to brighten their days.

None of them ever contemplated a future as risky as newspapers.

For a long time, neither did the Lynn sisters, even though they are a fifth-generation newspaper family. Polly, Christy and Elsie

Lynn left behind their father's dusty but cozy newsrooms for college and careers.

Now they are back. Elsie, 26, moved home in 2010 after she ran out of money while working and traveling through Asia. She manages two of her father's weeklies in the Burlington suburbs of Colchester and Essex.

Polly, 29, returned in 2011 from Denver, and has thrown herself into running the weekly newspaper in Killington, the popular ski town. Christy, 28, moved back in June after her boyfriend finished graduate school in Vancouver. She helps her father, Angelo, running the business side of Middlebury's paper, The Addison County Independent.

It is conventional wisdom that newspapers are a fading enterprise. Last month, the Tribune Company bought 19 local television stations even as it sought to sell its portfolio of papers, and twice in August, big-city papers changed hands: The New York Times sold The Boston Globe and other properties for $70 million, after paying $1.1 billion for The Globe 20 years ago, and the Graham family said it would sell The Washington Post after eight decades of ownership.

But instead of fleeing the newspaper business, the Lynn sisters have embraced it, and not just because it is part of their heritage.

''I've grown up in the papers,'' said Elsie Lynn. ''But I don't think that's the reason I'm in it. The future is exciting for me. We have this chance and this opportunity to be pioneers and change our career and change this industry.''

The papers the Lynn sisters help run have been surprisingly profitable. They have not faced bankruptcy like newspapers of the Tribune Company including The Los Angeles Times and haven't cut coverage like The Times-Picayune of New Orleans. In these parts of Vermont, where Internet connections are less reliable and winter snowstorms can block roads for days, readers often prefer print.

Mr. Lynn said that he had run his newspapers debt-free for a decade. While his papers aren't making money yet from their digital efforts, his newspaper and phone book businesses generate about $4.5 million in gross revenue.

''We can't afford not to make money,'' Mr. Lynn said as he sat in his office here surrounded by photographs of his daughters, the family dogs dozing loudly nearby. ''There's no future losing money in any of these papers.''

It helps that Mr. Lynn has a long history in the business. His great-grandfather, Charles Scott, bought The Iola Register in Kansas in 1882. Mr. Lynn was raised upstairs from the offices of another nearby Kansas paper called The Humboldt Union. In 1984, Angelo Lynn bought The Addison County Independent in Vermont and started building up his chain of papers. Mr. Lynn's older brother, Emerson, owns two papers with his wife, Suzanne, and Angelo as well as two other Vermont papers.

Angelo Lynn speaks fondly of the newspaper life. He spends his weekends hiking and skiing with his daughters and weekdays churning out enterprising local journalism.

''Once you become part of a community, you see the good that a paper does,'' Mr. Lynn said. ''That's very fulfilling.'' His daughters' newspaper futures were less certain. When Elsie Lynn arrived at the newsroom of The Colchester Sun and The Essex Reporter, she had never studied journalism or held a journalism job. She wasn't convinced she wanted to work with her father and uncle.

''I've said, 'Man, I don't know, Dad, if this is what I want to do,' '' she said as she sat in her threadbare newspaper office in a converted stable space on the outskirts of Colchester. ''He said 'No pressure.' ''

She settled in, typing up wedding announcements, but before long her father asked her to review the papers' finances. Elsie discovered they were owed $120,000 from advertisers. In three months, she collected $90,000. She also saved her father labor costs by absorbing multiple job titles. Elsie said she often logged 13-hour days writing and editing stories and promoting them on social media.

Polly Lynn was living in Colorado working for an educational tour company with her partner, Jason Mikula, when her father received an offer to buy The Mountain Times in Killington. Mr. Lynn asked the couple, who were already thinking of moving, to come to Vermont to run it. The couple took over in September 2011 just as Hurricane Irene hit and Killington was hit with some of the storm's worst flooding. She produced the first editions from her father's dining room table.

Since then, Polly said, she has kept a nonstop schedule of publishing deadlines and has designed a hyper-local news app for Killington. She spends evenings attending town planning meetings and winters skiing with sources and advertisers.

There has already been a payoff. Polly and Mr. Mikula increased the paper's revenue by 15 percent, or about $100,000, by improving editorial content and strengthening its advertising relationships, according to Mr. Lynn.

Mike Miller, a Killington business owner and former selectman, said local businesses appreciated the couple's forthright approach: when they made early mistakes on advertisements, they admitted they were wrong, fixed them and even offered to make more creative advertisements. They also appreciate the couple's efforts to participate in the community.

''I'm just amazed at their energy,'' Mr. Miller said. ''If there's something that there are going to be more than 10 people there, they cover it.''

In some ways, Christy Lynn had the toughest transition. While her sisters work at papers an hour's drive from their father, she works steps away from him. Her father focuses on editorial content, and she oversees the advertising sales team and comes up with new promotions.

She has accomplished some small coups. She realized that the Waterfalls Day Spa in Middlebury was promoting itself on social media but did not advertise much in the paper. So she persuaded the owners to advertise more in both the paper and online. Mr. Lynn said that advertising revenue grew 6 percent in this year's first quarter under Christy's watch.

Gary Greene, a newspaper sales broker, said successful community newspapers shared specific traits. Unlike larger newspapers, local community papers have little debt and don't depend heavily on classified advertising. They hire enough employees to report on town meetings and sports events and publish material people can't find elsewhere. They are in county seats, where they receive legal notices and advertisements from local businesses.

Mr. Greene, who sits on the boards of small newspaper chains nationwide and sees their financial statements, says those qualities are critical to profitability.

''These papers have all made money through the downturn,'' Mr. Greene said. ''What other business categories are doing 15 to 20 percent margins? Most businesses would love to make that kind of money.''

For now, newspaper analysts say these papers' futures remain promising as long as they remain the sole information source. Alan D. Mutter, a newspaper consultant who writes the Reflections of a Newsosaur blog, said that there was still value in information like school lunch menus and high school sports scores.

''Weeklies in healthy communities that do a good job reporting on local news and serving local businesses are by far the healthiest of publications,'' he said.

''The Messenger has been in business for 150 years,'' said Emerson Lynn, referring to one of his Vermont papers, The St. Albans Messenger. ''Do I think Google is going to be in existence for 150 years? Not a chance.''

It's unclear how long the Lynn sisters will work in newspapers. While Mr. Lynn has made no succession plans, he also doesn't want to sell. While some of the nation's largest papers are being sold for a small fraction of their purchase price, the market for smaller community papers is healthier. Mr. GREENe, the newspaper broker, said that this year his company closed eight deals with 23 publications, nearly double the sales volume in 2011 and 2012. And the resale value of smaller newspapers—the deals worth less than $20 million—is higher than that of bigger papers and chains.

It also helps that the Lynn family seems committed to the business. In March, Angelo and his wife, Lisa Gosselin, invited his brood and their partners and dogs for dinner at his home, a renovated camp building on Lake Dunmore. Dinner conversation revolved around food, skiing and newspapers. Polly warned her father to expect calls of complaint about a forthcoming article.

None of them talked about how long they would remain in the business. But long after they finished their dessert of poached pears and blueberry pie, they lingered at the table to chat. Before they left, Elsie remembered that The Colchester Sun was sponsoring a cold-water dive into Lake Champlain.

''Who is going to jump in the lake with me?'' she asked.

There was a flurry of reporterlike questions: ''How cold is the water? When is it?''

But one by one, they all agreed to take the plunge.

TRIBUTE TO JIMMY ROSE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a Kentuckian who has become a hero to many in my home state and across the country for his honest and moving portrayal of life in southeastern Kentucky. I am speaking of Jimmy Rose, the man from Pineville who has risen to fame this summer for his appearances on the television show ''America's Got Talent'' and his performance of the hit song ''Coal Keeps the Lights On.''

Last night, millions of Americans tuned in to see Jimmy's performance in the final round of the competition, held in New York City. I know I speak for thousands of Kentuckians when I say that no matter what the outcome tonight, he is truly a winner in our hearts, and his original song is a winner with people all over.

Jimmy is a U.S. Marine Corps veteran who learned how to play guitar from a fellow marine while deployed in Iraq. He has worked as a coal miner and he himself wrote the song ''Coal Keeps the Lights On'' to raise awareness about how excessive regulations are hurting jobs in his hometown and in the coal industry.

Coal is part of a vital energy sector in the State of Kentucky. But Jimmy

is tired of seeing coal mining jobs disappear from Pineville, from his native Bell County, and from the region. I agree with him, 100 percent.

From Jimmy's first appearance on ''America's Got Talent'' earlier this summer, he became a phenomenon. People could identify with the words he sang, and they could identify with his courteous disposition and steadfast character as the trademarks of the people of southeastern Kentucky. Fans across the country have happily supported, voted for, and sung along with Jimmy Rose.

I commend Jimmy Rose for putting a face on a problem that is all too often overlooked by some in Washington—the plight of the coal miner and the many hard-working Kentuckians whose jobs are related to the coal industry. In these difficult economic times, we should be doing everything we can to protect these jobs and protect a way of life for thousands of families.

I think Jimmy's message is an important one. And I want to congratulate Jimmy Rose for all his success to date. I am certain that we will be hearing much more from him in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADMIRAL MARK D. GUADAGNINI

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I honor a superb leader, aviator, and American. After more than 33 years of service to a grateful nation, RADM Mark D. Guadagnini is retiring from the United States Navy and his position as the Director of U.S. Fleet Forces Command's Maritime Headquarters. On this occasion, I believe it is fitting to recognize Rear Admiral Guadagnini's years of distinguished service and dedication to fostering the relationship between the military and this Chamber.

Rear Admiral Guadagnini is a 1980 distinguished graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy. Over the course of his career, he participated in six combat Operations, including Desert Storm, Provide Comfort, Deliberate Force, Southern Watch, Enduring Freedom, and Iraqi Freedom, accumulating almost 5000 hours of flight time and accomplishing nearly 100 combat missions. He has led at the highest levels of operational aviation command at Strike Fighter Attack Squadron 15, Carrier Air Wing 17, and Carrier Strike Group NINE.

In addition to his impressive accomplishments at sea, he was also one of our most well-rounded officers, serving as a test pilot, flag aide, fleet staff officer, manpower distribution officer, a Capitol Hill liaison, and, not coincidentally, as one of my first and best legislative fellows 20 years ago. While in the flag ranks, Rear Admiral Guadagnini leveraged his expertise serving as the chief of Naval Air Training; head of Human Resouces for the Naval Aviation Enterprise; Deputy Commander for Fleet Management at U.S. Fleet Forces Command, and lastly, as the director of Maritime Headquarters at U.S. Fleet Forces Command.

I could not be prouder of the accomplishments that ''Guad'' has earned while wearing the uniform of the world's greatest fighting force. His impact, particularly in the aviation community, will continue well into the future and our navy and nation will feel his absence. I wish him and his whole family ''fair winds and following seas.''

TRIBUTE TO DR. MILTON RUSH

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the distinguished teacher and agricultural scientist, Dr. Milton C. Rush. Dr. Rush devoted his career to his students, his research, and his tireless efforts to protect and enhance one of our most important sources of nutrition.

Dr. Rush began his career in rice pathologies in 1970 as a professor at Louisiana State University after receiving a doctor of philosophy degree in plant pathology from North Carolina State University. For the next 40 years at Louisiana State University, Dr. Rush has provided the agricultural community with invaluable research on rice pathology that has greatly benefited farmers throughout the State of Louisiana and the Nation. Under his leadership, the LSU rice program experienced its greatest years of agricultural research expansion and development. Through his years of service as an educator and pathologist, Dr. Rush created enduring changes in a wide breadth of research and direction to impact and improve the lives of countless students, rice growers and consumers within and throughout his community.

Perhaps Dr. Rush's greatest accomplishment came in his development of a new rice variety, which he named after his beloved wife, Blanca Isabel. This new high-yielding, early harvest, long-grain rice variety was the culmination of decades of research focusing on the epidemiology and control of rice diseases, rice tissue transformation, and the breeding of disease-resistant rice strains. This new purple rice is bred in Louisiana and contains anti-inflammatory and anti-oxidant properties. His outstanding development of a more healthful and nutritious variety of rice will continue to provide unparalleled benefits to the citizens and communities of Louisiana and the Nation, delivering an improved alternative for generations to come.

Dr. Rush has been honored frequently during his distinguished career. Among these honors are the Florence Avalon Daggett Professorship in Rice Pathology, the LSU AgCenter's Distinguished Service Award, the Sedberry Award for outstanding graduate professorship, memberships to the American Phytopathological Society, the Rice Technical Working Group, the Germplasm Advisory Committee, and two terms as president of the Louisiana Plant Protection Association Constitution Committee. Dr. Rush's career leaves a legacy of accomplishment and dedication to his family and all those who are a part of the agricultural communities that his tireless work impacted.

Dr. Rush has been and continues to be an inspiration to all those who have benefited from his decades of service to the field of rice pathology. It is with my heartfelt and greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me along with Dr. Rush's family in recognizing the life and many accomplishments of this incredible mentor, professor, and agricultural scientist, as well as his lasting impact throughout the Nation.

AIR FORCE 66TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today—September 18—marks the Air Force's 66th birthday. For 66 years, our Nation has entrusted the Air Force with preserving peace and freedom, and defending our democracy. Since its beginnings on July 26, 1947, when President Harry Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947 on board the presidential aircraft, the Sacred Cow, and set the creation of the United States Air Force in motion, to its instrumental role in the wars of Iraq and Afghanistan, the Air Force has always served America admirably and I have every confidence that it will continue in this proud tradition.

The Air Force tracks its origins back to 1907, when the Wright Brothers conducted the world's first airplane flight over the sands of Kitty Hawk, NC. Just like the Wright Brothers whose innovation spurred aviation, the vast success and numerous achievements of the Air Force would not be possible without the talented Airmen who fuel innovation today, enabling the Air Force to fly faster, further, and utilize technology that the Wright Brothers could not have imagined over 100 year ago.

Today, the United States Air Force is the largest, most capable, and most technologically advanced air force in the world, with about 5,300 manned aircraft in service, 246 Unmanned Combat Air Vehicles, and 450 intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Air Force prides itself on five core missions; Air and Space Superiority; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance; Rapid Global Mobility; Global Strike; and Command and Control. The Air Force's commitment to core missions illustrates its vast capability and has remained steadfast since the Air Force's establishment as a separate service 66 years ago. Our amazing Airmen today are constantly adapting and improving to meet the challenges of a fast-paced security environment and an ever-evolving battlespace across the globe.

The United States Air Force is, and will continue to be, the United States' key asymmetric advantage across the spectrum of conflict. Whether responding to a national security threat, a

natural disaster, or crisis engagements, the Air Force provides Global Vigilance, Global Reach and Global Power to ensure that the U.S. is capable of responding to events around the world. Without the Air Force's supremacy in air, space and cyberspace, the U.S. would not be able to move troops and equipment to war zones, send relief to countries devastated by natural disasters, provide air support to troops on the ground, or gather crucial intelligence through electronic warfare and stealth technology.

But let us not forget the true power behind the Air Force is its Airmen. The Air Force comprises over 330,000 personnel on active duty, 185,000 civilian personnel, and 180,000 in the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserves. These flexible, adaptable, and innovative Airmen employ unmatched air, space, and cyberspace capabilities. Our Airmen today are driven by the ideals of the Warrior Ethos and commit themselves to succeed in any mission our Nation asks of them. Our Airmen believe that our Constitution and the freedom it guarantees are worth fighting for. They sacrifice their personal comfort and safety to answer a higher calling: service in the cause of freedom, both here at home and abroad. I am awed by our servicemen and women's ability to adapt and succeed in a total force mission that at various stages has called upon them to be scholars, teachers, policemen, farmers, bankers, engineers, social workers, and, of course, warriors—often all at the same time.

Above all, I am perpetually thankful for their willingness to serve, and I have the greatest faith in their ability to face the difficult and dangerous missions that lie ahead. These patriots have always been the strength of our Nation. The unwavering dedication to duty, to our country, and to all Americans is embodied in the Air Force vision, ''The World's Greatest Air Force—Powered by Airmen, fueled by innovation.'' For 66 years, our Air Force has been on a mission to protect the skies so that our society may be free. Let us remember our Air Force Airmen for this achievement today, and wish them a happy 66th birthday.

NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, September 15 through October 15 is National Hispanic Heritage Month. This is a time to remember and to celebrate the integral role of Hispanic Americans in the economy, culture and identity of our Nation.

In New Mexico, we enjoy a rich Hispanic heritage that goes back over 400 years. Santa Fe, the oldest capital city in the United States, was founded a decade before the Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth Rock. New Mexico has the highest percentage of Hispanics of any State. From the Spanish colonists to immigrants from Latin America, the Hispanic community has informed our history, our art, and our sense of who we are as a people.

New Mexico is blessed with a blend of cultures and backgrounds like nowhere else. Our State is called the ''Land of Enchantment,'' not just for the beauty of our landscapes but also for the vibrant diversity of our culture.

The annual Spanish Market in Santa Fe is the largest exhibition of traditional Spanish Colonial and Hispanic art in the United States.

New Mexico is home to the National Hispanic Cultural Center, which is the fastest growing cultural institution in our State. The center, located in Albuquerque, is a guardian of Hispanic arts, culture and humanities, reaching people throughout the world.

Like America as a whole, the Hispanic community is itself diverse, representing a rich mosaic of nationalities and backgrounds. Its values of family, faith and hard work are the values that unite all of us as Americans and New Mexicans, and make us both more compassionate and stronger. Indeed, the story of Hispanics is a vital part of the American narrative—of overcoming hardship, of sacrifice, persevering, and helping one another.

During times of war and peace, at home and abroad, the Hispanic community has been a rich part of the fabric of the American story. From the time of the Revolutionary War, Hispanics have fought and died for our freedoms. Forty-one have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest military honor our Nation can bestow. Hispanics continue to contribute in communities throughout the Nation—in business, in education and the arts, and at every level of government service. Their talents and sacrifices are integral to our past, and crucial to our future.

The late Dennis Chavez from New Mexico was the first American-born Hispanic to be elected to the Senate. He was a trailblazer for the people of New Mexico and for the Hispanic community. I am honored to follow in his footsteps and to represent such a diverse State.

This month, as we celebrate the historic achievements and contributions of Hispanic Americans, we should also remember the challenges we face and dedicate ourselves to meeting those challenges. With comprehensive immigration reform, and working together for vital education, health care, and economic development initiatives, let us commit ourselves to ensure that Hispanic families in New Mexico and across the Nation have an equal opportunity to achieve the American dream.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DR. PAUL EMERY

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and honor the late Dr. Paul E. Emery's extensive service and commitment to the psychiatric community and the people of New Hampshire.

At an early age, Paul knew he wanted to become a psychiatrist. His calling was to help people overcome their challenges, and he did so with great compassion. He was a highly skilled and dedicated doctor who was loved by many.

He trained at Syracuse Psychopathic Hospital, Western New England Psychoanalytic Institute, and Yale University. He was also an NIMH fellow at Austin Riggs Center in Stockbridge, MA. His training was interrupted by the Korean war, during which he was promoted to captain and served as the division psychiatrist and chief of the Mental Hygiene Clinic in the U.S. Army. He received several commendations for his outstanding service.

He started his private practice of psychiatry in Concord, NH, and practiced for more than 23 years. During this time, he was a consultant for Concord Hospital, St. Paul's School, and the Division of Public Health Program on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse. He was also the medical director for the Forensic Unit of the New Hampshire State Hospital. He later became the first medical director and then executive director for the VA's First Center on Stress Recovery in Brecksville, OH. Subsequently, Dr. Emery became chief of psychiatry at the Manchester VAMC. After his retirement from the VAMC, he became staff psychiatrist at Manchester Counseling Services and Elliot Hospital. In addition, he served on the New Hampshire Parole Board.

Dr. Emery had an academic/faculty appointment at Dartmouth Medical School from the 1960s until he retired in 2005. He published about 30 scientific articles and chapters dealing primarily with post-traumatic stress disorder.

He founded the N.H. Psychiatric Society in 1972 and held various chairmanships and offices in that organization, including serving as its president during the 1980s and as chairman of the ethics committee during the 1990s. He was also active in the N.H. Medical Society and was its vice president during the mid-1970s.

Dr. Emery touched so many lives, and I join with citizens across New Hampshire in honoring the many contributions he made to our State and the psychiatric community.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE PARTIES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY FOR COOPERATION REGARDING ATOMIC INFORMATION, INCLUDING A TECHNICAL ANNEX AND SECURITY ANNEX (COLLECTIVELY REFERRED TO AS THE ''ATOMAL AGREEMENT'')—PM 20

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 Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, consistent with sections 123 and 144 b. of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153 and 2164(b)), the text of the Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information, including a technical annex and security annex (hereinafter collectively referred to as the ''ATOMAL Agreement''), as a proposed agreement for cooperation authorizing the exchange of U.S. Restricted Data and Formerly Restricted Data within the context of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) between the United States of America and the following member of NATO: the Republic of Croatia (hereinafter the ''New Party'').

In addition, I am pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party, with a copy of the memorandum of the Secretary of Defense with respect to the agreement. The ATOMAL Agreement entered into force on March 12, 1965, with respect to the United States and the other NATO members at that time. The Czech Republic, the Republic of Hungary, the Republic of Poland, Spain, the Republic of Bulgaria, the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Latvia, the Republic of Lithuania, Romania, the Slovak Republic, and the Republic of Slovenia subsequently became parties to the ATOMAL Agreement. The New Party has signed this agreement and has indicated its willingness to be bound by it. The ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party meets the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Although the ATOMAL Agreement continues in force with respect to the United States and the other current parties to it, it will not become effective as an agreement for cooperation authorizing the exchange of atomic information with respect to the New Party until completion of procedures prescribed by sections 123 and 144 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

For more than 40 years, the ATOMAL Agreement has served as the framework within which NATO and the other NATO members that have become parties to this agreement have received the information that is necessary to an understanding and knowledge of, and participation in, the political and strategic consensus upon which the collective military capacity of the Alliance depends. This agreement permits only the transfer of atomic information, not weapons, nuclear material, or equipment. Participation in the ATOMAL Agreement will give the New Party the same standing within the Alliance with regard to nuclear matters as that of the other current parties to the ATOMAL Agreement. This is important for the cohesiveness of the Alliance and will enhance its effectiveness.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the Department of Defense (DOD) and other interested agencies in reviewing the ATOMAL Agreement and have determined that its performance, including the proposed cooperation and the proposed communication of Restricted Data thereunder with respect to the New Party, will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party and authorized the DOD to cooperate with the New Party in the context of NATO upon satisfaction of the requirements of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

The 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 begins upon receipt of this submission.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 18, 2013.*

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO COMMIT, THREATEN TO COMMIT, OR SUPPORT TERRORISM THAT WAS ESTABLISHED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13224 ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2001—PM 21

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. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2013.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 18, 2013.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, 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. 1410. An act to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian lands in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts.

H.R. 2449. An act to authorize the President to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Nuclear Energy for a period not to exceed March 19, 2016.

H.R. 3092. An act to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 793. An act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1410. An act to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian lands in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 2449. An act to authorize the President to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Nuclear Energy for a period not to exceed March 19, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1513. A bill to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

S. 1514. A bill to save coal jobs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2009. An act to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

H.R. 2775. An act 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.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2918. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations: Income Deductions and Resource Eligibility'' (RIN0584–AE05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–2919. A communication from the Program Manager, Information Sharing Environment, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2013 Annual Report to the Congress on the Information Sharing Environment (ISE)''; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC–2920. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Center for Veterans Enterprise, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''VA Veteran-Owned Small Business Verification Guidelines'' (RIN2900–AO49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–2921. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''VA Health Professional Scholarship and Visual Impairment and Orientation and Mobility Professional Scholarship Programs'' (RIN2900–AO34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–2922. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Disease Associated with Exposure to Certain Herbicide Agents: Peripheral Neuropathy'' (RIN2900–AO32) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–2923. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Second Quarter of Fiscal Year 2013''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–2924. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Third Quarter of Fiscal Year 2013''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–2925. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (106); Amdt. No. 3549'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2926. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (35); Amdt. No. 3550'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2927. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbo Fan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0195)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2928. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Beechcraft Corporation and Hawker Beechcraft Corporation'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1180)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2929. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1038)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2930. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0637)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2931. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1321)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2932. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; PIAGGIO AERO INDUSTRIES S.p.A. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0472)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2933. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Standard Division and Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation Propellers'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0262)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2934. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eclipse Aerospace, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0448)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2935. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0207)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2936. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0361)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2937. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0362)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2938. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Regattas and Marine Parades in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0327)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2939. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Recurring Events in Northern New England'' ((RIN1625–AA08; AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1057)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2940. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Tall Ship Safety Zones; War of 1812'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0192)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2941. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Metedeconk River; Brick Township, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0636)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2942. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Bullhead City Regatta; Bullhead City, AZ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0260)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2943. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Maritime Heritage Festival Fireworks, St. Helens, OR'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0485)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2944. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Kentucky Air National Guard Vessel for Parachute Rescue Jumpmaster Training, Lake Erie, Dunkirk, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0584)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2945. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Chicago Harbor; Navy Pier Southeast; Chicago, IL'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0320)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2946. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone and Regulated Navigation Area; Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Romeoville, IL'' ((RIN1625–AA00, 1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2011–1108)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2947. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Discovery World Fireworks, Milwaukee Harbor, Milwaukee, WI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0326)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2948. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; James River; Newport News, VA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0670)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2949. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; North Hero Air Show; North Hero, VT'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0497)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2950. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Pacific Northwest Grain Handlers Association Facilities; Columbia and Willamette Rivers'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0011)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2951. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; San Diego International Airport Terminal Two West Grand Opening Fireworks; San Diego, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0637)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2952. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Kuoni Destination Management Fireworks; San Diego, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0666)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2953. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reporting Requirements for Positive Train Control Expenses and Investments'' (RIN2140–AB09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2954. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Point Thomson, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1175)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2955. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lexington, OK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0272)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2956. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy and Water Use Labeling for Consumer Products Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (Energy Labeling Rule)'' (RIN3084–AB15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2957. A communication from the Legal Advisor, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Speech-to-Speech and Internet Protocol (IP) Speech-to-Speech Telecommunications Relay Services; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, CG Docket Nos. 08–15 and 03–123, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking'' (FCC 13–101) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2958. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Lifeline and Link Up Modernization and Reform'' ((RIN3060–AF85) (DA 13–1441)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 237. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. Res. 238. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 239. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Evan Ryan, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Educational and Cultural Affairs).

*Nisha Desai Biswal, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs.

*Kenneth R. Weinstein, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2014.

By Mr. HARKIN for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Scott S. Dahl, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Labor.

*Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. KIRK:

S. 1515. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve and expand education savings accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 1516. A bill to amend title II of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment and implementation of guidelines on best practices for diagnosis, treatment, and management of mild traumatic brain injuries (MTBIs) in school-aged children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 1517. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act and the Social Security Act to extend health information technology assistance eligibility to behavioral health, mental health, and substance abuse professionals and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1518. A bill improving outcomes for youth at risk for sex trafficking, and other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1519. A bill to ensure orderly conduct of Nuclear Regulatory Commission actions; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. KING:

S. 1520. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the York River and associated tributaries for study for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1521. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from requiring seafood to be certified as sustainable by a third party nongovernmental organization and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1522. A bill to improve access to oral health care for vulnerable and underserved populations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. 1523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to make permanent qualified school construction bonds and qualified zone academy bonds, to treat qualified zone academy bonds as specified tax credit bonds, and to modify the private business contribution requirement for qualified zone academy bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COBURN:

S. 1524. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude major professional sports leagues from qualifying as tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 1525. A bill to ensure that the personal and private information of Americans enrolling in Exchanges established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is secured with proper privacy and data security safeguards; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. Res. 237. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. Res. 238. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. Res. 239. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs; from the Committee on Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. ENZI):

S. Res. 240. A resolution designating the week beginning September 15, 2013, as ''National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 120

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 120, a bill to expand the number of scholarships available to Pakistani women under the Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program.

S. 131

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 131, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured veterans and their spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 282

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 282, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a new counseling program.

S. 283

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to invest in innovation for education.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by establishing a program to support the modernization, renovation, or repair of career and technical education facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 441

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 441, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by establishing a program to provide professional development activities for educators, and for other purposes.

S. 466

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 466, a bill to assist low-income individuals in obtaining recommended dental care.

S. 502

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 502, a bill to assist States in providing voluntary high-quality universal prekindergarten programs and programs to support infants and toddlers.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) 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. 699

At the request of Mr. CHIESA, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 936

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 936, a bill to increase oversight of small business assistance programs provided by the Small Business Administration.

S. 1078

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1078, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide certain TRICARE beneficiaries with the opportunity to retain access to TRICARE Prime.

S. 1210

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1210, a bill to allow a State to submit a declaration of intent to the Secretary of Education to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of students.

S. 1242

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1242, a bill to amend the Fair Housing Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1324

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to prohibit any regulations promulgated pursuant to a presidential memorandum relating to power sector carbon pollution standards from taking effect.

S. 1363

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1363, a bill to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1,000,000, 000 and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) 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. 1431

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1452

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1452, a bill to enhance transparency for certain surveillance programs authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes.

S. 1459

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1459, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another.

S. 1462

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1462, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 1490

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1490, a bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to declare the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, a terrorist attack, and to ensure that the victims of the attack and their families receive the same honors and benefits as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families.

AMENDMENT NO. 1908

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1908 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1916

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1916 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1518. A bill improving outcomes for youth at risk for sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there is an epidemic of abuse that is taking place in America today. Recent reports estimate that hundreds of thousands of children and youths are at risk of domestic sex trafficking.

Individuals on the frontlines in the fight against domestic sexual trafficking of children report that instances are on the rise. They tell us former drug dealers have moved on to sex trafficking. They also tell us technological advances have made this type of trafficking easier as smart phones and other devices provide distance and increased levels of anonymity. Certain Web sites that post classified ads soliciting sexual partners also help facilitate trafficking.

The risk of sex trafficking is compounded every year for up to 30,000 young people who are ''emancipated'' from foster care. Too many of these emancipated youth turn 18, pack their few belongings in a trash bag and are driven to a homeless shelter, leaving them vulnerable and exposed to traffickers and other predators.

While in foster care, children and youth are also at increased risk for trafficking.

In July of this year, the FBI's Innocence Lost National Initiative, which combats domestic sex trafficking of minors, launched Operation Cross Country, a 3-day effort. Operation Cross Country recovered 105 children and arrested 152 traffickers. The efforts of the Innocence Lost National Initiative and the results of Operation Cross Country are laudable. However, they also revealed a disturbing element of our Nation's child welfare and foster care systems. According to some reports, up to 60 percent of sexually exploited children are recruited out of the child welfare and foster care programs. That is an unbelievable statistic, but it is apparently true. Because of the trauma and past abuse suffered by children and youth in these systems, they are particularly vulnerable to traffickers.

FBI officials involved in Operation Cross Country report:

Law enforcement refers to these young children as ''children with a void.'' Once the

pimp identifies that void and makes every attempt to fill it, a dependency between the child and the perpetrator develops.

Law enforcement officers also report:

The most vulnerable victims forced into sex trafficking range in age from 13 to 16. Most of the children come from either foster care homes or are considered runaways.

In order to combat domestic sex trafficking and improve outcomes for children and youth in foster care, systemic changes need to be made in the current child welfare system.

Therefore, today I am introducing the Improving Outcomes for Youth at Risk for Sex Trafficking Act of 2013. The short title of the bill is I O Youth.

We do owe these youth. These are our country's most damaged and most vulnerable children. Yet most kids who age out of foster care face negative outcomes such as homelessness, teen pregnancy, drug addiction, and trafficking. We ought to do better.

This legislation I am introducing today addresses some of the widespread conditions in the child welfare and foster care systems that make these children and youth particularly vulnerable to being sexually trafficked. I am sure most Americans would be surprised to learn that most child welfare agencies will not serve trafficked children and youth who are not in the custody of a biological or foster family or living in a group home.

Often these children, who are not legally able to give consent for sex, are arrested for prostitution and referred to the juvenile justice system. In many States, the courts and the juvenile justice system are ill-equipped to deal with the trauma these children and youth have endured.

My bill requires that States provide services to youth who have been trafficked or are at risk of being trafficked. The bill also redirects resources to improve the current court system to better identify and address needs of trafficked youth.

Many youth in foster care are routinely denied the opportunity to participate in normal age-appropriate activities and social events such as playing sports, participating in afterschool activities, and enjoying a social life with friends. This lack of contact and engagement in healthy and meaningful activities deprives young people of important social connections. Preventing youth from having normal experiences impairs their healthy development and contributes to isolation and loneliness, which in turn makes them vulnerable to domestic sex trafficking, homelessness, drug abuse, poor educational outcomes, poverty, and, of course, other negative outcomes.

My bill includes a number of provisions to encourage, enhance, support youth in foster care, facilitate their participation in age-appropriate activities and social events. I hope these provisions will promote healthy development, increase meaningful opportunities to form meaningful connections, reduce the risk of vulnerability to domestic sex trafficking, and other negative outcomes.

Another major risk factor for vulnerability to sex trafficking and other negative outcomes for older youth in care is a continued reliance on congregate care facilities. These facilities are routinely targeted by traffickers and are often warehouses for youth who are rarely, if ever, allowed to engage in healthy age-appropriate activities and social events.

I understand that many of the children and youth in foster care are deeply traumatized and present with many acute physical and mental conditions. Some of these children and youth need intensive treatment to help them manage or overcome these conditions. I am pleased to report there are many good providers who are doing this work who support the legislation I am introducing today.

I O Youth refocuses Federal priorities of connecting vulnerable youth with caring, permanent families. For those remaining in congregate care facilities, my legislation requires that youth have improved access to normal, age-appropriate activities.

Youth in foster care report that they feel uninvolved, unaware, and disconnected to any planning around their care or their future. They are not informed of their rights while in foster care. This can lead to a sense of disenfranchisement and a lack of connection to siblings, relatives, or other caring adults. In many cases, this lack of connection contributes to the void so often preyed upon by traffickers.

My bill requires that State child welfare agencies provide ongoing family finding for older youth in foster care. I O Youth, this bill, also requires greater participation of youth in planning for their future and encourages States to find individuals willing to be involved on an ongoing basis with the youth in foster care.

Individuals who work with victims of domestic sex trafficking tell us the single biggest challenge with access to these victims is the lack of accessible and affordable housing. For older youth who have been emancipated from foster care, not having a place to sleep is often a reason why they enter into the sex trade. In order to improve housing options for these at-risk youth, my bill redirects funds from the social services block grant in order to provide housing to trafficked and other vulnerable youth.

We live in very contentious times. There are fierce policy and partisan divides on many political issues. Domestic sex trafficking of children and youth from foster care is not one of those issues. If there is any issue under the Sun that is without controversy, it is this one.

Last June, the Senate Finance Committee heard from a courageous survivor of domestic sex trafficking. She told us that she had been sold:

to several other pimps that had sex with me and forced me to have sex with other men. My story is sad, but it's common. And, girls like me are all around, but people don't see them so they remain victims.

This young gentlelady went on to change her life, hold a regular job, and to testify against some of these so-called pimps. What a courageous young woman.

It is time for us to pay attention to these girls and to all the children and youth in the foster care system.

I expect my legislation to have broad, bipartisan support in the Senate. I am pleased that a number of organizations already support the bill, and I am particularly gratified that organizations that work directly with young people have come out so strongly in support of my legislation. I have received letters from support for I O Youth from FosterClub, Children's Home Society of America, the National Network for Young People in Foster Care, the National Center for Housing and Child Welfare, Covenant House International, Human Rights Project for Girls, The Children's Village, National Children's Alliance, and the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children. I am hopeful the Senate can come together to act quickly on my legislation. We owe these youth that much.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1521. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from requiring seafood to be certified as sustainable by a third party nongovernmental organization and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Responsible Seafood Certification and Labeling Act which I am introducing today. This bill addresses an issue of great importance to fishermen, seafood producers and coastal communities in my state and around the country—the issue of how fisheries are managed sustainably. Based on the most recent economic data, the Alaska seafood industry supported more than 63,000 direct jobs and contributed over $4.6 billion to the state's economy. Nationally, those numbers go up to 165,800 total jobs and an economic contribution of $15.7 billion.

The salmon fisheries are a major part of my State's seafood economy and commercial fishermen around the State harvested more than 265 million salmon this season. With nearly 1 in 7 Alaskans employed in the commercial seafood industry, and numbers like the ones I just shared, you can understand why I take seriously how the Federal Government affects my State's fishermen.

On June 5, the National Park Service announced new guidelines to promote healthy food options for concessionaires at National Park Service facilities. These guidelines include the following statement:

Where seafood options are offered, provide only those that are 'Best Choice' or 'Good

Alternatives' on the Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch list, certified sustainable by the Marine Stewardship Council, or identified by an equivalent program that has been approved by the NPS.

Within the week, I was hearing from constituents, and they were not happy. Digging further into the origins led to policies developed by the Department of Health and Human Services and the General Services Administration that served as precursors to the NPS Guidelines, and an indication that this is a broader problem within the Federal Government.

How bad could this be? Why are these guidelines a problem? Why I am so concerned? Before delving into those questions, I want to acknowledge what some of you may know: Alaska salmon is a 'Best Choice' according to the Monterey Bay Aquarium. You can check your smart phone app. Problem solved, no impediment to the Park Service allowing its vendors to serve Wild Alaska salmon to its visitors, or any other Federal agency creating a problem for wild Alaska seafood . . . right? Wrong! It is a problem, a big problem, and here is why.

I believe it is bad Federal policy to allow third party certifiers, including Non-Governmental Organizations, NGOs, from the UK, to be the arbiters of what seafood is allowed to be sold in National Parks, or procured by Federal agencies. Not too long ago, wild Alaska salmon served as the flagship species for—MSC. Now MSC is disparaging the ''sustainability'' of Alaska salmon. These NGOs have political agendas, lack transparency, and are soliciting payment for their certification schemes. These NGOs are meddling, and their efforts to usurp Federal and State management expertise is harming U.S. seafood interests. What started as voluntary efforts to differentiate well-managed fisheries, to create market value for seafood products, to reward responsible fishermen and processors, has turned into an aggressive scheme apparently intent on taking over federal and state management responsibilities, intruding into the fabric of fisheries management in my State and around the country. The U.S. currently spends almost a billion tax dollars each year to sustainably manage American fisheries in compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act. There is no reason to let groups with no accountability interfere with this process.

On July 12 I sent a letter to HHS, GSA, and the Park Service stating my concerns, defending wild Alaska seafood, and requesting that all three agency heads meet with me to discuss how to change these guidelines. At an Energy and Natural Resources Committee oversight hearing on the Park Service's maintenance backlog, I questioned Director Jarvis on this issue. When Director Jarvis responded that he would make sure wild Alaska seafood would be included, I said that is not good enough, this is a national issue important to seafood interests around the country, and federal agency regulations, policies and guidelines need to be changed to eliminate the references to third party certification NGOs.

The bill I am introducing today will prohibit any U.S. Federal agency from requiring or endorsing the use of any third party non-governmental organization's label, criteria or other scheme to certify fish or seafood as sustainable. This prohibition will apply to any federal agency's purchase of fish or seafood, the sale of fish or seafood by a vendor or lessee on federal land or property, and any reference to a seafood sustainability standard developed by a third party non-governmental organization in any regulation, policy or guideline.

This is the right Federal policy for the Alaska seafood industry, and for our Nation's fishermen and coastal communities that depend on healthy and sustainable fisheries. It also is the right policy to ensure that hard working fishermen and the coastal communities that depend on them are not disadvantaged by the agenda of several misguided NGOs.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. 1523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to make permanent qualified school construction bonds and qualified zone academy bonds, to treat qualified zone academy bonds as specified tax credit bonds, and to modify the private business contribution requirement for qualified zone academy bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today I am proud to partner with Senator SHERROD BROWN to introduce the Rebuilding America's Schools Act. This legislation would provide a permanent path forward so our Nation's students can learn in high-quality settings. Investing in education is key to the future success of our Nation, so we have to make choices that support teachers and strong curricula, textbooks, and technology. We must also invest in school facilities.

Studies show that the learning environment affects students' academic achievement, as well as their behavior. It also makes a difference in the effectiveness of teachers. When the Department of Education asked principals about the caliber of their facilities in 2005, 43 percent reported that environmental factors like excessive noise, poor lighting, or inadequate ventilation interfered with instruction. The number was even higher when it came to portable or temporary buildings and classrooms. Building on these sentiments is a recent report by the American Society of Civil Engineers, which gave our Nation's school facilities a grade of ''D.'' Clearly, we have significant work to do.

I have fought for many years to provide the Federal support needed to help improve our existing schools and build new ones, so that our students have the best environment possible to learn and grow. For most students, their school is the center of their lives. School is where friendships are built, knowledge is gained, and the foundation is laid for them to excel in society.

The Rebuilding America's Schools Act would provide important additional Federal resources to build and renovate schools through the qualified zone academy bond program and the Qualified School Construction Bond Program. Since 1998, qualified zone academy bonds have helped renovate and repair schools in every State. In 2010–2011, school districts in 49 States used $11 billion in qualified school construction bond financing to build and renovate 21st century schools in communities across the country. The need is great—the National Education Association estimates that our public school systems need as much as $322 billion to bring our school facilities up to modern standards. Our legislation would make significant progress in helping to finance these desperately needed improvements.

In addition to helping make sure that no child has to attend classes at a deteriorating school, this legislation will help create good-paying construction jobs and stimulate our local economies. In fact, our legislation is an important opportunity to make an investment in our schools, our students, our teachers, and ultimately, our communities. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation that invests in the future success of our youngest generations and our Nation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 237—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MENENDEZ submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 237

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall

not exceed $6,599,622, of which amount (1) not to exceed $150,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $2,749,842, of which amount (1) not to exceed $150,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October, 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for ''Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 238—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 238

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed $8,663,935, of which amount (1) not to exceed $75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $3,609,973, of which amount (1) not to exceed $75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 4. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for ''Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 239—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. CANTWELL submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Indian Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 239

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions imposed by section 105 of S. Res. 4, agreed to February 4, 1977 (95th Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by that section, the Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or non-reimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). For the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $2,009,768.00, of which amount (1) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $837,403.00, of which amount (1) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairwoman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 240—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 15, 2013, AS ''NATIONAL HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS WEEK''

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado,

Mr. WARNER, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. ENZI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 240

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions are degree-granting institutions that have a full-time equivalent undergraduate enrollment of at least 25 percent Hispanic students;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions play an important role in educating many underprivileged students and helping those students attain their full potential through higher education;

Whereas more than 350 Hispanic-Serving Institutions operate in the United States;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions serve more than half, or 56 percent, of all Hispanic students, enrolling more than 1,480,000 students in 2011;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions are actively involved in stabilizing and improving the communities in which the institutions are located;

Whereas celebrating the vast contributions of Hispanic-Serving Institutions to the United States strengthens the culture of the United States; and

Whereas the achievements and goals of Hispanic-Serving Institutions deserve national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the achievements and goals of Hispanic-Serving Institutions across the United States;

(2) designates the week beginning September 15, 2013, as ''National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week''; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1953. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. FRANKEN) 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 1954. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1955. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1956. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1957. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MARKEY) 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 1953. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. FRANKEN) 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 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4_____. SMART WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ''eligible entity'' means—

(A) a utility;

(B) a municipality;

(C) a water district; and

(D) any other authority that provides water, wastewater, or water reuse services.

(2) SMART WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.—The term ''smart water resource management pilot program'' or ''pilot program'' means the pilot program established under subsection (b).

(b) SMART WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a smart water resource management pilot program in accordance with this section.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the smart water resource management pilot program is to award grants to eligible entities to demonstrate novel and innovative technology-based solutions that will—

(A) increase the energy and water efficiency of water, wastewater, and water reuse systems;

(B) improve water, wastewater, and water reuse systems to help communities across the United States make significant progress in conserving water, saving energy, and reducing costs; and

(C) support the implementation of innovative processes and the installation of advanced automated systems that provide real-time data on energy and water.

(3) PROJECT SELECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make competitive, merit-reviewed grants under the pilot program to not less than 3, but not more than 5, eligible entities.

(B) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting an eligible entity to receive a grant under the pilot program, the Secretary shall consider—

(i) energy and cost savings;

(ii) the novelty of the technology to be used;

(iii) the degree to which the project integrates next-generation sensors, software, analytics, and management tools;

(iv) the anticipated cost-effectiveness of the pilot project in terms of energy efficiency savings, water savings or reuse, and infrastructure costs averted;

(v) whether the technology can be deployed in a variety of geographic regions and the degree to which the technology can be implemented on a smaller or larger scale; and

(vi) whether the project will be completed in 5 years or less.

(C) APPLICATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), an eligible entity seeking a grant under the pilot program shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(ii) CONTENTS.—An application under clause (i) shall, at a minimum, include—

(I) a description of the project;

(II) a description of the technology to be used in the project;

(III) the anticipated results, including energy and water savings, of the project;

(IV) a comprehensive budget for the project;

(V) the names of the project lead organization and any partners;

(VI) the number of users to be served by the project; and

(VII) any other information that the Secretary determines to be necessary to complete the review and selection of a grant recipient.

(4) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 300 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall select grant recipients under this section.

(B) EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary shall annually carry out an evaluation of each project for which a grant is provided under this section that—

(i) evaluates the progress and impact of the project; and

(ii) assesses the degree to which the project is meeting the goals of the pilot program.

(C) TECHNICAL AND POLICY ASSISTANCE.—On the request of a grant recipient, the Secretary shall provide technical and policy assistance.

(D) BEST PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall make available to the public—

(i) a copy of each evaluation carried out under subparagraph (B); and

(ii) a description of any best practices identified by the Secretary as a result of those evaluations.

(E) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of each evaluation carried out under subparagraph (B).

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use not less than $7,500,000 of amounts made available to the Secretary to carry out this section.

(2) PRIORITIZATION.—In funding activities under this section, the Secretary shall prioritize funding in the following manner:

(A) Any unobligated amounts made available for the State Energy Program of the Department of Energy.

(B) Any unobligated amounts (other than those described in subparagraph (A)) made available to the Secretary.

SA 1954. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. SCHATZ) 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 the bill, add the following:

Subtitle B—Energy Productivity Innovation Challenge

SEC. 411. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Energy Productivity Innovation Challenge Act of 2013'' or the ''EPIC Act of 2013''.

SEC. 412. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to assist energy policy innovation in the States to promote the goal of doubling electric and thermal energy productivity by January 1, 2030.

SEC. 413. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) ENERGY PRODUCTIVITY.—The term ''energy productivity'' means, in the case of a State or Indian tribe, the gross State or tribal product per British thermal unit of energy consumed in the State or tribal land of the Indian tribe, respectively.

(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6202).

SEC. 414. PHASE 1: INITIAL ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the

Secretary shall issue an invitation to States to submit plans to participate in an electric and thermal energy productivity challenge in accordance with this section.

(b) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to section 417, the Secretary shall use funds made available under section 418(b)(1) to provide an initial allocation of grants to not more than 25 States.

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant provided to a State under this section shall be not less than $500,000 nor more than $1,750,000.

(c) SUBMISSION OF PLANS.—To receive a grant under this section, not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of the invitation under subsection (a), a State (in consultation with energy utilities, regulatory bodies, and others) shall submit to the Secretary an application to receive the grant by submitting a revised State energy conservation plan under section 362 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322).

(d) DECISION BY SECRETARY.—

(1) BASIS.—The Secretary shall base the decision of the Secretary on an application submitted under this section on—

(A) plans for improvement in electric and thermal energy productivity consistent with this subtitle; and

(B) other factors determined appropriate by the Secretary, including geographic diversity.

(2) RANKING.—The Secretary shall—

(A) rank revised plans submitted under this section in order of the greatest to least likely contribution to improving energy productivity in the State; and

(B) provide grants under this section in accordance with the ranking and the scale and scope of a plan.

(e) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—A plan submitted under subsection (c) shall provide—

(1) a description of the manner in which—

(A) energy savings will be monitored and verified and energy productivity improvements will be calculated using inflation-adjusted dollars;

(B) a statewide baseline of energy use and potential resources for calendar year 2010 will be established to measure improvements;

(C) the plan will promote achievement of energy savings and demand reduction goals;

(D) public and private sector investments in energy efficiency will be leveraged with available Federal funding; and

(E) the plan will not cause cost-shifting among utility customer classes or negatively impact low-income populations; and

(2) an assurance that—

(A) the State energy office required to submit the plan, the energy utilities in the State participating in the plan, and the State public service commission are cooperating and coordinating programs and activities under this subtitle;

(B) the State is cooperating with local units of government, Indian tribes, and energy utilities to expand programs as appropriate; and

(C) grants provided under this subtitle will be used to supplement and not supplant Federal, State, or ratepayer-funded programs or activities in existence on the date of enactment of this subtitle.

(f) USES.—A State may use grants provided under this section to promote—

(1) the expansion of policies and programs that will advance industrial energy efficiency, waste heat recovery, combined heat and power, and waste heat-to-power utilization;

(2) the expansion of policies and programs that will advance energy efficiency construction and retrofits for public and private commercial buildings (including schools, hospitals, and residential buildings, including multifamily buildings) such as through expanded energy service performance contracts, equivalent utility energy service contracts, zero net-energy buildings, and improved building energy efficiency codes;

(3) the establishment or expansion of incentives in the electric utility sector to enhance demand response and energy efficiency, including consideration of additional incentives to promote the purposes of section 111(d) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2621(d)), such as appropriate, cost-effective policies regarding rate structures, grid improvements, behavior change, combined heat and power and waste heat-to-power incentives, financing of energy efficiency programs, data use incentives, district heating, and regular energy audits; and

(4) leadership by example, in which State activities involving both facilities and vehicle fleets can be a model for other action to promote energy efficiency and can be expanded with Federal grants provided under this subtitle.

SEC. 415. PHASE 2: SUBSEQUENT ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO STATES.

(a) REPORTS.—Not later than 18 months after the receipt of grants under section 414, each State (in consultation with other parties described in subsection (b)(3)(F) that received grants under section 414 may submit to the Secretary a report that describes—

(1) the performance of the programs and activities carried out with the grants; and

(2) in consultation with other parties described in subsection (b)(3)(F), the manner in which additional funds would be used to carry out programs and activities to promote the purposes of this subtitle.

(b) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the receipt of the reports required under subsection (a), subject to section 417, the Secretary shall use amounts made available under section 418(b)(2) to provide grants to not more than 6 States to carry out the programs and activities described in subsection (a)(2).

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant provided to a State under this section shall be not more than $15,000,000.

(3) BASIS.—The Secretary shall base the decision of the Secretary to provide grants under this section on—

(A) the performance of the State in the programs and activities carried out with grants provided under section 414;

(B) the potential of the programs and activities described in subsection (a)(2) to achieve the purposes of this subtitle;

(C) the desirability of maintaining a total project portfolio that is geographically and functionally diverse;

(D) the amount of non-Federal funds that are leveraged as a result of the grants to ensure that Federal dollars are leveraged effectively;

(E) plans for continuation of the improvements after the receipt of grants under this subtitle; and

(F) demonstrated effort by the State to involve diverse groups, including—

(i) investor-owned, cooperative, and public power utilities;

(ii) local governments; and

(iii) nonprofit organizations.

SEC. 416. ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall invite Indian tribes to submit plans to participate in an electric and thermal energy productivity challenge in accordance with this section.

(b) SUBMISSION OF PLANS.—To receive a grant under this section, not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of the invitation under subsection (a), an Indian tribe shall submit to the Secretary a plan to increase electric and thermal energy productivity by the Indian tribe.

(c) DECISION BY SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of plans under subsection (b), the Secretary shall make a final decision on the allocation of grants under this section.

(2) BASIS.—The Secretary shall base the decision of the Secretary under paragraph (1) on—

(A) plans for improvement in electric and thermal energy productivity consistent with this subtitle;

(B) plans for continuation of the improvements after the receipt of grants under this subtitle; and

(C) other factors determined appropriate by the Secretary, including—

(i) geographic diversity; and

(ii) size differences among Indian tribes.

(3) LIMITATION.—An individual Indian tribe shall not receive more than 20 percent of the total amount available to carry out this section.

SEC. 417. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—To evaluate program performance and effectiveness under this subtitle, the Secretary shall consult with the National Research Council regarding requirements for data and evaluation for recipients of grants under this subtitle.

(b) COORDINATION WITH STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Grants to States under this subtitle shall be provided through additional funding to carry out State energy conservation programs under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.).

(2) RELATIONSHIP TO STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A grant provided to a State under this subtitle shall be used to supplement (and not supplant) funds provided to the State under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.).

(B) MINIMUM FUNDING.—A grant shall not be provided to a State for a fiscal year under this subtitle if the amount of funding provided to all State grantees under the base formula for the fiscal year under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) is less than $50,000,000.

(c) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—The participation of a State in a challenge established under this subtitle shall be voluntary.

SEC. 418. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle $100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2017.

(b) ALLOCATION.—Of the total amount of funds made available under subsection (a)—

(1) 30 percent shall be used to provide an initial allocation of grants to States under section 414;

(2) 61 percent shall be used to provide a subsequent allocation of grants to States under section 415;

(3) 4 percent shall be used to make grants to Indian tribes under section 416; and

(4) 5 percent shall be available to the Secretary for the cost of administration and technical support to carry out this subtitle.

SEC. 419. OFFSET.

Section 422(f) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17082(f)) (as amended by section 401) is amended by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and inserting the following:

''(5) $175,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

''(6) $125,000,000 for fiscal year 2015;

''(7) $75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017; and

''(8) $100,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.''.

SA 1955. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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, add the following:

TITLE V—METAL THEFT PREVENTION ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Metal Theft Prevention Act of 2013''.

SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term ''critical infrastructure'' has the meaning given the term in section 1016(e) of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT ACT) Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e));

(2) the term ''specified metal'' means metal that—

(A)(i) is marked with the name, logo, or initials of a city, county, State, or Federal government entity, a railroad, an electric, gas, or water company, a telephone company, a cable company, a retail establishment, a beer supplier or distributor, or a public utility; or

(ii) has been altered for the purpose of removing, concealing, or obliterating a name, logo, or initials described in clause (i) through burning or cutting of wire sheathing or other means; or

(B) is part of—

(i) a street light pole or street light fixture;

(ii) a road or bridge guard rail;

(iii) a highway or street sign;

(iv) a water meter cover;

(v) a storm water grate;

(vi) unused or undamaged building construction or utility material;

(vii) a historical marker;

(viii) a grave marker or cemetery urn;

(ix) a utility access cover; or

(x) a container used to transport or store beer with a capacity of 5 gallons or more;

(C) is a wire or cable commonly used by communications and electrical utilities; or

(D) is copper, aluminum, and other metal (including any metal combined with other materials) that is valuable for recycling or reuse as raw metal, except for—

(i) aluminum cans; and

(ii) motor vehicles, the purchases of which are reported to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (established under section 30502 of title 49); and

(3) the term ''recycling agent'' means any person engaged in the business of purchasing specified metal for reuse or recycling, without regard to whether that person is engaged in the business of recycling or otherwise processing the purchased specified metal for reuse.

SEC. 503. THEFT OF SPECIFIED METAL.

(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful to knowingly steal specified metal—

(1) being used in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce; and

(2) the theft of which is from and harms critical infrastructure.

(b) PENALTY.—Any person who commits an offense described in subsection (a) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

SEC. 504. DOCUMENTATION OF OWNERSHIP OR AUTHORITY TO SELL.

(a) OFFENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall be unlawful for a recycling agent to purchase specified metal described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 502(2), unless—

(A) the seller, at the time of the transaction, provides documentation of ownership of, or other proof of the authority of the seller to sell, the specified metal; and

(B) there is a reasonable basis to believe that the documentation or other proof of authority provided under subparagraph (A) is valid.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recycling agent that is subject to a State or local law that sets forth a requirement on recycling agents to obtain documentation of ownership or proof of authority to sell specified metal before purchasing specified metal.

(3) RESPONSIBILITY OF RECYCLING AGENT.—A recycling agent is not required to independently verify the validity of the documentation or other proof of authority described in paragraph (1).

(4) PURCHASE OF STOLEN METAL.—It shall be unlawful for a recycling agent to purchase any specified metal that the recycling agent—

(A) knows to be stolen; or

(B) should know or believe, based upon commercial experience and practice, to be stolen.

(b) CIVIL PENALTY.—A person who knowingly violates subsection (a) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $10,000 for each violation.

SEC. 505. TRANSACTION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) RECORDING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a recycling agent shall maintain a written or electronic record of each purchase of specified metal.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recycling agent that is subject to a State or local law that sets forth recording requirements that are substantially similar to the requirements described in paragraph (3) for the purchase of specified metal.

(3) CONTENTS.—A record under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the name and address of the recycling agent; and

(B) for each purchase of specified metal—

(i) the date of the transaction;

(ii) a description of the specified metal purchased using widely used and accepted industry terminology;

(iii) the amount paid by the recycling agent;

(iv) the name and address of the person to which the payment was made;

(v) the name of the person delivering the specified metal to the recycling agent, including a distinctive number from a Federal or State government-issued photo identification card and a description of the type of the identification; and

(vi) the license plate number and State-of-issue, make, and model, if available, of the vehicle used to deliver the specified metal to the recycling agent.

(4) REPEAT SELLERS.—A recycling agent may comply with the requirements of this subsection with respect to a purchase of specified metal from a person from which the recycling agent has previously purchased specified metal by—

(A) reference to the existing record relating to the seller; and

(B) recording any information for the transaction that is different from the record relating to the previous purchase from that person.

(5) RECORD RETENTION PERIOD.—A recycling agent shall maintain any record required under this subsection for not less than 2 years after the date of the transaction to which the record relates.

(6) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Any information collected or retained under this section may be disclosed to any Federal, State, or local law enforcement authority or as otherwise directed by a court of law.

(b) PURCHASES IN EXCESS OF $100.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a recycling agent may not pay cash for a single purchase of specified metal of more than $100. For purposes of this paragraph, more than 1 purchase in any 48-hour period from the same seller shall be considered to be a single purchase.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recycling agent that is subject to a State or local law that sets forth a maximum amount for cash payments for the purchase of specified metal.

(3) PAYMENT METHOD.—

(A) OCCASIONAL SELLERS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), for any purchase of specified metal of more than $100 a recycling agent shall make payment by check that—

(i) is payable to the seller; and

(ii) includes the name and address of the seller.

(B) ESTABLISHED COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS.—A recycling agent may make payments for a purchase of specified metal of more than $100 from a governmental or commercial supplier of specified metal with which the recycling agent has an established commercial relationship by electronic funds transfer or other established commercial transaction payment method through a commercial bank if the recycling agent maintains a written record of the payment that identifies the seller, the amount paid, and the date of the purchase.

(c) CIVIL PENALTY.—A person who knowingly violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each violation, except that a person who commits a minor violation shall be subject to a penalty of not more than $1,000.

SEC. 506. ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.

The Attorney General may bring an enforcement action in an appropriate United States district court against any person that engages in conduct that violates this title.

SEC. 507. ENFORCEMENT BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An attorney general or equivalent regulator of a State may bring a civil action in the name of the State, as parens patriae on behalf of natural persons residing in the State, in any district court of the United States or other competent court having jurisdiction over the defendant, to secure monetary or equitable relief for a violation of this title.

(b) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days before the date on which an action under subsection (a) is filed, the attorney general or equivalent regulator of the State involved shall provide to the Attorney General—

(1) written notice of the action; and

(2) a copy of the complaint for the action.

(c) ATTORNEY GENERAL ACTION.—Upon receiving notice under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall have the right—

(1) to intervene in the action;

(2) upon so intervening, to be heard on all matters arising therein;

(3) to remove the action to an appropriate district court of the United States; and

(4) to file petitions for appeal.

(d) PENDING FEDERAL PROCEEDINGS.—If a civil action has been instituted by the Attorney General for a violation of this title, no State may, during the pendency of the action instituted by the Attorney General, institute a civil action under this title against

any defendant named in the complaint in the civil action for any violation alleged in the complaint.

(e) CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of bringing a civil action under subsection (a), nothing in this section regarding notification shall be construed to prevent the attorney general or equivalent regulator of the State from exercising any powers conferred under the laws of that State to—

(1) conduct investigations;

(2) administer oaths or affirmations; or

(3) compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

SEC. 508. DIRECTIVE TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, the United States Sentencing Commission, shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal Sentencing Guidelines and policy statements applicable to a person convicted of a criminal violation of section 503 of this title or any other Federal criminal law based on the theft of specified metal by such person.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the Sentencing Commission shall—

(1) ensure that the sentencing guidelines and policy statements reflect the—

(A) serious nature of the theft of specified metal; and

(B) need for an effective deterrent and appropriate punishment to prevent such theft;

(2) consider the extent to which the guidelines and policy statements appropriately account for—

(A) the potential and actual harm to the public from the offense, including any damage to critical infrastructure;

(B) the amount of loss, or the costs associated with replacement or repair, attributable to the offense;

(C) the level of sophistication and planning involved in the offense; and

(D) whether the offense was intended to or had the effect of creating a threat to public health or safety, injury to another person, or death;

(3) account for any additional aggravating or mitigating circumstances that may justify exceptions to the generally applicable sentencing ranges;

(4) assure reasonable consistency with other relevant directives and with other sentencing guidelines and policy statements; and

(5) assure that the sentencing guidelines and policy statements adequately meet the purposes of sentencing as set forth in section 3553(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 509. STATE AND LOCAL LAW NOT PREEMPTED.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to preempt any State or local law regulating the sale or purchase of specified metal, the reporting of such transactions, or any other aspect of the metal recycling industry.

SEC. 510. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1956. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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_____. COORDINATION OF REFINERY OUTAGES.

Section 804 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17283) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 804. COORDINATION OF REFINERY OUTAGES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration.

''(2) PLANNED REFINERY OUTAGE.—The term 'planned refinery outage' means a removal, scheduled before the date on which the removal occurs, of a refinery, or any unit of a refinery, from service for maintenance, repair, or modification.

''(3) REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCT.—The term 'refined petroleum product' means any gasoline, diesel fuel, fuel oil, lubricating oil, liquid petroleum gas, or other petroleum distillate that is produced through the refining or processing of crude oil or an oil derived from tar sands, shale, or coal.

''(4) REFINERY.—The term 'refinery' means a facility used in the production of a refined petroleum product through distillation, cracking, or any other process.

''(5) UNPLANNED REFINERY OUTAGE.—The 'unplanned refinery outage' means the removal of a refinery, or any unit of a refinery, from service that is not scheduled in advance.

''(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The owner or operator of a refinery shall submit to the Administrator information describing—

''(1) the schedule of the refinery for any planned refinery outage, including—

''(A) the dates for the planned refinery outage at least 1 year in advance of the date of the expected outage or the date the outage is scheduled; and

''(B) the estimated inventories and production of refined petroleum products during the period described in subparagraph (A); and

''(2) any unplanned refinery outages as soon as practicable

''(c) REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF AVAILABLE INFORMATION.—The Administrator shall, on an ongoing basis—

''(1) review information on planned refinery outages and unplanned refinery outages—

''(A) reported by refineries under subsection (b); and

''(B) that is available from commercial reporting services;

''(2) analyze that information to determine whether the scheduling of a planned refinery outage or an unplanned refinery outage may nationally or regionally substantially affect the price or supply of any refined petroleum product by—

''(A) decreasing the production of the refined petroleum product; and

''(B) causing or contributing to a retail or wholesale supply shortage or disruption; and

''(3) alert the Secretary of any refinery outage that the Administrator determines may nationally or regionally substantially affect the price or supply of a refined petroleum product.

''(d) ACTION BY SECRETARY.—On a determination by the Secretary that a refinery outage may affect the price or supply of a refined petroleum product, the Secretary shall make available to refinery operators information on planned refinery outages or unplanned refinery outages to prevent significant market disruptions.

''(e) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section—

''(1) alters any existing legal obligation or responsibility of a refinery operator;

''(2) creates any legal right of action; or

''(3) authorizes the Secretary—

''(A) to prohibit a refinery operator from conducting a planned refinery outage; or

''(B) to require a refinery operator to continue to operate a refinery.

''(f) STUDY ON NATIONAL STRATEGIC REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS RESERVE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall study and submit to Congress a report on the costs and benefits of creating a national strategic refined petroleum products reserve for refined petroleum products.

''(2) INFORMATION.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include information on—

''(A) the days of existing storage capabilities within the different petroleum administration defense districts based on normal usage of refined petroleum products;

''(B) the feasibility of increasing storage capacity for refined petroleum products on a regional basis; and

''(C) the impact additional storage capacity would have on the retail price of refined petroleum products for consumers in the event of a supply shortage or market disruption from a natural disaster or refinery outage.''.

SA 1957. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MARKEY) 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 beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4___. RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY STANDARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 610. RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY STANDARD.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) BASE QUANTITY OF ELECTRICITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'base quantity of electricity' means the total quantity of electric energy sold by a retail electric supplier, expressed in terms of kilowatt hours, to electric customers for purposes other than resale during the most recent calendar year for which information is available.

''(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'base quantity of electricity' does not include—

''(i) electric energy that is not incremental hydropower generated by a hydroelectric facility; and

''(ii) electricity generated through the incineration of municipal solid waste.

''(2) BIOMASS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'biomass' means—

''(i) cellulosic (plant fiber) organic materials from a plant that is planted for the purpose of being used to produce energy;

''(ii) nonhazardous plant or algal matter that is derived from—

''(I) an agricultural crop, crop byproduct, or residue resource; or

''(II) waste, such as landscape or right-of-way trimmings (but not including municipal solid waste, recyclable postconsumer waste paper, painted, treated, or pressurized wood, wood contaminated with plastic, or metals);

''(iii) animal waste or animal byproducts; and

''(iv) landfill methane.

''(B) NATIONAL FOREST LAND AND CERTAIN OTHER PUBLIC LAND.—In the case of organic material removed from National Forest System land or from public land administered by the Secretary of the Interior, the term 'biomass' means only organic material from—

''(i) ecological forest restoration;

''(ii) precommercial thinnings;

''(iii) brush;

''(iv) mill residues; or

''(v) slash.

''(C) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B),

the term 'biomass' does not include material or matter that would otherwise qualify as biomass if the material or matter is located on the following Federal land:

''(i) Federal land containing old growth forest or late successional forest unless the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the removal of organic material from the land—

''(I) is appropriate for the applicable forest type; and

''(II) maximizes the retention of—

''(aa) late-successional and large and old growth trees;

''(bb) late-successional and old growth forest structure; and

''(cc) late-successional and old growth forest composition.

''(ii) Federal land on which the removal of vegetation is prohibited, including components of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

''(iii) Wilderness study areas.

''(iv) Inventoried roadless areas.

''(v) Components of the National Landscape Conservation System.

''(vi) National Monuments.

''(3) EXISTING FACILITY.—The term 'existing facility' means a facility for the generation of electric energy from a renewable energy resource that is not an eligible facility.

''(4) INCREMENTAL HYDROPOWER.—The term 'incremental hydropower' means additional generation that is achieved from increased efficiency or additions of capacity made on or after—

''(A) the date of enactment of this section; or

''(B) the effective date of an existing applicable State renewable portfolio standard program at a hydroelectric facility that was placed in service before that date.

''(5) INDIAN LAND.—The term 'Indian land' means—

''(A) any land within the limits of any Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria;

''(B) any land not within the limits of any Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria title to which was on the date of enactment of this section held by—

''(i) the United States for the benefit of any Indian tribe or individual; or

''(ii) any Indian tribe or individual subject to restriction by the United States against alienation;

''(C) any dependent Indian community; or

''(D) any land conveyed to any Alaska Native corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

''(6) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' means any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including any Alaskan Native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), that is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

''(7) RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The term 'renewable energy' means electric energy generated by a renewable energy resource.

''(8) RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCE.—The term 'renewable energy resource' means solar, wind, ocean, tidal, geothermal energy, biomass, landfill gas, incremental hydropower, or hydrokinetic energy.

''(9) REPOWERING OR COFIRING INCREMENT.—The term 'repowering or cofiring increment' means—

''(A) the additional generation from a modification that is placed in service on or after the date of enactment of this section, to expand electricity production at a facility used to generate electric energy from a renewable energy resource;

''(B) the additional generation above the average generation during the 3-year period ending on the date of enactment of this section at a facility used to generate electric energy from a renewable energy resource or to cofire biomass that was placed in service before the date of enactment of this section; or

''(C) the portion of the electric generation from a facility placed in service on or after the date of enactment of this section, or a modification to a facility placed in service before the date of enactment of this section made on or after January 1, 2001, associated with cofiring biomass.

''(10) RETAIL ELECTRIC SUPPLIER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'retail electric supplier' means a person that sells electric energy to electric consumers that sold not less than 1,000,000 megawatt hours of electric energy to electric consumers for purposes other than resale during the preceding calendar year.

''(B) INCLUSION.—The term 'retail electric supplier' includes a person that sells electric energy to electric consumers that, in combination with the sales of any affiliate organized after the date of enactment of this section, sells not less than 1,000,000 megawatt hours of electric energy to consumers for purposes other than resale.

''(C) SALES TO PARENT COMPANIES OR AFFILIATES.—For purposes of this paragraph, sales by any person to a parent company or to other affiliates of the person shall not be treated as sales to electric consumers.

''(D) GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term 'retail electric supplier' does not include—

''(I) the United States, a State, any political subdivision of a State, or any agency, authority, or instrumentality of the United States, State, or political subdivision; or

''(II) a rural electric cooperative.

''(ii) INCLUSION.—The term 'retail electric supplier' includes an entity that is a political subdivision of a State, or an agency, authority, or instrumentality of the United States, a State, a political subdivision of a State, a rural electric cooperative that sells electric energy to electric consumers, or any other entity that sells electric energy to electric consumers that would not otherwise qualify as a retail electric supplier if the entity notifies the Secretary that the entity voluntarily agrees to participate in the Federal renewable electricity standard program.

''(b) COMPLIANCE.—For calendar year 2014 and each calendar year thereafter, each retail electric supplier shall meet the requirements of subsection (c) by submitting to the Secretary, not later than April 1 of the following calendar year, 1 or more of the following:

''(1) Federal renewable energy credits issued under subsection (e).

''(2) Certification of the renewable energy generated and electricity savings pursuant to the funds associated with State compliance payments as specified in subsection (e)(4)(G).

''(3) Alternative compliance payments pursuant to subsection (h).

''(c) REQUIRED ANNUAL PERCENTAGE.—For each of calendar years 2014 through 2039, the required annual percentage of the base quantity of electricity of a retail electric supplier that shall be generated from renewable energy resources, or otherwise credited towards the percentage requirement pursuant to subsection (d), shall be the applicable percentage specified in the following table:

"Calendar Years	Required Amount percentage
2014	6.0
2015	8.5
2016	11.0
2017	11.0
2018	14.0
2019	14.0
2020	17.5
2021	17.5
2022	21.0
2023	21.0
2024	23.0
2025 and thereafter through 2039	25.0.

''(d) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A retail electric supplier may satisfy the requirements of subsection (b)(1) through the submission of Federal renewable energy credits—

''(A) issued to the retail electric supplier under subsection (e);

''(B) obtained by purchase or exchange under subsection (f); or

''(C) borrowed under subsection (g).

''(2) FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—A Federal renewable energy credit may be counted toward compliance with subsection (b)(1) only once.

''(e) ISSUANCE OF FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish by rule a program—

''(A) to verify and issue Federal renewable energy credits to generators of renewable energy;

''(B) to track the sale, exchange, and retirement of the credits; and

''(C) to enforce the requirements of this section.

''(2) EXISTING NON-FEDERAL TRACKING SYSTEMS.—To the maximum extent practicable, in establishing the program, the Secretary shall rely on existing and emerging State or regional tracking systems that issue and track non-Federal renewable energy credits.

''(3) APPLICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity that generates electric energy through the use of a renewable energy resource may apply to the Secretary for the issuance of renewable energy credits.

''(B) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for the issuance of the credits, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Secretary that—

''(i) the electric energy will be transmitted onto the grid; or

''(ii) in the case of a generation offset, the electric energy offset would have otherwise been consumed onsite.

''(C) CONTENTS.—The application shall indicate—

''(i) the type of renewable energy resource that is used to produce the electricity;

''(ii) the location at which the electric energy will be produced; and

''(iii) any other information the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(4) QUANTITY OF FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the Secretary shall issue to a generator of electric energy 1 Federal renewable energy credit for each kilowatt hour of electric energy generated by the use of a renewable energy resource at an eligible facility.

''(B) INCREMENTAL HYDROPOWER.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—For purpose of compliance with this section, Federal renewable energy credits for incremental hydropower shall be based on the increase in average annual generation resulting from the efficiency improvements or capacity additions.

''(ii) WATER FLOW INFORMATION.—The incremental generation shall be calculated using the same water flow information that is—

''(I) used to determine a historic average annual generation baseline for the hydroelectric facility; and

''(II) certified by the Secretary or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

''(iii) OPERATIONAL CHANGES.—The calculation of the Federal renewable energy credits for incremental hydropower shall not be based on any operational changes at the hydroelectric facility that is not directly associated with the efficiency improvements or capacity additions.

''(C) INDIAN LAND.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue 2 renewable energy credits for each kilowatt hour of electric energy generated and supplied to the grid in a calendar year through the use of a renewable energy resource at an eligible facility located on Indian land.

''(ii) BIOMASS.—For purposes of this paragraph, renewable energy generated by biomass cofired with other fuels is eligible for 2 credits only if the biomass was grown on the land.

''(D) ON-SITE ELIGIBLE FACILITIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of electric energy generated by a renewable energy resource at an on-site eligible facility that is not larger than 1 megawatt in capacity and is used to offset all or part of the requirements of a customer for electric energy, the Secretary shall issue 3 renewable energy credits to the customer for each kilowatt hour generated.

''(ii) INDIAN LAND.—In the case of an on-site eligible facility on Indian land, the Secretary shall issue not more than 3 credits per kilowatt hour.

''(E) COMBINATION OF RENEWABLE AND NONRENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES.—If both a renewable energy resource and a nonrenewable energy resource are used to generate the electric energy, the Secretary shall issue the Federal renewable energy credits based on the proportion of the renewable energy resources used.

''(F) RETAIL ELECTRIC SUPPLIERS.—If a generator has sold electric energy generated through the use of a renewable energy resource to a retail electric supplier under a contract for power from an existing facility and the contract has not determined ownership of the Federal renewable energy credits associated with the generation, the Secretary shall issue the Federal renewable energy credits to the retail electric supplier for the duration of the contract.

''(G) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE RENEWABLE PORTFOLIO STANDARD PROGRAMS.—Payments made by a retail electricity supplier, directly or indirectly, to a State for compliance with a State renewable portfolio standard program, or for an alternative compliance mechanism, shall be valued at 1 credit per kilowatt hour for the purpose of subsection (b)(2) based on the quantity of electric energy generation from renewable resources that results from the payments.

''(f) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDIT TRADING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A Federal renewable energy credit may be sold, transferred, or exchanged by the entity to whom the credit is issued or by any other entity that acquires the Federal renewable energy credit, other than renewable energy credits from existing facilities.

''(2) CARRYOVER.—A Federal renewable energy credit for any year that is not submitted to satisfy the minimum renewable generation requirement of subsection (c) for that year may be carried forward for use pursuant to subsection (b)(1) within the next 3 years.

''(3) DELEGATION.—The Secretary may delegate to an appropriate market-making entity the administration of a national tradeable renewable energy credit market for purposes of creating a transparent national market for the sale or trade of renewable energy credits.

''(g) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDIT BORROWING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2014, a retail electric supplier that has reason to believe the retail electric supplier will not be able to fully comply with subsection (b) may—

''(A) submit a plan to the Secretary demonstrating that the retail electric supplier will earn sufficient Federal renewable energy credits within the next 3 calendar years that, when taken into account, will enable the retail electric supplier to meet the requirements of subsection (b) for calendar year 2014 and the subsequent calendar years involved; and

''(B) on the approval of the plan by the Secretary, apply Federal renewable energy credits that the plan demonstrates will be earned within the next 3 calendar years to meet the requirements of subsection (b) for each calendar year involved.

''(2) REPAYMENT.—The retail electric supplier shall repay all of the borrowed Federal renewable energy credits by submitting an equivalent number of Federal renewable energy credits, in addition to the credits otherwise required under subsection (b), by calendar year 2022 or any earlier deadlines specified in the approved plan.

''(h) ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE PAYMENTS.—As a means of compliance under subsection (b)(4), the Secretary shall accept payment equal to the lesser of—

''(1) 200 percent of the average market value of Federal renewable energy credits and Federal energy efficiency credits for the applicable compliance period; or

''(2) 3 cents per kilowatt hour (as adjusted on January 1 of each year following calendar year 2006 based on the implicit price deflator for the gross national product).

''(i) INFORMATION COLLECTION.—The Secretary may collect the information necessary to verify and audit—

''(1)(A) the annual renewable energy generation of any retail electric supplier; and

''(B) Federal renewable energy credits submitted by a retail electric supplier pursuant to subsection (b)(1);

''(2) the validity of Federal renewable energy credits submitted for compliance by a retail electric supplier to the Secretary; and

''(3) the quantity of electricity sales of all retail electric suppliers.

''(j) ENVIRONMENTAL SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Incremental hydropower shall be subject to all applicable environmental laws and licensing and regulatory requirements.

''(k) STATE PROGRAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section diminishes any authority of a State or political subdivision of a State—

''(A) to adopt or enforce any law (including regulations) respecting renewable energy, including programs that exceed the required quantity of renewable energy under this section; or

''(B) to regulate the acquisition and disposition of Federal renewable energy credits by retail electric suppliers.

''(2) COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION.—No law or regulation referred to in paragraph (1)(A) shall relieve any person of any requirement otherwise applicable under this section.

''(3) COORDINATION WITH STATE PROGRAM.—The Secretary, in consultation with States that have in effect renewable energy programs, shall—

''(A) preserve the integrity of the State programs, including programs that exceed the required quantity of renewable energy under this section; and

''(B) facilitate coordination between the Federal program and State programs.

''(4) EXISTING RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS.—In the regulations establishing the program under this section, the Secretary shall incorporate common elements of existing renewable energy programs, including State programs, to ensure administrative ease, market transparency and effective enforcement.

''(5) MINIMIZATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS AND COSTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall work with the States to minimize administrative burdens and costs to retail electric suppliers.

''(l) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—An electric utility that has sales of electric energy that are subject to rate regulation (including any utility with rates that are regulated by the Commission and any State regulated electric utility) shall not be denied the opportunity to recover the full amount of the prudently incurred incremental cost of renewable energy obtained to comply with the requirements of subsection (b).

''(m) PROGRAM REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences under which the Academy shall conduct a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of the program established under this section.

''(2) EVALUATION.—The study shall include an evaluation of—

''(A) the effectiveness of the program in increasing the market penetration and lowering the cost of the eligible renewable energy technologies;

''(B) the opportunities for any additional technologies and sources of renewable energy emerging since the date of enactment of this section;

''(C) the impact on the regional diversity and reliability of supply sources, including the power quality benefits of distributed generation;

''(D) the regional resource development relative to renewable potential and reasons for any investment in renewable resources; and

''(E) the net cost/benefit of the renewable electricity standard to the national and State economies, including—

''(i) retail power costs;

''(ii) the economic development benefits of investment;

''(iii) avoided costs related to environmental and congestion mitigation investments that would otherwise have been required;

''(iv) the impact on natural gas demand and price; and

''(v) the effectiveness of green marketing programs at reducing the cost of renewable resources.

''(3) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2018, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report describing the results of the evaluation and any recommendations for modifications and improvements to the program.

''(n) STATE RENEWABLE ENERGY ACCOUNT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury a State renewable energy account.

''(2) DEPOSITS.—All money collected by the Secretary from the alternative compliance payments under subsection (h) shall be deposited into the State renewable energy account established under paragraph (1).

''(3) GRANTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Proceeds deposited in the State renewable energy account shall be used by the Secretary, subject to annual appropriations, for a program to provide grants—

''(i) to the State agency responsible for administering a fund to promote renewable energy generation for customers of the State or an alternative agency designated by the State; or

''(ii) if no agency described in clause (i), to the State agency developing State energy conservation plans under section 362 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322).

''(B) USE.—The grants shall be used for the purpose of—

''(i) promoting renewable energy production; and

''(ii) providing energy assistance and weatherization services to low-income consumers.

''(C) CRITERIA.—The Secretary may issue guidelines and criteria for grants awarded under this paragraph.

''(D) STATE-APPROVED FUNDING MECHANISMS.—At least 75 percent of the funds provided to each State for each fiscal year shall be used to promote renewable energy production through grants, production incentives, or other State-approved funding mechanisms.

''(E) ALLOCATION.—The funds shall be allocated to the States on the basis of retail electric sales subject to the renewable electricity standard under this section or through voluntary participation.

''(F) RECORDS.—State agencies receiving grants under this paragraph shall maintain such records and evidence of compliance as the Secretary may require.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. prec. 2601) is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title VI the following:

''Sec. 609. Rural and remote communities electrification grants.

''Sec. 610. Renewable electricity standard.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate office building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Implementing MAP–21's Provision to Accelerate Project Delivery.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate office building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 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. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 18, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Reevaluating the Effectiveness of Federal Mandatory Minimum Sentences.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 10 a.m. in Room 428A Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a roundtable entitled ''Closing the Wealth Gap: Empowering Minority Owned Businesses to Reach Their Full Potential for Growth and Job Creation.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate September 18, 2013, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Older Americans: The Changing Face of HIV/AIDS.''

The Committee will meet in room 562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building beginning at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Economic Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Implementation of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Act of 2012: One Year After Enactment.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, at 10:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Recovering From Superstorm Sandy: Assessing the Progress, Continuing Needs, and Rebuilding Strategy.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAM WORKERS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 164 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 164) designating October 30, 2013, as a national day of remembrance for nuclear weapons program workers.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 164) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NATIONAL HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS WEEK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 240, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 240) designating the week beginning September 15, 2013, as ''National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 240) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 19, 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 any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; and that following morning business the Senate resume consideration of S. 1392, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. There being 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 6:07 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 19, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

TAMARA WENDA ASHFORD, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE MARY ANN COHEN, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RICHARD STENGEL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY, VICE TARA D. SONENSHINE.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LESLIE RAGON CALDWELL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE LANNY A. BREUER, RESIGNED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AUTHORITY TO EXTEND THE UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership on this very important piece of legislation. For 60 years, the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea has brought stability, security and prosperity to the Korean Peninsula and Asia-Pacific region. Most recently, the U.S.-Korean Free Trade Agreement has demonstrated our mutual commitment of shared future economic growth and prosperity.

I rise in strong support of this bill as it is critically important to extend the current U.S.-South Korea civilian nuclear energy cooperation agreement for two years. While substantial progress has been made by the negotiators, more time is needed to properly complete a new agreement that recognizes both our countries' status as global leaders of nuclear energy. Swift passage of this 2-year extension will give both countries the confidence that cooperation between our two countries will continue smoothly.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 2449.

TRIBUTE TO LT. GEN. EUGENE L. TATTINI

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lt. Gen. Eugene L. Tattini (ret.), as he concludes 12 years as Deputy Director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Jet Propulsion Laboratory. Throughout his tenure, Lt. Gen. Tattini has been a strong institutional leader, a guiding force behind planetary science and an exemplary contributor in his field.

Prior to his career at JPL, Lt. Gen. Tattini was a distinguished graduate of the Reserve Officer Training Corps program at the University of Illinois, and entered the United States Air Force as second lieutenant. He received a Master of Business Administration degree from Oklahoma City University and holds certificates from both the Air War College and Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Lt. Gen. Tattini was also selected to attend the Executive Development Program at Cornell University and the Program for Senior Managers in Government at Harvard University.

During Gene's 36-year military career, he served in 20 separate assignments ranging from a Minuteman II missile combat crew member at Grand Forks Base to an air staff acquisition policy staff officer at the Pentagon. As commander of the Space and Missile Systems Center at the Los Angeles Air Force Base, Lt. Gen. Tattini managed the research, design, development and acquisition of launch systems and satellites. He was also a member of the development team that launched the first U.S. anti-satellite weapon against a cooperating space target. Lt. Gen. Tattini's decorated and storied military career includes awards such as the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with Oak leaf cluster and the Meritorious Service Medal with Three oak leaf clusters, to name a few.

As the Deputy Director at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, he was responsible for the daily management of JPL resources and activities, and oversaw management of programs such as projects related to Mars and interplanetary network programs. JPL's highly successful Mars rover program has pushed the boundaries of robotic exploration and has inspired a new generation of scientists. Other JPL missions will help us understand Earth's climate and explore distant planets and galaxies. These programs and activities have created job opportunities for thousands locally and nationally, and have continued JPL's distinction and prominence in space exploration.

It is with great appreciation and respect that I congratulate Lt. Gen. Eugene L. Tattini today upon 48 years of public service. The time and energy Lt. Gen. Tattini put in to his work is extraordinary and people nationwide have benefited greatly from his dedicated service. Applauding his commitment and dedication to NASA's JPL and its work, I now proudly ask you all to join me in commending Lt. Gen. Eugene L. Tattini for his lifetime of service to our country.

RECOGNIZING THOMAS WATSON HARRELL, SR.

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Thomas Watson Harrell, Sr., a World War II Navy veteran who passed away recently at the age of 91.

Born in Cuthbert, GA on October 12, 1921, Mr. Harrell enlisted in the Navy in 1942 and was first stationed in Norfolk, VA. Mr. Harrell served honorably and faithfully until 1945, rising to the rank of Quartermaster Second Class. For most of his service, Mr. Harrell sailed aboard the destroyer escort USS *Crouter* (DE–11). He was one of the original crew members and a part of the initial shakedown cruise. The *Crouter* would go on to see almost all of its action in the volatile South Pacific, including escorting the invasion force bound for Okinawa.

Mr. Harrell represents a part of this country's greatest generation, distinguished by their honor and sacrifice. Mr. Harrell's story will be preserved for future generations as a part of the Library of Congress's Veterans History Project, which preserves and makes accessible to future generations the personal accounts of American war veterans so that others may understand their stories and sacrifice.

Mr. Harrell was proud of his service and was an active member of the Destroyer Escort Sailors Association. Always mindful of his civic duties, Mr. Harrell was active in supporting his elected representatives and never missed an opportunity to vote, even voting in the last election by absentee ballot from his nursing home.

I am honored today to recognize the service of Mr. Thomas Watson Harrell, Sr. and his contributions to the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING THE HUDSON LADY HORNETS FOR CLAIMING A SECOND TEXAS 3A SOFTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP TITLE

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with enormous pride that I recognize and congratulate the Hudson Lady Hornets on a stellar 2013 softball season in which they once again captured the Texas State Class 3A Softball Championship. The Lady Hornets have attained a dazzling level of excellence with their second state championship title.

The Hudson Lady Hornets triumphed over a solid team of Lady Jackets from Mineola with a final score of 12–9. Although Hudson dominated much of the game for more than two hours, the Lady Jackets fought back valiantly in the seventh inning. But that rally was short lived, with the ladies from Hudson pulling away determinedly to achieve their second state championship title win.

The lessons learned about teamwork and discipline should help everyone who played, coached, and assisted in knowing that whatever the obstacles that may lie ahead in life, they can overcome and they can be champions.

The Hudson Lady Hornets' championship success is a tribute to the coach, who brought his team back for another chance at victory, as well as a tribute to the players and all who assisted them along the way.

Having practiced with the Lady Hornets' in the last practice before their defense of their State Title in Austin, I saw firsthand that these gallant young women had the talent, the ability, the coaching, the drive, and that intangible quality that makes a winner. It was an honor for me to help Coach Eby in practice, just as I had promised to do during an assembly at Hudson High School recognizing the team for last year's championship.

This team has shown great faith in its journey to the championship crown. The team

scripture is 2 Corinthians 5:7, which reads ''For we walk by faith, not by sight.'' And the Lady Hornets affirmed their faith by painting the numbers 5 and 7 on their faces.

This recognition of their accomplishment is extended to all of the athletic staff, including Coach Jimmy Eby, and Assistant Coaches Wes Capps, Tanner Hines and Amanda Malone, as well as Hudson High School Principal John Courtney and Superintendent Mary Ann Whiteker.

The team members responsible for bringing the second championship title home to Hudson included Freshmen Alyssa Pierce, Katelyn Hanks, and Cortny Luna; Sophomores Madison Jeffrey, Bryli Lee, Maria Mireles, and Adriana Mosley; Juniors Kaylee ''KK'' Parker, Ashley Davis, and Madison Selman; and Seniors Cassidy Brasuell, Alyssa Dotson, Kelsee Selman, and Haley Willson.

The Hudson Independent School District staff and the community of Hudson have devoted countless hours to support and encourage these young ladies in the pursuit of their dream.

It is my most esteemed honor to congratulate everyone involved with this endeavor. May God continue to bless these young women, their families and friends, and all those individuals who call Hudson home.

Congratulations to the 2013 State Champion Hudson Lady Hornets, as their back to back championship legacy is now recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family I was unable to cast the following votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall vote 458—I would have voted ''yes,'' rollcall vote 459—I would have voted ''yes,'' rollcall vote 460—I would have voted ''yes,'' rollcall vote 461—I would have voted ''yes,'' rollcall vote 462—I would have voted ''yes,'' rollcall vote 463—I would have voted ''yes,'' rollcall vote 464—I would have voted ''yes,'' rollcall vote 465—I would have voted ''yes.''

I would have voted in favor of H.R. 2775 because I believe there needs to be protocols in place to verify eligibility of taxpayer funded benefits. Without these practical verifications in place there will be billions of dollars in fraud that will go undetected. We need to do everything we can to protect the hard earned dollars of the taxpayers and that's why I support this commonsense piece of legislation.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF REP. DEMETRIUS NEWTON

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of Alabama State Representative and Civil Rights Attorney Demetrius Newton, a beloved Alabamian remembered for his remarkable display of leadership and civil rights activism.

Rep. Newton passed away on Wednesday, September 11 at the age of 85. While I am deeply saddened by his passing I am comforted in knowing that his legacy is one that will live on through his contributions to the Civil Rights Movement and the State of Alabama.

Rep. Newton was born on March 15, 1928 in Fairfield, Alabama. In 1949, he received a degree from Wilberforce University in Wilberforce, Ohio. Rep. Newton received a law degree from Boston University in 1952. But while Rep. Newton understood the power of education, he is most remembered for his lifelong commitment to justice and Civil Rights.

Upon receiving his law degree from Boston University in 1952, Rep. Newton served in the United States Army. Following his time in the military, he returned to Birmingham, Alabama where he fought segregationist laws in courtrooms across the state as a private practice attorney.

In 1986, Rep. Newton was elected to the Alabama House of Representatives, representing District 53, Jefferson County. He held this position for 27 years until his death. From 1998 to 2010, Rep. Newton served as Alabama's first black speaker pro tempore. Rep. Newton worked as a judge for the city of Brownville, Alabama from 1972–1978 and served as Birmingham's City Attorney from 1991–1999. He was also a law professor at Miles College.

Rep. Newton paved the way for many black lawyers and elected officials across the State of Alabama. As an attorney, he played an instrumental role in the Civil Rights Movement representing icons such as Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King Jr. As a black attorney in segregated Alabama, Rep. Newton faced many struggles fighting court battles before all white judges and juries. He courageously dedicated his career to strengthening the rights for blacks in Alabama's courtrooms at a time when it wasn't safe to do so.

Rep. Newton was instrumental in fighting for the inclusion of blacks on juries in Bessemer, Birmingham and Etowah County. On behalf of his friend Dr. Martin Luther King, Rep. Newton was involved in a legal battle for the rights of those who marched in the 1965 Selma to Montgomery marches.

Rep. Newton filed many lawsuits throughout his career challenging segregation in public places, specifically interstate and intrastate travel. Rep. Newton is responsible for filing the first fair employment case, McKinstry v. U.S. Steel, under Title VII of the 1964 Voring Rights Act.

Until his death, Rep. Newton took his role as an Alabama state legislator very seriously. He was an outspoken opponent of the 1901 Alabama Constitution. Throughout his legislative career, he introduced legislation calling for a constitutional convention to rewrite the outdated document. Rep. Newton remained committed to his cause and continued to introduce amendments to the legislation throughout his legislative career.

As a veteran of the Alabama State House of Representatives, Rep. Newton gained the respect of his colleagues from both sides of the aisle. When the Republicans gained control of the State Legislature in 2010, they reserved his seat on the front row although it is traditionally reserved for the majority's leadership. His Republican colleagues have noted that when Rep. Newton walked to the podium to speak, members from both parties would pause their otherwise uninterrupted conversations and direct their attention to the podium. His presence and his legacy demanded respect.

Rep. Newton has been described by his colleagues in the legislature as a fine gentleman, a true statesman, and a scholar who was ''always prepared and always articulate.''

His instrumental role in the Civil Rights Movement and his 27 years of service in the Alabama Legislature has made an indelible mark on the State of Alabama. Today we honor him for his role in the story of Alabama. As the first black woman elected to congress from Alabama I am humbled to stand before the nation and share his story of strength, compassion and courage.

Saying thank you to Rep. Newton seems woefully inadequate. But, we are truly grateful for the life of this extraordinary public servant. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Rep. Demetrius Newton.

PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL ENVOY

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of this legislation and look forward to its passage by the House.

One of the most important services our State Department Special Envoys perform is to help highlight the concern of the American people for specific, often troubling, developments beyond our shores. Such is the case and the need where issues of the persecution of religious minorities are concerned.

During my tenure in Congress, I have heard from many of my constituents on the scope and brutality of state-sponsored or state-sanctioned persecution of religious minorities. Whether it has been Coptic Christians in Egypt, Baha'i in Iran, Falun Gong in China, or Muslims in Burma, the story is always the same: a violent element of the majority religion—or in China and Iran, the state itself—commits the most horrific acts of violence against religious minorities in their midst, including the destruction of the sacred places of those religious minorities. Our government must do more to help combat this insidious evil, and one mechanism for doing so is creating and properly funding this position.

As a nation founded by religious minorities seeking a safe haven in a new land, we have both a history and an obligation to do all in our power to protect the rights and the lives of religious minorities around the world. Creating the position of Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia is one important step in making good on that commitment. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF JERRY DENNIS, PRESIDENT, SEIU LOCAL 200UNITED

HON. DANIEL B. MAFFEI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the career of Jerry Dennis, who has retired from the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 200United after 37 years of dedicated service.

Jerry lives in Central New York and has tirelessly committed his career to strengthening our middle class and the local economy. He has many achievements to be proud of and deserves our commendation and public recognition for everything he has done for our community.

Jerry started out as a servicing representative for SEIU Local 200 in 1978. He quickly moved up the ranks and was elected president of Local 200 in 1986, after the statewide Local was restructured into four regional entities. Soon after, Jerry turned his focus to organizing new members through the challenging union–busting times of the 1980's and 1990's. Moreover, Jerry helped grow membership by more than 1,000 people in just over a decade.

When SEIU announced that it was working to build industry–focused locals on a state wide basis in 2000, Jerry led the charge in Central New York. With the backing of all five member unions, Local 200United was chartered in 2001, with Jerry as President.

Jerry was elected to the Board of Auditors at the SEIU convention in 2004. Highly regarded in the labor community for his expertise and longstanding record of accomplishments, Jerry was elected to the SEIU Executive Board on June 4th, 2008. In May 2013, Jerry stepped down as president of SEIU Local 200 United. He continues to be involved as a Trustee on the SEIU Local200 Executive Board.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize Jerry Dennis for his outstanding record of union and civic leadership and extend our sincere best wishes for a rewarding and gratifying retirement.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ALFRED RASCON

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Lieutenant Colonel Alfred Rascon for over 40 years of dedicated service to the people of this country. Over those years, Lt. Col. Rascon has displayed unparalleled heroism, courage, and dedication to his duties which will serve as an inspiration to servicemen and the American people for years to come. We pay tribute to Lt. Col. Rascon's service as we celebrate him and the other Medal of Honor recipients that are part of today's special order.

Lt. Col. Rascon was born in Chihuahua, Mexico in 1942. His family soon emigrated to Oxnard, California, where the lieutenant colonel graduated from high school and fulfilled his childhood dream of joining the United States Army. After completing specialist medical and airborne training, Lt. Col. Rascon was eventually deployed to Vietnam.

As a medic, Lt. Col. Rascon assisted countless injured soldiers on the battlefield, but one event in particular exemplifies the remarkable courage he displayed that made him the quintessential Medal of Honor recipient. On March 16, 1966, Lt. Col. Rascon's platoon came under intense fire from an enemy force near the Long Khanh Province. Lt. Col. Rascon crawled under heavy machine gun fire and avoided grenade explosions in order to treat his fellow soldiers, shielding their bodies with his own and suffering grievous injuries from the shrapnel and gunfire that filled the air. After the fighting ceased, he ignored his own wounds, and instead treated the wounded and directed their evacuation.

Lt. Col. Rascon's selfless acts of heroism are remarkable, yet what makes them even more extraordinary is that he only became a United States citizen after he left Vietnam. Lt. Col. Rascon displayed such unparalleled patriotism for our country even before he could officially call it his own.

Lt. Col. Rascon now lives in Maryland's third congressional district and we are proud to call him one of our own. He has continued to serve his country proudly. He returned to Vietnam, then served as a military liaison to Panama and finally completed his service in the Army Medical Service Corps in both Iraq and Afghanistan. Lt. Col Rascon's heroism and dedication to the United States are an inspiration and are extraordinary reminders of the sacrifices our servicemen and women make for our country every day. I extend him my deepest gratitude for his years of service, and congratulate him once again for his well-deserved Medal of Honor.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JULIUS L. CHAMBERS

HON. MELVIN L. WATT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Julius L. Chambers, an extraordinary American, civil rights leader and my friend and mentor, who died on August 2, 2013.

Julius Chambers committed his professional and personal life to improving the lives of others by working tirelessly for civil rights, social justice and human rights. After overcoming substantial odds and graduating number one in his class from the University of North Carolina School of Law, Julius founded the first integrated law firm in North Carolina in 1964. I was fortunate to have had Julius as a source of inspiration and advice throughout my undergraduate and law school years and I was privileged to join his law firm in 1971. Under his leadership, the firm did as much to influence evolving civil rights law as any private law firm in the United States. Julius litigated a number of landmark civil rights cases, including Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education which resulted in the desegregation of Charlotte-Mecklenburg County public schools.

In 1984 Julius left his law firm to become Director-Counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund (LDF) in New York. Under his leadership, the LDF continued to be the leading civil rights organization engaged in defending against legal assaults on civil and constitutional rights.

In 1993 Julius Chambers became the Chancellor of North Carolina Central University, his undergraduate alma mater, where he provided exceptional leadership and continued to be a role model and to have an important influence on young people. Even as he did so, he also continued to make significant legal contributions in the area of civil rights as one of three lawyers who argued the Shaw v. Hunt case before the Supreme Court in December 1995. In Shaw v. Hunt and a subsequent case, the Supreme Court ultimately upheld the constitutionality of North Carolina's 1st Congressional District and North Carolina's 12th Congressional District, the district I am honored to represent. In fact, during his career Julius Chambers argued a total of nine cases in the United States Supreme Court and won all of them, a record that probably has never been matched.

Mr. Speaker, not only was Julius an outstanding citizen and lawyer, he was also a devoted husband to Vivian Chambers, to whom he was married for 52 years before she predeceased him in June 2012, and he was a loving father to Derrick and Judy.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring and remembering the life of Julius Chambers and celebrating the far-reaching influence of his life. Julius' example and the lasting legacy of his incredible work will continue to inspire me and countless others to continue working to advance us toward a fairer and more just society.

CONGRATULATING MANUEL MUÑOZ

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Manuel Muñoz, an activist and entrepreneur, whose leadership and dedication to his community have played a vital role in ensuring that the residents of Ventura County be informed and engaged on issues of local, national and international importance.

On September 15, 1983, Manuel founded VIDA Newspaper—the only bilingual newspaper in Ventura County. This publication reaches thousands of bilingual individuals in the county, safeguarding and continuously maintaining the right of members of our community to have access to critical news and information. Since its founding, Manuel has served as Publisher and Director of VIDA Newspaper.

Manuel has played a vital role in not only the founding of this publication, but the successful manner in which it has thrived. While journalism and publishing can be a difficult industry and at times an unpredictable one, VIDA Newspaper continues to grow under Manuel's leadership.

Manuel's editorial leadership and proficiency in journalism have been recognized on both a local and national level. Manuel has been the recipient of several resolutions and commendations from the Mexican Government,

the City of Oxnard and the California State Assembly and State Senate. Additionally, Manuel has been recognized as the Journalist of the Year by the National Association of Hispanic Publications.

Today, almost thirty years since VIDA Newspaper's founding, I am pleased to join the Institute of Mexicans Abroad in honoring Manuel Muñoz with the Ohtli Award. The Ohtli Award is presented to an outstanding civilian who has dedicated most of his or her life to the well-being of Mexicans residing abroad, thus paving the way to create for them new professional opportunities. The Ohtli Award, which includes a medallion, a silver rosette, and an official diploma, is the highest honor that the Mexican government can present to a Mexican or a Hispanic of Mexican descent residing outside Mexico.

I am pleased to join the Consulate of Mexico in Oxnard in honoring Manuel Muñoz as an exemplary trailblazer who has without a doubt paved the way for many in Ventura County.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall votes 460–462. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on all three.

AUTHORITY TO EXTEND THE UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE KELLY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise In strong support of H.R. 2449, a bipartisan bill to extend the current U.S.-Korea civil nuclear agreement for two years.

This year we celebrate the 60th anniversary of the U.S.-South Korea alliance. Over the decades, South Korea has become a key U.S. ally in Asia and we stand shoulder to shoulder in political, strategic, military, cultural, and other issues.

One of these crucial issues is energy. This extension will allow the U.S. and Korea to enter into a new era of energy partnership.

The current nuclear cooperation agreement is due to expire in March 2014 and its prompt extension is vital to avoid trade disruptions.

It is critical that we uphold the reputation of the U.S. as a stable and reliable trading partner, in light of the energy industry's long-lead items and use of long-term contracts for nuclear components, fuel and services.

Ultimately this is about jobs: red, white, and blue American jobs. Billions of dollars in U.S. exports and thousands of U.S. jobs are at stake if we fail.

This is about jobs for U.S. companies such as Westinghouse, which is headquartered in Cranberry, PA, in my own district. Westinghouse, which employs about 9000 employees in the U.S., has been a leader in energy cooperation with Korea for nearly four decades.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this important legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of September 9, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following.

Monday, September 9, 2013: Rollcall No. 448: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 2052, ''yea''; rollcall No. 449: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 2844, ''yea.''

Tuesday, September 10, 2013: Rollcall No. 450: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1155, ''yea''; rollcall No. 451: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 2747, ''yea''; rollcall No. 452: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 130, ''yea''; rollcall No. 453: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 304, ''yea''; rollcall No. 454: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 256, ''yea''; rollcall No. 455: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 459, ''yea''.

Wednesday, September 11, 2013: Rollcall No. 456: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 2775, ''nay''; rollcall No. 457: On Agreeing to the Resolution providing the Rule on H.R. 2775, ''nay''.

Thursday, September 12, 2013: Rollcall No. 458: On Passage of H.R. 2775, ''nay''; rollcall No. 459: On passage of the Journal, ''aye'' 621.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF ZETA PHI BETA SORORITY

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work and community impact of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc. Founded in 1920 on the campus of Howard University, Zeta Phi Beta has been at the forefront of social change since its founding. As advocates of the people, members of Zeta from across the world are dedicated to serving their communities.

Specifically, Zetas are committed to:

Elder Care—Zeta manages a comprehensive program that focuses on elder abuse awareness, financial peace, supporting the caregiver and volunteering at senior care facilities.

Stork's Nest—A 40-year-old partnership between Zeta Phi Beta and March of Dimes, Stork's Nest is a community-based, prenatal, health promotion program for low-income pregnant women.

Prematurity Awareness Sundays occur every year in the month of November. More than 300 churches across the country are sites for distributing information on prematurity awareness, causes of prematurity and the importance of seeking prenatal care in an effort to decrease infant mortality and decrease the number of low birth weight babies.

Adopt-A-School allows members of Zeta Phi Beta to identify low performing schools and provide assistance in a number of ways to enhance the educational experience, increase test scores and grades.

Triple Negative Breast Cancer—Breast cancers found in African American women are more likely to be triple negative. Zeta chapters have begun adding information about triple negative breast cancer to existing projects and programs on breast cancer to build awareness and support efforts of health care professionals and organizations recommending earlier breast health testing.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc. as it marks 93 years of dedicated service by coming to Capitol Hill, and continuing to advocate for communities across the world.

HONORING JOE WICKS

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a true friend, patriot and public servant, Joe Wicks, who will soon be departing the Hill and returning to Michigan after years of outstanding work as my Chief of Staff.

With an unassuming nature and an always positive demeanor, one might not guess at first glance that Joe possesses a keen political intellect and wisdom far beyond his years. Joe first came to work for me when he offered to serve as campaign manager during my first run for Congress in 2004, and has been at my side every day I've served in Washington.

A proud native of Saugatuck, Michigan and a 2002 graduate of Hillsdale College, Joe brought his strong Midwestern values and his belief in the primacy of the free enterprise system to Washington to serve on my staff. Often soft-spoken, I've come to learn over the years that when Joe speaks you should listen. His commitment to American exceptionalism, liberty and the enduring belief that government is at its best when it champions competitive freedom has been a great asset to my office and I believe has been of service to Michigan and our country.

While everyone in the Walberg office is sorry to see Joe go, we will always appreciate his good-natured disposition and his love of NASCAR. Joe is to be commended for his outstanding and faithful service to the state of Michigan. On behalf of myself, Sue and all of Team Walberg, thank you Joe for your loyalty and faithfulness, and God bless you in your next and future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING RYAN DOWD

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize Ryan

Dowd, a native of Oswego, Illinois who has devoted more than half of his life to serving Aurora's homeless.

After 14 years of service, Friday, September 20th will be Ryan's last day serving as the executive director of Hesed House, the second largest shelter in the State of Illinois, and the largest shelter outside of the city of Chicago. Under his leadership, Hesed House ministries have tripled in effectiveness, housing more than 1,000 individuals annually.

Ryan began volunteering at Hesed House when he was just 13 years old and started working at the shelter during college. Upon graduating from Northern Illinois University's College of Law in 2003 with a dual JD and MPA degree, Ryan accepted a position as the associate director of Hesed House and would eventually become executive director in 2004.

I am humbled by Ryan's commitment to serve our community. While Ryan's work in Aurora is sadly coming to an end, I know he will continue to serve his fellow man and make the world a better place as he begins a career in international human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ryan Dowd and his service to the community. His tireless commitment and dedication will be missed, and I wish him and his family the best of luck in all of their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE SAN LUIS CANAL COMPANY

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the San Luis Canal Company (SLCC) during their centennial celebration. SLCC serves hundreds of landowners throughout Merced County, and we thank them for all of their hard work.

In 1913, SLCC was established as a private mutual water company. SLCC is comprised of 45,000 acres between Los Banos and Dos Palos. They strive every day to protect the land by managing water resources efficiently and effectively. Currently, SLCC is working diligently to resolve the land subsidence issues throughout the Central Valley.

SLCC has a long standing history of working with the neighboring water districts as well as communicating with the landowners in the area. Keeping the farmers involved and informed is extremely important to SLCC, so that all stakeholders can work to come up with solutions to the significant water issues.

SLCC's focus on sustainable irrigation practices is both impressive and commendable. The conservation techniques undoubtedly contribute to maintaining the Central Valley's status as an agricultural leader. Farmers in the Valley feed our great nation, and SLCC is a vital component to ensuring the success of farmers throughout Merced County.

In addition, SLCC manages some of the most substantial water projects in the State of California including the San Luis Canal. It is the largest earth-moving project in the Bureau of Reclamation's history. The Canal ranges from 8,350 to 13,100 cubic feet per second and extends 102.5 miles.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the San Luis Canal Company as they celebrate this momentous occasion. Their outstanding service and dedication to the farmers and residents in our Central Valley must be honored.

HONORING ALEXANDRA BOSTIC

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alexandra Bostic of Aurora, Indiana, and her parents, Noel and Jennifer Bostic, on Alexandra being selected as one of two national scholarship winners by the National Interscholastic Athletic Administrators Association (the NIAAA). The NIAAA is an organization founded in 1977 to promote the educational value of interscholastic athletics through the professional development of its member athletic administrators.Alexandra was awarded the scholarship, from among entries from all 50 states, based on her academic achievement, athletic accomplishments, and her essay on how participation in high school athletics impacted her life. In Alexandra's essay, she talked about leadership, teamwork, and time management. She also discussed the value of work ethic, not only on the playing field, but also in the classroom.

These are all important skills that will give Alexandra an opportunity to become a very successful person, but Alexandra's thoughts about the word ''sportsmanship'' were most touching to me. A rival high school lost one of its players in an ATV accident, and Alexandra's team faced their rival the next game after the accident. However, that day, it was about more than sports. It was about coming together to honor the life of their fellow player, not as opponents, but as friends. As Alexandra said, ''this to me is the perfect example of sportsmanship.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Alexandra's achievement and the accomplishments of all her fellow student athletes.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ''NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION REORGANIZATION CODIFICATION AND COMPLEMENTS ACT''

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of our most important responsibilities here in Congress is oversight of executive branch agencies. Such oversight illuminates flaws either in the structure or the conduct of these agencies that sometimes requires legislative action. Today, I am speaking for just such a reason.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission had operated with acceptable performance for quite some time until a few years ago when a new chairman took over the leadership of the agency in 2009. Unlike his predecessors, this chairman did not seek to work collegially with his fellow Commission members, but sought to consolidate and expand his authority as chairman. This abuse of power led to multiple investigations by Congressional committees and the NRC's Inspector General.

In 1980, during Congress' consideration of President Carter's proposal to reorganize the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Members raised concerns about the potential for just such an abuse by a rogue chairman: namely that the President's plan concentrated too much authority in the chairmanship of the agency.

I believe it is incumbent upon us, as Members of Congress, to exercise our legislative responsibility and address this situation.

For that purpose, my colleagues Mr. Barton, Mr. Burgess and Mr. Kenzinger, and I are introducing the ''Nuclear Regulatory Commission Reorganization Plan Codification and Complements Act.''

Following the Three Mile Island accident in 1979, the President and the Congress saw the need to improve the NRC's ability to respond to an accident. President Carter responded by proposing the ''Reorganization Plan of 1980'' to strengthen the power of the chairmanship by consolidating administrative and emergency authorities. A little known artifact of this history is that the 1980 Plan was subsequently approved by Congress as a resolution, not enacted as a law. Our bill would correct that artifact by seeking to codify a modern version of the 1980 Plan while limiting the potential for a chairman to abuse his authority as I described a moment ago.

While the Fukushima accident happened on foreign soil, the then-NRC chairman exercised emergency authority—authority reserved for emergencies within the NRC's jurisdiction—without making a declaration and without adequate reporting of his actions. Clearly, there must be clear operating authority and accountability in an emergency, including a declaration and termination of any special authority. This bill clarifies those requirements.

If the NRC chairman is the subject of an investigation by the Inspector General as a result of allegations of wrongdoing, the Inspector General should not remain under the chairman's supervision. This bill would require delegation of that supervisory responsibility to another member of the Commission.

These are just a few examples of the provisions in this bill. This is about good government. While the current NRC chairman worked to reestablish collegiality at the Commission, I believe we must act to preclude future leadership breakdowns akin to her predecessor. These are common sense changes to ensure the proper conduct of the people's business at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I look forward to working with my colleagues in a bipartisan fashion toward passage of this bill into law.

HONORING THE FRIENDS OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the vital work of the Friends of the Mississippi River (FMR) on the 20th anniversary of its founding. Since its inception in

1993, this organization and its army of volunteers has dedicated itself to protecting America's greatest river here at the head of navigation. Countless hours of hard work and dedication by FMR in partnership with many other organizations and individuals is making a difference for generations to come.

When the Friends of the Mississippi River was founded in 1993 its mission was to engage citizens in an effort to protect, restore and enhance the Mississippi River in the Twin Cities region. The river is one of our nation's most important natural resources, cherished each year by millions of residents and visitors alike. As one of the world's longest rivers, the Mississippi is a defining geographic feature of North America and its watershed drains all or parts of 31 states. The river's ecosystem is a natural resource of global significance, with nearly half of North America's ducks, geese and swans relying on the Mississippi River for food, direction and resting places during seasonal migrations.

Thanks to the tireless efforts of its staff, board and the hundreds of members and volunteers that support it, FMR is a one of Minnesota's leading citizen organizations for land conservation, watershed protection and river stewardship. As the ecological vitality of the Upper Mississippi River continues to be under threat, FMR faces the important task of protecting the river's ability to support native plant and animal species. Today, FMR continues to lead efforts critical to the long-term wellbeing of the Mississippi River and the Twin Cities region. FMR provides expertise and technical assistance critical to the protection of the Mississippi River and it continues to engage public and private landowners, local governments and concerned citizens as a steward for current and future generations.

FMR advocacy has helped to make the Twin Cities a model for watershed planning and decision-making. Over the past two decades, FMR has nobly fought for the protection and improvement of the Mississippi River and watershed, and their hard work deserves recognition.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in rising to honor the commitment and dedication of the Friends of the Mississippi River as we commemorate their 20th anniversary today, as they continue the legacy to restore and protect this river for future generations of Minnesotans and indeed all Americans.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 462, I was unable to be present for the vote on S. 793. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

RECOGNIZING HOLY NAME HIGH SCHOOL

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a milestone in the life of a high school in Ohio. Holy Name High School in Parma Heights begins a yearlong centennial celebration in 2014.

In the first decade of the Twentieth Century, the people of Holy Name Parish determined the grade school must be expanded to offer college preparatory second level higher education. In the fall of 1914, Holy Name High School admitted its first classes. Educated by the Sisters of Charity, Holy Name was the first Catholic high school in the Cleveland area to enroll both male and female students. In its ensuing century of education, both the school and its nearly 20,000 alumni have gone on to make a difference throughout the community, nation and world.

The school's motto, ''The School's The Thing,'' was adopted in 1926. Its message conveys the credo that personal glory in school activity means little. The school encourages its students through the teachings of the Gospels to live Catholic values and develop abilities that prepare them to lead responsible, constructive, and meaningful lives. Name High School seal consists of the Chi Rho encircled by the school of identification. Its seal, the Greek Chi Rho, is an official expression of Holy Name's desire to do all things in Christ, with Him, and through Him.

Holy Name High School's rigorous academic standards are echoed in its extra-curricular activities. From clubs to performances to sports, the ''Green Wave'' excels. Coined in the 1920, the Green Wave was first used to described the perfect coordination of the Holy Name football team, which gave the appearance of a giant green wave engulfing opponents.

Through its century of education, Holy Name High School has educated its students, promoted strong values and prepared them to live lives of service. Its alumni include people in public service as well as the private sector, community leaders and those in service to our nation. As the school, its students, parents and alumni celebrate its 100th anniversary milestone, we know they will look upon their years at Holy Name High School with fond recollection, warm memories and pride. Turning toward the future, Holy Name High School walks confidently, ensuring a quality well-rounded education for the generations to come. Onward!

RECOGNIZING MR. WILLIAM ''POPSIE'' THOMPSON AND ''THE WORLD FAMOUS RAINBOW CRUSADERS''

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of one of my most distinguished constituents, Mr. William ''Popsie'' Thompson, and the young people who work with him as part of ''The World Famous Rainbow Crusaders'' community musical group. A gifted performer, he uses his talents and abilities to keep our children safe and prepare them for a brighter future.

In 1986, Popsie noticed a group of bored children gathering around his tailor shop in Sunrise, Florida. It occurred to him that what these kids needed was an activity to boost their self-esteem and academic potential. This inspired Popsie to form The World Famous Rainbow Crusaders, a diverse troupe of over 200 young singers and dancers ranging from ages 2 to 20.

The group has since become a fixture at local celebrations and parades in the south Florida area, representing the community values of tolerance and racial harmony. Furthermore, they are the first drug awareness program to be officially recognized by the Boy Scouts of America. Popsie and his Crusaders have traveled throughout the country, with performances in Tennessee, Georgia, and Washington, DC being among their most notable appearances.

Mr. Speaker, due to their continued efforts to promote the values of anti-drug use, education, and racial harmony, I am proud to recognize Popsie Thompson and The World Famous Rainbow Crusaders. Thanks to them, hundreds of children and young adults in south Florida have greater opportunities to excel and make a difference in their community.

RECOGNIZING AND COMMENDING CSM (RET.) ELLIS DANDY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Command Sergeant Major (Retired) Ellis Dandy, who will be retiring from Fort Benning's Equal Employment Office after more than 52 years of combined active duty military and civil service. He will be honored at a retirement ceremony on Thursday, September 19, 2013 at 12:30 p.m. at McGinnis Wickam Hall at Fort Benning.

A Columbus, Georgia native, Mr. Dandy enlisted in the United States Army after graduating from high school in 1960. Throughout his military career, he served tours of duty in Europe, Southeast Asia and Korea. He taught at Army schools and served first as an Instructor/Facilitator and later as a Senior Instructor at the former Department of Defense Race Relations Institute, which is now called the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute. His last assignment on active duty was at the Pentagon where he served as the Army's Sergeant Major for Equal Opportunity (EO).

After 25 years of military service, Mr. Dandy retired in 1986 with the rank of Sergeant Major (E9). He earned both an Associate and Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology/Psychology from the University of Maryland while on active duty. He also completed the requirements for a Master's in Management from Troy State University shortly after his retirement. His military decorations include the Legion of Merit Medal, Bronze Star Medal, Department of Defense Commendation Medal, Army Commendation Medal (2), Purple Heart Medal, Combat Infantryman's Badge and the Army's General Staff Badge, among others.

Not long after his retirement, Mr. Dandy chose to again serve his country as a civil servant and accepted a position as Equal Employment Officer with the United States Food and Drug Administration in Rockville, Maryland in 1987.

In 1988, the Second Congressional District of Georgia gained an extraordinary and hard-working citizen when Mr. Dandy moved to Fort

Benning, Georgia where he has served as the Equal Employment Manager ever since. Under his leadership, the office has been honored with numerous Department of the Army and Army Major Command awards, including three times Best EEO Program Management, Most Supportive EEO Officer, Best EEO Complaints Program Management, and four times Best EEO Program Activities.

Mr. Dandy wears many hats, both in his line of work and out in the surrounding communities. He is a Certified Mediator, Race/Human Relations Trainer, and Small Group Facilitator. He is also an Ordained Baptist Deacon at his church, where he serves on the Trustee Board and sings in the Senior Gospel Choir.

Mr. Dandy has served in various capacities including president and/or board member with the American Red Cross West Central Georgia Chapter; Muscogee County Junior Marshall's Program; Greater Columbus Urban League and the League's Guild Affiliate; Annual Black History Breakfast Committee; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); Columbus Consolidated Government's Personnel Review Board; Columbus Mayor's Commission on Diversity; Columbus Times Newspaper Advisory Board; Lupus Foundation of America; Controller's Civic and Social Club; and the American Cancer Society, Columbus Chapter's Minority Task Force.

On a personal note, I have been blessed over the years with Mr. Dandy's longstanding friendship. He is one of the founding members of my Black History Observance Committee in Columbus, Georgia and I can personally attest to his strong commitment and enduring dedication to his country and his community.

Mr. Dandy has certainly accomplished many things in his life but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of his wife Edith, their six children and twelve grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, and the more than 700,000 people in Georgia's 2nd Congressional District in recognizing, commending and extending our sincerest appreciation to Mr. Ellis Dandy, a true jack of all trades, for his years of outstanding service to our nation and his dedication to serving his community.

HONORING THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARC OF ESSEX COUNTY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the ARC of Essex County, New Jersey as it celebrates its 65th Anniversary.

When a group of dedicated parents, religious leaders and volunteers gathered in September of 1948 to create services for individuals with developmental disabilities, they not only created a service that would benefit a community, but they formed a service that would change the lives of people development intellectual disabilities forever. With the efforts from these amazing individuals, came a place where people of all ages can grow comfortably and accomplish goals that would be very hard to attain otherwise.

Today, the ARC of Essex County is a private, non-profit agency serving people who live in and around the region and it is one of the pre-eminent organizations of its kind in the New York and New Jersey metropolitan area. The ARC provides resources to over 1,300 individuals and their families with both traditional and self-directed options.

Offering a large number of programs, family resources and education outlets, the ARC is happy to individually tailor fit their programs to address the unique needs of each person and family. The group also allows for more traditional services such as Adult Day Care Service and community service programs. Each of these programs has proven to be a valuable asset to everyone involved with the ARC.

The dedication of the volunteers of the ARC is to be commended as well. Their work allows the important programs and advocacy of the ARC to continue and be extraordinarily successful. These passionate volunteers are consistently providing services and assistance to individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

Much of the success of the ARC of Essex County may be seen through its accomplishments. Their educators, volunteers and staff have created opportunities for people with developmental disabled people that would have been unthinkable 65 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the ARC of Essex County, New Jersey as it celebrates its 65th Anniversary.

RECOGNIZING SAN ANTONIO JOURNALIST MONICA NAVARRO

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize San Antonio Journalist Monica Navarro, an award recipient of the San Antonio Association of Hispanic Journalists—Henry Guerra Lifetime Achievement Award for Excellence in Journalism.

For 30 years, Monica has been a reporter and anchor for San Antonio's Univision Channel 41, and her name has become synonymous with community news. Before joining Univision in 1983, she worked in Mexico City for seven years as a national sports reporter and anchor. A two-time Emmy Award winner, Monica was named the 2003 National Journalist of the Year by the Hispanic Media Awards.

Over the years, she has reported on stories that have a direct impact into people's lives, becoming a reliable source for Latino news. As a result of a California Endowment Health Journalism Fellowship at the University of Southern California, she produced an award winning four-part project titled, "El Peso de la Obesidad," which focused on the impact of obesity and diabetes on the Latino community. She now has a crucial health segment in the newscast called "Reforma de Salud" to inform the Hispanic community about the recent health reform.

I am honored and pleased to have had this time to recognize Monica Navarro on her career and community involvement. She has contributed her time, knowledge, and efforts to journalism and to serving her community.

A TRIBUTE TO MAYOR DANIEL EVANS

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a truly outstanding North Carolinian, Mayor Daniel Evans, of Smithfield, North Carolina. Mayor Evans was elected to his post sixteen years ago and has since dedicated himself wholly to bettering this great community. I ask you to join me in recognizing his long and honorable career.

Mayor Evans' hard work and leadership have been vital to the continual development of Smithfield. During Mayor Evans' tenure, he has administered projects to fix water and sewer infrastructure in the East and South Smithfield and was instrumental in the expansion of Neuse Charter School, an institution that has made a tremendous impact in the community since its opening in 2007. He has also been a great force for economic progress through his pivotal role in the development of innovative projects, such as the Smithfield Farmer's Market, as well as securing lower energy prices for the citizens of Smithfield. All of these achievements have contributed to the growth of Smithfield.

Mr. Speaker, even as Mayor Evans has dedicated many years of his life to solving the complex problems facing Smithfield, he has managed to remain openly accessible to its citizens. His enduring commitment to his community makes him an exemplary public servant, and his accomplishments will continue to benefit Eastern North Carolina for many years to come. As his time as Mayor of Smithfield comes to a close, let us honor Mayor Evans and pray that both he and his family may receive God's richest blessings upon them.

AMERICORPS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize AmeriCorps on its 20th anniversary.

As a co-Chair of the National Service Caucus, I am proud to recognize the hard work and dedication of the men and women who have served our nation through AmeriCorps.

Since its inception in 1994, more than 820,000 Americans have taken the AmeriCorps pledge, serving over one billion hours with more than 15,000 nonprofits, public agencies and faith-based organizations across America. In my home State of North Carolina, 10,000 people will participate in one of hundreds of AmeriCorps programs this year alone.

Their common goal is to improve the lives of the American people, and they have done so immeasurably. Every day, these dedicated men and women work with community-based organizations to deliver services, address local needs, and deliver aid where it is needed most, and in innovative ways. They support and improve low-performing schools, build and renovate homes for low-income families, fight

poverty, expand access to health services, rebuild communities after disasters, and help veterans transition back to civilian life.

Building on the service of individual AmeriCorps members, the AmeriCorps national program provides benefits far beyond the sum of its parts and multiplies a modest federal investment many times over.

First, AmeriCorps members help tens of thousands of faith-based and community groups expand services, enhance their capacity, raise funds, develop new partnerships, and create innovative, sustainable programs. In fact, AmeriCorps is the most effective multiplier of volunteers in service, with its members helping to recruit, train, and supervise more than 4 million volunteers in 2012.

Along the way, AmeriCorps helps organizations leverage substantial private investment from businesses, foundations and other sources, thereby stretching our federal dollars and broadening the reach of the AmeriCorps mission.

But our national service programs not only transform the lives of those who receive services; they transform the lives of those who deliver them. Participants learn marketable skills and earn post-service education scholarships, which helps them jumpstart their careers and increase earning potential over the course of their professional careers. And AmeriCorps alums are also more involved in their communities and more likely than their peers to enter into a career of public service.

This September is just the beginning of a year-long celebration of the extraordinary impact AmeriCorps has had in its past twenty years. It is also a time to look ahead and to ensure AmeriCorps is poised for even greater impact in future years.

To all of our remarkable AmeriCorps members and alums, I want to personally thank you for your service and commend your efforts to help our local communities. And once again, I extend my congratulations to AmeriCorps on this twenty year anniversary and my excitement for what is to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 462, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

CELEBRATING 100 YEARS OF SCOTT HIGH SCHOOL HISTORY

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a milestone in the life of one of the oldest high schools in our district. Toledo's Scott High School celebrates its 100th birthday this month.

When young Toledoans in the first decade of the last century began to outgrow the former Central High School, construction on two new schools began: Morrison Waite High School on Toledo's East Side and Jessup W. Scott High School on Toledo's West Side. Scott High School was named for a mid-19th century Toledo Blade newspaper editor who was a well-known civic leader and philanthropist. Eight thousand people reportedly attended Scott High School's dedication ceremony and 1,193 students were enrolled on that first day of classes, September 8, 1913.

From the start and through the decades, Scott High School was a sports powerhouse. Many of its alumni have gone on to professional careers and even the Olympics. Scott and Waite High Schools have been friendly rivals from the start. Beginning in 1914 until 1963, the two schools came together in an annual Thanksgiving Day match up which generated interest far beyond the bounds of Toledo. Perhaps even more famous than its sports teams, Scott is also known for its internationally known marching band the "Fantastic Dancing Machines." Truly one of the premier marching bands in the Midwest, the band has won many awards in band competitions throughout the United States and has performed all over the country. With a fine music tradition, Scott High School boasts famed jazz pianist Art Tatum among its illustrious alumni.

Scott High School's alumni are proud of their roots, proud of their traditions, and proud of their school. Many graduates live in Toledo and have made their mark in our hometown. As they look back with fondness on school days gone by and reminisce at the passage of 100 years, so too they look forward with hope to new accomplishments in the century to come.

IN HONOR OF DR. LAWRENCE J. SCHWEINHART FOR HIS EXCEPTIONAL DEDICATION TO EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Lawrence J. Schweinhart, president of the HighScope Educational Research Foundation, who retires next month after nearly 40 years of exceptional service to the organization and a career of commitment to early childhood education.

Dr. Schweinhart has made the economic and social benefits of high quality preschool programs well known to educators, researchers, legislators, philanthropic organizations, parents, and the general public worldwide while demonstrating extraordinary leadership through his service on local, state, national, and international boards and policymaking committees

He has provided an example of ethics and integrity the public seeks in those who serve as role models for young children and the people who care for them and has brought the highest standards of research and practice to the field of early childhood education. Dr. Schweinhart has simultaneously earned the esteem and affection of long-time colleagues and inspired a new generation of early childhood educators.

After a professional lifetime of securing active participatory learning for children throughout the country and around the world, he is retiring on October 31, 2013. I honor Lawrence for all he has done for the education community and for children. Please join me in thanking Lawrence for his unparalleled leadership. We wish him well in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 461, I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 2449. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING DR. MARTY FENSTERSHEIB

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues from California, the Honorable ANNA G. ESHOO and the Honorable ZOE LOFGREN to express our most sincere congratulations to Dr. Marty Fenstersheib, who is retiring after a 30-year career with the Santa Clara county government.

Dr. Fenstersheib is a Board Certified Pediatrician who trained in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and at the Milwaukee Children's Hospital in Wisconsin, and was in private practice in Greensboro, North Carolina. He received his Masters in Public Health from the University of California, Berkeley and became Board Certified in Public Health and Preventative Medicine.

Throughout his career in medicine and public health, Dr. Fenstersheib has shown an ardent commitment to underserved communities. He has worked with the Well Baby Clinics in San Francisco's Mission District; La Clinica, a migrant workers' clinic in Watsonville; and with Luchesa Migrant Workers Camp in Gilroy.

Dr. Fenstersheib began his career with the Santa Clara County Public Health Department in 1984 as both the Medical Director of the immunization program and as a pediatric clinician for the Department's Refugee Health Program. In 1994, he became the Health Officer for Santa Clara County and held that position until his retirement.

Dr. Fenstersheib founded the first HIV Early Intervention Clinical Program in California in 1987. This program became the model for the State of California and led to the establishment and funding of more than two dozen similar clinics in California. Additionally, Dr. Fenstersheib was at the forefront of combating the AIDS epidemic and served as a clinician caring for HIV infected persons for more than 27 years. Drs. Fenstersheib and Robert Frascino co-chaired the annual community education seminar on HIV in Santa Clara County for 11 years. Through these seminars, they provided healthcare professionals and patients with current information on HIV.

Community involvement and engagement were hallmarks of Dr. Fenstersheib's career, as evidenced by the numerous boards and leadership positions he served on in Santa

Clara County. These positions included: President of the California Conference of Local Health Officers, President of the Health Officers Association of California, Executive Member of the National Association of County and City Health Officials, Vice President of the Santa Clara County Medical Association, and Senior Fellow of the Silicon Valley Chapter of the American Leadership Forum.

For his dedication, Dr. Fenstersheib was the recipient of several esteemed honors and awards, including: Santa Clara County Medical Association's Outstanding Contribution in Community Service award and Special Recognition by the California Department of Health Office of AIDS.

Furthermore, Dr. Fenstersheib's instrumental leadership helped to pioneer the creation of two vital Santa Clara County programs. He was a founding member of the Santa Clara County Health Services Planning Council. He also served as the first chair of the Santa Clara Valley Medical Center's Department of Community Health and Preventative Medicine.

Dr. Fenstersheib has been an outspoken voice for the public's health and the face of public health in Santa Clara County. He has been one of the most respected voices on issues of pediatric obesity, tobacco control, HIV, tuberculosis, childhood immunizations, and chronic disease prevention.

It is in thanks for and in admiration of Dr. Fenstersheib that we read this Congressional Record today. We hope his legacy of public service will serve as an inspiration to others to support and serve their communities.

REMEMBERING TOLEDO'S MACOMBER-WHITNEY HIGH SCHOOL

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this weekend in my home community of Toledo, Ohio, hundreds of alumni from Macomber-Whitney High School will gather together to renew friendships and recall their high school years in a first all class reunion. The weekend events will feature riverside gatherings, tours, and a dinner.

Vocational High School began training students in 1927. The school was moved to its own location, and Irving E. Macomber Vocational Technical High School opened its doors in 1938. Named for the man who helped develop Toledo's schools and parks, Macomber educated boys serving the entire city and was part of the Toledo Public School District.

Harriet Whitney High School began providing a vocational public education to high school age girls in 1939. The school's namesake was Toledo's first school teacher nearly a century before. Whitney, too, served the entire city and was part of the Toledo Public School District.

In 1959, Whitney and Macomber High School became joint-operational. The schools were next-door to each other and became known as Macomber-Whitney. Despite the fact that they shared an urban campus and some operations, the two schools remained completely separate in faculties, enrollments, and curriculum until the 1973–1974 school year. In the spring of 1972, an assembly was held for Macomber sophomores. They were told that they could major in one of several programs offered at Whitney, taking core courses at Whitney and other courses required for graduation at Macomber. The available programs included Distributive Education, Business Technology, Marketing, and Data Processing. About fifty boys signed up. After initial adjustment, the program change worked well.

The Macomber Macmen were members of the Toledo City League and sported the colors of black and gold. Their main rivals were the Scott Bulldogs, which was especially heated in their basketball match-ups. The Macmen earned a team state title came in 1989, when the boys basketball team won the Division I state championship. The Lady Macs won two league titles: one for track & field in 1987 and one for basketball in the 1990–91 season.

As enrollment declined toward the end of the last century, the decision was made to close Macomber-Whitney High School at the end of the 1990–91 school year. The Whitney building continued as home to adult education classes, but was demolished in 2011 by Toledo Public Schools. The Macomber building has been repurposed by a nonprofit organization.

Macomber-Whitney High School educated thousands of students in the proud tradition of Toledo Public Schools, teaching them practical skills necessary to enter the workforce. Through those years values were learned, traditions passed on, and friendships made. The memories of their time at Macomber-Whitney not forgotten, its alumni will recall past days with joy, fond recollection, and proud memories.

DOG TAG . . . LEFT BEHIND

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was 2010 when Australian John Naismith traveled to Vietnam, a country rich with history, to teach English. During his fascinating time there, Naismith explored an old abandoned airstrip where the Battle of Khe Sanh took place in 1968. It was one of the bloodiest, most violent, and longest (January-July) battles of the Vietnam War between the North Vietnamese Army (NVA) and the Americans—primarily U.S. Marines, Soldiers, and Airmen and South Vietnamese soldiers. In this mountainous, rainy, hot region of the former South Vietnam, Naismith discovered an old discolored aluminum dog tag shining lightly underneath the dirt. He picked it up. He held the dog tag in his hand, looked curiously at it, and wondered about the history of it.

The war had ended long ago; life started all over again for many. The area of the battle had changed. A museum had been built where the battle was once fought. But a dog tag remained where it was left behind—for 43 years—presumably belonging to an American Marine, likely a casualty of the Vietnam war.

It represented someone's past. It wasn't something that Naismith could put down. He carried it with him in hopes of putting together an image of a young American warrior who had worn the dog tag into the battle of Khe Sanh. Thus the search for history of the dog tag began.

The U.S. entered into the Vietnam War to prevent Communist North Vietnam from taking over South Vietnam. However, the number of U.S. casualties grew significantly during the war. Some Americans never returned home. Some returned with the wounds of war. Those wounds were both physical and mental. Until the war in Afghanistan, Vietnam was the longest war in U.S. history.

American bodies of the fallen and wounded were sometimes difficult to identify, so every member of the military wore, as their fathers had done in previous wars, dog tags. In Vietnam, one tag was put around the neck and the other laced onto the boot. The dog tags listed the American's initials, last name, blood type, serial number, gas mask size, and religion—everything anyone would need to know in order to identify the individual who fell in battle.

But this dog tag found 43 years later . . . to whom did it belong? Was the warrior dead or alive? Naismith was determined to find out. His first source was the United States Government, but after months of looking, it could provide no clues where the owner of the tag was or if he was alive or dead. Naismith poured through casualty lists and could find no record of the individual who owned the dog tag. He had hit a wall.

The Government continued to search its own records. Meanwhile, Naismith left Australia and traveled to the U.S., where he found others interested in finding out what had happened to the U.S. Marine. Naismith met up with his friend Charlie Fagan, owner of Good Time Charlie's Motorcycle Shop, in California. Motorcycle shops like Charlie's were aware of numerous motorcycle groups made up of old ''war horses'' from the Vietnam War. Naismith told Charlie the story of the dog tag and his two-year quest to find the dog tag's owner. Charlie knew of Tanna Toney-Ferris, a woman who worked intensely with Vietnam vets on numerous issues, including locating them. So, using social media, Tanna told the story of the dog tag. The dog tag saga spread rapidly across several online social networks and websites. Finally, in June 2013, ''Sparky'' in Florida posted the following message to an online Marine network: ''[H]elp me locate the owner of the USMC Vietnam Veteran's dog tag. [. . . It was] found in Khe Sanh Vietnam 2 years ago by an Australian teacher. The name is L.P. Martinson. His name is NOT on the WALL, so he made it out of Vietnam.''

Finally, half way around the world in Afghanistan, Marine Staff Sergeant Joshua Laudermilk, on active duty, saw the post, called Information, and obtained Martinson's phone number. He then contacted Martinson by phone. The Marine had finally been located.

U.S. Marine Corps Sergeant Lanny P. Martinson, from Minnesota, was a part of the Khe Sanh Battle of South Vietnam. On June 4, 1968 his leg was blown away during the fighting. The 23-year-old Marine was carried off the battlefield and immediately taken to surgery. When he woke up, he did not realize neither of his dog tags were with him. Time passed and Lanny Martinson dealt with his war wounds best he could. He became successful in construction management in Minnesota. He worked until the VA granted him

100% disability in 1998 and he took up art and portrait painting. Four years ago, he and his wife Delphine moved to Texas.

When his daughter Bobby was 16 in 1998, she asked Martinson for his dog tags. She admired her warrior father and wanted the tags to wear to show he was part of the rare breed of Vietnam fighters. Martinson looked in his ''war chest'' and was surprised that they were not there. He surmised that the dog tag on the boot had been destroyed and the other tag was left behind on the battlefield. His guess had been right. It remained on that same battlefield for 43 years, until Naismith found it.

On August 20, 2013, Naismith and some of the other searchers got on motorcycles, left California and headed east—to Sugarland Texas. They took L.P. Martinson's dog tag with them. Three days later—45 years after Martinson was wounded in battle—Martinson and Naismith met for the first time at Martinson's home. The day after they met, a special ceremony was held in Missouri City, Texas, in honor of Sergeant Lanny P. Martinson, United States Marine Corps. More than 100 people attended the event, including motorcycle club members, Vietnam vets, citizens, and City Councilmember Danny Ngyuen—who was a young child living in South Vietnam during the war. Naismith presented Martinson the dog tag that had been left behind.

The Australian teacher and the U.S. Marine—now friends—plan to travel to Vietnam together. They will visit the battlefield of Khe Sanh where Martinson and his buddies valiantly fought, where he was wounded, and where a dog tag . . . was left behind.

Lanny Martinson intends to bequeath his dog tag to his daughter.

And that's just the way it is.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 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 $16,738,492,645,235.04. We've added $6,111,615,596,321.96 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.

HONORING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES OF NORTHWEST NEW JERSEY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey, serving five counties of northwest New Jersey, which is celebrating its 10th Anniversary.

As a non-profit law firm, the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey seeks to provide free legal assistance on matters affecting essential needs of low-income and other vulnerable people in our community. In the past ten years, Legal Services of New Jersey has provided services for 42,873 low-income constituents in the area. Their services seek to help individuals maintain safe and affordable housing, gain suitable incomes, access quality health care and secure family stability. The organization has attorneys and administrators working in Hunterdon, Morris, Somerset, Sussex and Warren counties.

Legal Services of Northwest Jersey is dedicated to the cause of equal justice and each year prioritizes their work and mission to serve different needs of the low-income community. Recently, the organization has focused on disaster legal assistance, access to health care and assistance for those affected by HIV/AIDS. In these areas, the organization has helped those affected by Superstorm Sandy as well as those seeking legal advice on accessing benefits of the Affordable Care Act and Medicare/Medicaid. In order to provide these services, as a public-private partnership, the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey is funded by federal, state and county governments. Most notably, the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Violence Against Women, the Merck Foundation and the County Bar Associations provide support for the organization. In addition, the organization received a $20,000 grant from the State of New Jersey in October 2012, specifically to provide legal access to those constituents affected by HIV/AIDS.

To highlight one of their own, William F. Matrician, Esq., a veteran, has served as an attorney with the Legal Aid Society of Morris County since 1971. He was instrumental in helping the organization grow into the well-recognized and respected non-profit law firm that it is today. His colleague, Joel A. Murphy, Esq., describes Bill as ''a great attorney with a very big heart''. Bill's character and dedicated service to those less-fortunate in his community is indicative of all those who devote their work and time to the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey's mission.

In recent news, the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey has made available its MENTOR (Meeting Education Needs Through Representation) program to low-income constituents. The Daily Record, highlighted and explained the mission of the program that seeks to meet the education needs of its client families through representation over a broad range of educational areas, including special education, school attendance and registration, homelessness, educational access and school disciplinary proceedings. Through the MENTOR and similar programs, the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey provides constituents with help in obtaining their basic rights as citizens, in this case, access to a quality education.

Recently, the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey has struggled to provide the civil legal services needed by their constituents due to fewer resources. Despite such obstacles, the organization has continued to provide the most comprehensive and helpful legal advice it can to low-income constituents of northwest New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Legal Services of Northwest Jersey as they celebrate their 10th Anniversary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 460, I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 3092. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

HONORING LEAH LAUDICK

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a young constituent, Leah Elizabeth Laudick of Greensburg, Indiana.

Leah was a beautiful young girl who enjoyed collecting rocks, chasing butterflies, and picking flowers. Leah loved being with her family whether it was playing basketball with her brothers or caring for her younger siblings. Leah's parents, Andy and Shelly Laudick, were both good friends of mine, and Leah's dad, Andy, was a fellow member of the Greensburg Pirates' varsity football team.

We mourn a life that ended too soon and pray for understanding and comfort for family members and those in our community who knew and loved Leah. While in times of turmoil we struggle to understand the unexplainable, may we find peace and joy in our religious faith and the memories of time shared with those we love.

I ask the citizens of the 6th Congressional District to join me in keeping Andy and Shelly, their sons Brayden, Luke, Reid and Nicholas, daughters, Lauren and Adalyn and the entire extended Laudick family in our thoughts and prayers.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, DR. QUENTIN YOUNG

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend and hero, Dr. Quentin Young, and to wish him a very happy 90th birthday. Quentin Young is the most cheerful, indefatigable, self-confident, unrelenting and optimistic warrior for justice that I have ever known. He is a tireless activist for health care justice, social justice, and equality.

My physician (until he retired without my permission) and friend, Quentin has been the nationally recognized, erudite and silver-tongued spokesperson and irrepressible cheerleader for a single-payer national health care system for the last many decades. He coined the phrase'' Everybody in, Nobody out.''

Literally ''walking the walk'', Quentin Young walked the state of Illinois advocating for universal health care with now Governor Pat Quinn. He was doctor, friend and advisor to Mayor Harold Washington, and personal physician to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during his

visits to Chicago. Quentin never missed a chance to weigh in on what is now known as Obamacare.

Dr. Young is Chairman of Health and Medicine Policy Research Group, a group that he founded in 1980 to promote social justice and challenge inequities in health and health care. He is also the national coordinator of Physicians for a National Health Program. He served as chairman for the Department of Internal Medicine at Cook County Hospital in Chicago during the 1970's and early 1980's, where he established the Department of Occupational Medicine. In 1998, Dr. Young served as President of the American Public Health Association, and in 1997 he was inducted as a Master of the American College of Physicians. In 2010, Dr. Young was appointed by Illinois Governor Pat Quinn as the Illinois' Public Health Advocate.

A renaissance man, Quentin Young is a great supporter of the arts and hosted his own radio show on WBEZ—Chicago area's PBS station. I am honored to call him a treasured friend and to be among the legions of people, young and old, who have relied on him as a mentor and for whom he is a leader and example of how to live a meaningful and spirited life. His work is making the world a healthier and better place. Happy Birthday, Dr. Quentin Young.

IN RECOGNITION OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY VICTORIA NULAND

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ambassador Victoria Nuland, who was sworn in this afternoon as the State Department's Assistant Secretary for Europe and Eurasia. Assistant Secretary Nuland, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, has served with distinction under Democratic and Republican Presidents, most recently as State Department Spokesperson, as U.S. Ambassador to NATO, and as the former Vice President's Principal Deputy National Security Advisor. Throughout her career, Ambassador Nuland has demonstrated a fervent commitment to strengthening the transatlantic partnership, a relationship based on shared devotion to democratic principles and values. As Ranking Member of the House Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, I look forward to working with Assistant Secretary Nuland to strengthen America's ties with Europe, as we work together to advance our mutual interests around the world.

IN SUPPORT OF THE EASTERN PARTNERSHIP

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the people of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine. These six countries are members of the European Union's Eastern Partnership, an initiative that aims to promote democratic values, rule of law, and economic opportunity in Eastern Europe.

Participation in the Eastern Partnership is strictly voluntary, in line with the long-standing international principle that sovereign states have the right to make their own decisions and choose their own alliances.

Each of these six countries, to one degree or another, has made clear their interest in closer relations with the European Union and has chosen—again voluntarily—to participate in the Eastern Partnership.

Three of the Eastern Partnership countries—Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine—are poised to make historic strides in their relations with the European Union by initialing or signing Association Agreements at this November's Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius, Lithuania. These Association Agreements, which include deep and comprehensive free trade provisions, will accelerate the process of political reform in each country and create conditions for extraordinary economic growth.

These Association Agreements pose no threat to other countries. Indeed, I believe that the greater geographic neighborhood and peoples of the Eastern Partnership countries would benefit from these countries' integration into the European economy. For this reason, I cannot understand nor do I condone threats of trade embargoes, energy price hikes, gas supply cutoffs, and other forms of intimidation that might dissuade Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine from a path they have voluntarily chosen.

Mr. Speaker, I call on any government engaged in such coercive practices to respect each country's right under international law to define and conduct its own relations.

I call on the Administration to stand with the people of Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine at this important moment in Europe's history.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 19, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 23

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine combating human trafficking, focusing on Federal, state, and local perspectives.

SD–342

SEPTEMBER 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Eunice S. Reddick, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Niger, John Hoover, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Sierra Leone, Michael Stephen Hoza, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cameroon, Mark Bradley Childress, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania, Thomas Frederick Daughton, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Namibia, Matthew T. Harrington, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho, and Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco, all of the Department of State.

SD–419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine United States efforts to reduce healthcare-associated infections.

SD–430

Committee on Rules and Administration

Business meeting to markup the Omnibus Budget resolution for Senate committees for the period October 1, 2013, through February 28, 2015.

SR–301

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard

To hold hearings to examine the role of certification in rewarding sustainable fishing.

SR–253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety

To hold hearings to examine black carbon, focusing on a global health problem with low-cost solutions.

SD–406

2:30 p.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the impact of political uncertainty on jobs and the economy.

SD–608

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security

To hold hearings to examine rebuilding the nation's infrastructure, focusing on leveraging innovative financing to supplement Federal investment.

SR–253

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) legislation.

SH–216

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Tomasz P. Malinowski, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Keith Michael Harper, of Maryland, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as United States Representative to the UN Human Rights Council, Crystal Nix-Hines, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and Pamela K. Hamamoto, of Hawaii, to be Representative to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador, all of the Department of State.

SD–419

SEPTEMBER 25

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the ''Terrorism Risk Insurance Act'' (TRIA), focusing on the state of the terrorism risk insurance market.

SD–538

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the need to invest in America's infrastructure and preserve Federal transportation funding.

SD–406

2:30 p.m.

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.

SD–538

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Philip S. Goldberg, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines, Robert O. Blake, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia, Karen Clark Stanton, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste, and Amy Jane Hyatt, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Palau, all of the Department of State.

SD–419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Carol Waller Pope, of the District of Columbia, Ernest W. Dubester, of Virginia, and Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, all to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

SD–342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Vince Girdhari Chhabria, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and James Maxwell Moody, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

SD–226

SEPTEMBER 26

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security

To hold hearings to examine the United States aviation industry and jobs, focusing on keeping American manufacturing competitive.

SR–253

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine reforming and renewing the postal service, part II, focusing on promoting a 21st century workforce.

SD–342

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

OCTOBER 1

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 812, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to implement the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, and H.R. 1613, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs.

SD–366

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6547–6609

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1515–1525, and S. Res. 237–240. **Page S6597**

Measures Reported:

S. Res. 237, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. Res. 238, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

S. Res. 239, authorizing expenditures by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. **Page S6596**

Measures Passed:

National Day of Remembrance for Nuclear Weapons Program Workers: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 164, designating October 30, 2013, as a national day of remembrance for nuclear weapons program workers, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S6608**

National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 240, designating the week beginning September 15, 2013, as ''National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week''. **Page S6609**

Measures Considered:

Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S6554–88**

Pending:

Wyden (for Merkley) Amendment No. 1858, to provide for a study and report on standby usage power standards implemented by States and other industrialized nations. **Page S6555**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, September 19, 2013. **Page S6609**

Messages from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information, including a technical annex and security annex (collectively referred to as the ''ATOMAL Agreement''); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (PM–20) **Page S6594**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was established in Executive Order 13224 on September 23, 2001; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–21) **Page S6594**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Tamara Wenda Ashford, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

Richard Stengel, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy.

Leslie Ragon Caldwell, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General. **Page S6609**

Messages from the House: **Page S6594**

Measures Referred: **Page S6594**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S6547, S6594–95**

Executive Communications: **Pages S6595–96**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S6596–97**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6597–98**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6598–S6602**

Additional Statements: **Page S6593**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S6602–08**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S6608**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:07 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 19, 2013. (For Senate's program, see

the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6609.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SUPERSTORM SANDY RECOVERY

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation and Community Development concluded a hearing to examine recovering from Superstorm Sandy, focusing on assessing the progress, continuing needs, and rebuilding strategy, after receiving testimony from Shaun Donovan, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Chair, Hurricane Sandy Rebuilding Task Force; and Peter Rogoff, Federal Transit Administrator, Department of Transportation.

BIGGERT–WATERS FLOOD INSURANCE ACT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Policy concluded a hearing to examine implementation of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Act of 2012, focusing on one year after enactment and additional challenges for FEMA to address, after receiving testimony from Senators Vitter and Landrieu; Craig Fugate, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Alicia Puente Cackley, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment Team, Government Accountability Office; Christine Shirley, National Flood Insurance Program Coordinator for the State of Oregon, Eugene; Steve Ellis, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Washington, D.C.; and Birny Birnbaum, The Center for Economic Justice, Austin, Texas.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY

Committee on the Budget: Committee and the Government Performance Task Force concluded a hearing to examine enhancing accountability and increasing financial transparency, focusing on the status of transparency efforts under way and the extent to which new initiatives address lessons learned from the Recovery Act, after receiving testimony from Stanley J. Czerwinski, Director, Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office; Thomas Lee, Sunlight Foundation, Washington, D.C.; and Gerald J. Kane, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Terrell McSweeny, of the District of Columbia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, and Michael P. O'Rielly, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine implementing Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century's (MAP–21) provisions to accelerate project delivery, after receiving testimony from John Porcari, Deputy Secretary, and Joseph W. Come, Assistant Inspector General for Highway and Transit Audits, both of the Department of Transportation; Dan Ashe, Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; and Nancy H. Sutley, Council on Environmental Quality.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Stevan Eaton Bunnell, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, and Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for National Protection and Programs, who was introduced by Senators Warner and Kaine, both of the Department of Homeland Security, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S.1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 113th Congress; and

The nominations of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, and Scott S. Dahl, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Labor.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee from October 1, 2013, through February 28, 2015.

FEDERAL MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCES

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reevaluating the effectiveness of

Federal mandatory minimum sentences, after receiving testimony from Senator Paul; Marc Levin, Texas Public Policy Foundation, Austin; Brett Tolman, Ray Quinney and Nebeker, PC, Salt Lake City, Utah; and Scott Burns, National District Attorneys Association, Alexandria, Virginia.

CLOSING THE WEALTH GAP

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine closing the wealth gap, focusing on empowering America to reach its full economic potential for growth and job creation, after receiving testimony from Darryl Hairston, Associate Administrator for Business Development, Small Business Administration; Zenita Wickham Hurley, State of Maryland Special Secretary of the Governor's Office of Minority Affairs, Baltimore; Signe-Mary McKernan, The Urban Institute, Rakesh Kochhar, Pew Research Center, Toya Powell, U.S. Black Chambers, Inc., Lisa Hasegawa, National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development, Kevin Allis, Potawatomi Business Development Corporation, and Shree Whitaker Taylor, Delta Decisions of DC, all of Washington, D.C.; Connie E. Evans, Association for Enterprise Opportunity, Arlington, Virginia; Barbara Crain Major, Collaborative, New Orleans, Louisiana; and Anisa Balwani, RCI Technologies, Inc., Iselin, New Jersey.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: On Tuesday, September 17, 2013, Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 113th Congress.

HIV/AIDS IN AMERICA

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine older Americans, focusing on the changing face of HIV/AIDS in America, after receiving testimony from Ronald O. Valdiserri, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health, Infectious Diseases, Office of HIV/AIDS and Infectious Disease Policy, Department of Health and Human Services; Daniel Tietz, AIDS Community Research Initiative of America, and Rowena Johnston, amfAR, The Foundation for AIDS Research, both of New York, New York; Carolyn L. Massey, Massmer Associates, LLC, Laurel, Maryland; and Kenney Miller, Down East AIDS Network, Ellsworth, Maine.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 14 public bills, H.R. 3119–3132; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 56; and H. Res. 349–350 were introduced. **Page H5654**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5655–56**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 351, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act 2008; and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–215); and

H. Res. 352, providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (H. Rept. 113–216). **Pages H5653–54**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative LaMalfa to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5591**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:55 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5597**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Dale Ribble, Oak Lake Church, Lincoln, Nebraska. **Page H5597**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated yesterday, September 17th:

Providing for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central

Asia: H.R. 301, amended, to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 402 yeas to 22 nays, Roll No. 465. **Pages H5606–09**

National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013: The House passed H.R. 761, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, by a recorded vote of 246 ayes to 178 noes, Roll No. 471. **Pages H5600–06, H5609–24**

Rejected the Cicilline motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 197 ayes to 229 noes, Roll No. 470. **Pages H5621–23**

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule.

Pages H5600, H5604

Agreed to:

Pearce amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 113–214) that clarifies the intention of the bill that it will not impact Secretarial Order 3324, as it relates to oil/gas and potash. **Page H5617**

Rejected:

Lowenthal amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 113–214) that sought to clarify that the definition of ''Strategic and Critical Minerals'' only includes the minerals identified by the National Research Council (NRC) as strategic and critical minerals (and any additional minerals added by the Secretary that meet the NRC's criteria). Also would clarify that the definition of ''Mineral Exploration or Mine Permit'' in this underlying legislation only refers to mineral exploration or mine permit for strategic and critical minerals (by a recorded vote of 187 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 466); **Pages H5612–14, H5618–19**

Veasey amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 113–214) that sought to designate the Secretary of Interior to publish no later than 60 days ager enactment of the bill a list of ''Strategic and Critical Minerals'' for the purpose of the bill. The Secretary must update the list every 5 years (by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 237 noes, Roll No. 467);

Pages H5614–15, H5619–20

Connolly amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 113–214) that sought to require mineral exploration and mining projects to be subjected to an Environmental Impact Statement review prior to approval. Removes the arbitrary limit on the time frame for such reviews (by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 468); and **Pages H5615–16, H5620**

Hastings (FL) amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 113–214) that sought to require that the cost of cleanup be included in financial assurance and that financial insurance instruments shall be in the form of a surety bond, letter of credit or other instrument that would routinely be accepted in commerce (by a recorded vote of 191 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 469). **Pages H5616–17, H5620–21**

H. Res. 347, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 190 noes, Roll No. 464, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 463. **Pages H5600–06**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:31 p.m. and reconvened at 4:31 p.m. **Page H5618**

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 349, electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives. **Page H5624**

Presidential Messages: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001 is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2013—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 113–63).

Page H5641

Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted the text of the Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information, including a technical annex and security annex—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 113–64). **Page H5641**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5605, H5605–06, H5606, H5619, H5619–20, H5620, H5621, H5622–23, H5623–24. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

Committee Meetings

SEQUESTRATION IN FISCAL YEAR 2014 AND PERSPECTIVES OF THE MILITARY SERVICES ON THE STRATEGIC CHOICES AND MANAGEMENT REVIEW

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing on Planning for Sequestration in Fiscal Year 2014 and Perspectives of the Military Services on the

Strategic Choices and Management Review. Testimony was heard from General James F. Amos, USMC; Admiral Jonathan W. Greenert, USN; General Raymond T. Odierno, USA; and General Mark A. Welsh III, USAF.

KEEPING COLLEGE WITHIN REACH: IMPROVING ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY THROUGH INNOVATIVE PARTNERSHIPS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training held a hearing entitled ''Keeping College Within Reach: Improving Access and Affordability through Innovative Partnerships''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S CLIMATE CHANGE POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing entitled ''The Obama Administration's Climate Change Policies and Activities''. Testimony was heard from Gina McCarthy, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency; and Ernest Moniz, Secretary, Department of Energy.

REGULATION OF EXISTING CHEMICALS AND THE ROLE OF PRE-EMPTION UNDER SECTIONS 6 AND 18 OF THE TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL ACT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing entitled ''Regulation of Existing Chemicals and the Role of Pre-Emption under Sections 6 and 18 of the Toxic Substances Control Act''. Testimony was heard from Lemuel M. Srolovic, Chief, Environmental Protection Bureau, Office of the Attorney General, New York; and public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE SEC'S MONEY MARKET FUND RULE PROPOSAL

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled ''Examining the SEC's Money Market Fund Rule Proposal''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BENGHAZI: WHERE IS THE STATE DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled Benghazi: Where Is the State Department Accountability''. Testimony was heard from Patrick F. Kennedy, Under Secretary for Management, Department of State.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies held a markup on H.R. 2952, the ''Critical Infrastructure Research and Development Advancement Act of 2013''; and H.R. 3107, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish cybersecurity occupation classifications, assess the cybersecurity workforce, develop a strategy to address identified gaps in the cybersecurity workforce, and for other purposes. The following measures were forwarded, as amended: H.R. 2952 and H.R. 3107.

UNDERSTANDING THE THREAT TO THE HOMELAND FROM AQAP

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''Understanding the Threat to the Homeland from AQAP''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S USE OF FISA AUTHORITIES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing on ''Oversight of the Administration's Use of FISA Authorities''. This was a closed hearing.

THE ROLE OF VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN THE U.S. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SYSTEM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''The Role of Voluntary Agreements in the U.S. Intellectual Property System''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FEDERAL IMPLEMENTATION OF OBAMACARE: CONCERNS OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Job Creation and Regulatory Affairs; and Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements held a joint subcommittee hearing entitled ''Federal Implementation of ObamaCare: Concerns of State Governments''. Testimony was heard from Jeff Colyer, Lieutenant Governor, State of Kansas; Brad Hutton, State Senator, South Carolina; Alan Wilson, Attorney General, South Carolina; Katrina Jackson, State Representative, Louisiana; Kathy Kliebert, Secretary of Department of Health and Hospitals, Louisiana; Eleanor Sobel, State Senator, State of Florida; and Matthew Hudson, State Representative, State of Florida.

SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2013; RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT; NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013; AND CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 687, the ''Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013''; H.R. 1526, the ''Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act; H.R. 3102, the ''Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013''; and H.J. Res. 59, Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014. The Committee granted, by voice vote, a structure rule for H.R. 687. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for the purpose of amendment the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part A of the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part A of the report. The report provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Additionally, the rule provides a structure rule for H.R. 1526. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 113–21, modified by the amendment printed in part B of 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 makes in order only those further amendments printed in part C of the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part C of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule provides a closed rule for H.R. 3102. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule waives all points of order against provisions of the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit.

The Committee also granted, by voice vote, a closed rule for H.J. Res. 59. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted and the joint resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

In Section 2, the rule provides that it shall be in order at any time from the calendar day of September 26, 2013, through the calendar day of September 29, 2013, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules and that the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter or consideration pursuant to this section.

Testimony was heard from the following Chairmen: Hastings (WA); Lucas (OK); and Rogers (KY); and the following Representatives: Grijalva; DeFazio; Lowey; Van Hollen; Norton; and Scalise.

METHAMPHETAMINE ADDICTION: USING SCIENCE TO EXPLORE SOLUTIONS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Methamphetamine Addiction: Using Science to Explore Solutions''. Testimony was heard from Niki Crawford, First Sergeant, Meth Suppression Section Commander, Indiana State Police; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2542, the ''Regulatory Flexibility

Improvements Act of 2013''. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

FEMA REAUTHORIZATION: RECOVERING QUICKER AND SMARTER

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled ''FEMA Reauthorization: Recovering Quicker and Smarter''. Testimony was heard from Joseph L. Nimmich, Associate Administrator for Response and Recovery, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Yolanda Chavez, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Grant Programs, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development; and public witnesses.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE'S EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS DIVISION POST–TIGTA AUDIT

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled ''Internal Revenue Service's Exempt Organizations Division Post-TIGTA Audit''. Testimony was heard from Daniel Werfel, Acting Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service.

Joint Meetings

DEBT CEILING

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the economic costs of debt-ceiling brinksmanship, after receiving testimony from Mark Zandi, Moody's Analytics, West Chester, Pennsylvania; David Malpass, Encima Global LLC, New York, New York; and Donald B. Marron, The Urban Institute, and Dan Mitchell, Cato Institute, both of Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Deborah Lee James, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Air Force, Jessica Garfola Wright, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, and Marcel J. Lettre II, of Maryland, to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Intelligence, all of the Department of Defense, Frank G. Klotz, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Energy for Nuclear Security, and Kevin A. Ohlson, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jo Emily Handelsman, of Connecticut, and Robert Michael Simon, of Maryland, both to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and Kathryn D. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine wildlife management authority within the State of Alaska under the Alaska National Interest Lands Act and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine promoting a system of shared responsibility, focusing on issues for reauthorization of the ''Higher Education Act'', 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine reforming and renewing the postal service, part I, focusing on maintaining services, reducing costs and increasing revenue through innovation and modernization, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 357, 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, and the nominations of Cornelia T. L. Pillard, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Landya B. McCafferty, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Hampshire, Brian Morris, and Susan P. Watters, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Montana, Jeffrey Alker Meyer, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, and Patricia M. Wald, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The U.S. Presence in Afghanistan Post-2014: Views of Outside Experts'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation, hearing entitled ''Defense Department's posture for September 11, 2013: What are the Lessons of Benghazi?'', 3:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pension, hearing entitled ''Future of Union Organizing'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Two Weeks Until Enrollment: Questions for CCIIO'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing entitled ''Keystone's Red Tape Anniversary: Five Years of Bureaucratic Delay and Economic Benefits Denied'', 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled ''Examining the Syrian Refugee Crisis'', 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing entitled ''An Unclear Roadmap: Burma's Fragile Political Reforms and Growing Ethnic Strife'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, markup on H. Res. 284, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to promoting energy security of European allies through opening up the Southern Gas Corridor, 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, hearing entitled ''DHS Acquisition Practices: Improving Outcomes for Taxpayers Using Defense and Private Sector Lessons Learned'', 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, hearing entitled ''Assessing the Nation's State of Preparedness: A Federal, State, and Local Perspective'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Federal Bureau of Prisons'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing entitled ''The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Consolidation, and the Consequent Impact on Competition in Healthcare'', 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing entitled ''Keeping Hydropower Affordable and Reliable: The Protection of Existing Hydropower Investments and the Promotion of New Development'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs, hearing entitled ''Executive Branch standards for land-in-trust decisions for gaming purposes'', 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Reviews of the Benghazi Attack and Unanswered Questions'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Oversight and Subcommittee on Environment, joint subcommittee hearing entitled ''Dysfunction in Management of Weather and Climate Satellites'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access, hearing entitled ''Private Sector Initiatives to Educate Small Business Owners and Entrepreneurs'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3080, the ''Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013''; H.R. 3095, to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes; and H.R. 3096, to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the ''Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Trials in Transparency: An Analysis of VA Cooperation with Congress in Meeting its Oversight Responsibilities on Behalf of Veterans'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing entitled ''Social Security Disability Insurance fraud conspiracy in Puerto Rico'', 2:30 p.m., B–318 Rayburn.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities'', 10 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, September 19

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will continue consideration of S. 1392, Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, September 19

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 3102—Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1334
Brownley, Julia, Calif., E1331
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1338
Costa, Jim, Calif., E1333
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E1335
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E1330
Dingell, John D., Mich., E1336
Foster, Bill, Ill., E1332
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1335, E1338
Gohmert, Louie, Tex., E1329
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1334
Holt, Rush, N.J., E1330
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E1336
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1334, E1336, E1337
Keating, William R., Mass., E1339, E1339
Kelly, Mike, Pa., E1332
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E1329
Kinzinger, Adam, Ill., E1329
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1332
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E1332
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1333
McIntyre, Mike, N.C., E1335
Maffei, Daniel B., N.Y., E1331
Messer, Luke, Ind., E1333, E1338
Moran, James P., Va., E1332
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1337
Price, David E., N.C., E1335
Sarbanes, John P., Md., E1331
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1336, E1338
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E1329
Schwartz, Allyson Y., Pa., E1334, E1336, E1338
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E1330
Terry, Lee, Nebr., E1333
Walberg, Tim, Mich., E1332
Watt, Melvin L., N.C., E1331

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.